



Fiscal Year 2012
Annual Report to Congress
on the
Notification and Federal Employee
Antidiscrimination and Retaliation
Act of 2002

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Executive Summary.....	3-4
II.	Introduction.....	5
III.	Background.....	5
IV.	Data.....	5-9
	a. Civil Cases	
	b. Reimbursement to the Judgment Fund	
	c. Types of Disciplinary Actions	
	d. Description of Policy on Disciplinary Actions	
	e. Final Year-End Data Posted Under Section 301 (c) (1) (B)	
V.	Analysis of Trends, Causal Analysis, and Practical Knowledge.....	9
	Gained Through Experience	
VI.	Adjustment to Budget.....	9
VII.	Actions Planned or Taken to Improve Complaint or Civil Rights Programs.....	10-11
	Pursuant to Section 203 (a)(7)(D)	
VIII.	No FEAR Plan.....	11
	APPENDIX A: Pending Federal Court Cases by Alleged Violation.....	14
	APPENDIX B: Reimbursement of Judgment Fund.....	15
	APPENDIX C: Disciplinary Actions.....	16
	APPENDIX D: AFI 36-704, Civilian Personnel Discipline and.....	17-18
	Adverse Actions: Guide to Disciplinary Actions and Selecting the Penalty	
	APPENDIX E: No FEAR Act Report.....	19-27
	APPENDIX F: No FEAR Act Training Plan.....	28-29
	APPENDIX G: No FEAR Act Training Documentation.....	30-45

I. Executive Summary

The Department of the Air Force (DAF) provides its Annual Report to Congress as required by Section 203 of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (“No FEAR Act”), Public Law 107-174. The DAF report provides information on the number of cases in Federal court pending or resolved that resulted in judgments, awards, or compromise settlements; the amount of money required to be reimbursed by the Air Force; the number of employees disciplined as defined in 5 C.F.R. 724.102 and the specific nature, e.g., reprimand, etc., of the disciplinary actions taken, separated by the provisions(s) of law involved; the final year-end data about discrimination complaints for each fiscal year posted in accordance with Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) regulations at 29 C.F.R. 1614 subpart G (implementing section 301(c) (1)(B) of the No FEAR Act); a detailed description of the agency’s policy for taking disciplinary actions; an analysis of trends and practical knowledge gained through experience; any actions planned or taken to improve complaint or civil rights programs with the goal of eliminating discrimination and retaliation in the workplace; any adjustments to the budget to comply with the No FEAR Act requirements and the agency’s written plan developed to train its employees.

This No FEAR Act Annual Report covers Fiscal Year (FY) 2012, from October 1, 2011 to September 30, 2011. During this reporting period there were 22 Federal court cases pending ([Appendix A](#)). Eighteen of the cases had two or more bases. Eleven (11) cases alleged violations of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000e et seq) (Title VII). Seven (7) alleged violations filed under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA) of 1967 (29 U.S.C. §§ 631, 633(a)); four (4) alleged the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Rehab. Act) (29 U.S.C. §791); none fell under the Whistleblower Protection Act (WPA) (5 U.S.C. §2302(b)(8)).

Of the pending Federal court cases, two (2) cases are pending from 2009; six (6) cases are pending from 2011, and thirteen (13) cases are pending from 2012. The two most prevalent bases of the Federal court cases pending are race and reprisal.

There were a total of eleven (11) Federal court cases closed this reporting period; two (2) with awards and nine (9) with no awards. None of the awards paid resulted in findings. Total awards pay-out was \$180K.

Reimbursement of the Judgment Fund for FY12 was \$575K. This is a \$85K decreased from what was reimbursed in FY11, ([Appendix B](#)). There were one separately designated attorney’s fees of \$37K from the amount reimbursed to the Judgment Fund and there were no adjustment made to the agency’s budget to pay awards.

The DAF disciplined a total of 10 employees for infractions arising from provision of law cited in the No FEAR Act. All but two of the discipline actions resulted in a suspension the others resulted in reprimand. ([Appendix C](#)). Five (5) of the respective provisions were sexual harassment and five (5) were prohibited personnel practice. The agency’s policy on disciplinary actions and selecting the penalty can be found in AFI 36-704, 22 July 1994, Civilian Personnel; Discipline and Adverse Actions: Guide to Disciplinary Actions, pgs 34 – 40. ([Appendix D](#)).

The final year-end data posted on DAF's web site pursuant to Section 301(c) (1) (B) of the No FEAR Act is included in [Appendix E](#).

A summary of the data this reporting period shows there were 472 complaints filed while in FY11, 615 complainants were filed. This is a decrease by 23.4% in complaints filed. Complaints filed equated to just 0.26% of the DAF workforce, ten (10) included remands. This FY12 there were a total of seven (7) complaints which resulted in findings of discrimination. Six (6) were findings from hearing and one (1) was a finding without a hearing. The bases identified: retaliation and age. The issues complained of: assignment of duties, evaluation/appraisal, and time and attendance.

The basis of retaliation was the most filed 196 complaints while race 175 complaints was the second most filed basis. There were 289 claims of retaliation filed in FY11 a decreased by 39.5% this FY. In race based complaints 238 were filed in FY11 down by 26.5% this FY. This FY all bases reflected a decreased excepted national origin which increased by only 0.9%. The most significant decreased was in the basis of retaliation. In FY11, 289 complaints were filed this FY 196 complaints were filed a decreased of 32%. Other significant decreases were in the bases of race, age, and disability. The most prevalent issue claimed this reporting period was disciplinary action – removal. The majority of issues reflected a decreased and uneventful.

With regards to processing times the average numbers of days showed an increased in the investigation stages and the final action stages. The most significant increase was in the final actions stage taking an additional 89 days to process. Overall the average processing days increased by 180 days. FY11 overall average was 308 days this FY shows an average of 466 days.

This FY, 61 complaints were dismissed by the agency while in FY11 83 cases were dismissed. The average days pending prior to dismissal was 69 days compared to 58 days in FY11. Total complaints withdrawn by complainants were 53 compared to 71 withdrawals last year.

Pending complaints from previous FY this year is 374 compared to 290 in FY11. Complaints pending in investigation shows 37, pending in hearing 220, pending in final action 116 and pending in appeal with EEOC Office of Federal Operations 235. Pending complaints where investigation exceeded the required time frame 315, in FY11 213.

The agency's training plan is found at [APPENDIX F](#). It outlines how the agency implemented the No FEAR training requirements. The No FEAR training statistical report for civilian employees trained was 89.0% and military civilian supervisors trained was 86.5% with a combined agency total of 88.0% see [APPENDIX G](#), a reporting of 100% of our major commands (MAJCOM), and 99% of our installations.

II. Introduction

The No FEAR Act requires Federal agencies to submit annual reports to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President *pro tempore* of the Senate, the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate, the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives, each committee of Congress with jurisdiction relating to the agency, the Attorney General, and EEOC. Additionally, the U.S. Office of Personnel Management's (OPM) final regulation on the No FEAR Act requires that OPM also receive a copy of the report. The DAF submission is in accordance with these reporting requirements.

III. Background

The No FEAR Act was signed into law on May 15, 2002, and became effective on October 1, 2003. The Act requires Federal agencies to be accountable for violations of antidiscrimination and whistleblower protection laws and to post certain statistical data on their web sites relating to Federal sector EEO complaints filed with the agencies.

Section 203 of the No FEAR Act requires that each Federal agency submit its annual report to Congress not later than 180 days after the end of each FY. Federal agencies must report, among other things, the number of Federal court cases arising under each of the respective areas of law specified in the Act in which discrimination was alleged; the status or disposition of cases; amount of money required to be reimbursed; number of employees disciplined; any policies implemented related to appropriate disciplinary actions against a Federal employee who discriminated against any individual, or committed a prohibited personnel practice; and, an analysis of the data collected with respect to trends, and causal analysis.

The President delegated responsibility to OPM for the issuance of regulations governing implementation of Title II of the No FEAR Act. The OPM published final regulations on May 10, 2006, concerning the reimbursement provisions of the Act; final regulations to carry out the notification and training requirements of the Act on July 20, 2006; and the final regulations to implement the reporting and best practices provisions of the No FEAR Act on December 28, 2006. The EEOC issued its final regulations to implement the posting requirements of Title III of the No FEAR Act on August 2, 2006. The DAF has prepared this report based on the provisions of the No FEAR Act and OPM and EEOC's final regulations.

IV. Data

Section 203(a)(1) of the No FEAR Act requires that Federal agencies include in their Annual Report to Congress "the number of cases arising under each of the respective provisions of law covered by paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 201(a) in which discrimination on the part of such agency was alleged." The OPM's final regulations at 5 C.F.R. § 724.302 on reporting and best practices issued on December 28, 2006, clarify section 203(1) of the No FEAR Act stating that Federal agencies report on the "number of cases in Federal court [district or appellate] pending or resolved...arising under each of the respective provisions of the Federal Antidiscrimination laws and Whistleblower

Protection Laws applicable to them...in which an employee, former Federal employee, or applicant alleged a violation(s) of these laws, separating data by the provision(s) of law involved.”

Additionally, the final year-end data posted on DAF’s web site pursuant to Section 301(c) (1) (B) of the No FEAR Act is included in [Appendix E](#). The final year-end data indicate there were 472 complaints of discrimination filed, by 446 complainants. This is a decrease by 23.4% in complaints filed and equated to just 0.26% of the DAF workforce.

a. Civil Cases

During this reporting period there were 22 Federal court cases pending ([Appendix A](#)). Eighteen of the cases had two or more bases. Eleven (11) cases alleged violations of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000e et seq) (Title VII). Seven (7) alleged violations filed under the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA) of 1967 (29 U.S.C. §§ 631, 633(a)); four (4) alleged the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Rehab. Act) (29 U.S.C. §791); none fell under the Whistleblower Protection Act (WPA) (5 U.S.C. §2302(b)(8)).

b. Reimbursement to the Judgment Fund

The OPM published final regulations in the Federal Register on May 10, 2006, to clarify the Agency reimbursement provisions of Title II of the No FEAR Act. These regulations state, among other things, that the Financial Management Service (FMS), a Bureau of the U.S. Department of the Treasury, will provide notice to an Agency’s Chief Financial Officer within 15 business days after payment from the Judgment Fund. The Agency is required to reimburse the Judgment Fund within 45 business days after receiving the notice from FMS or must contact FMS to make arrangements in writing for reimbursement.

The reimbursement to the Treasury Judgment Fund was \$575K for two discrimination cases filed in Federal court resulting in judgments, awards, or compromise settlements during FY12. Neither had resulted in findings. \$37K attorney’s fees separately designated. The DAF has reimbursed the Treasury Judgment Fund of all monies owed to the Fund for judgments, awards, and compromise settlements for FY12. A more detailed comparative can be found in [Appendix C](#).

c. Types of Disciplinary Actions

Section 203(a)(4) of the No FEAR Act requires that Federal agencies include in the Annual Report to Congress the number of disciplinary actions taken for conduct inconsistent with Federal anti-discrimination and whistleblower protections. The OPM’s regulation clarified that these cases refer to the number of discrimination cases for which the Judgment Fund paid on behalf of the Agency. The regulations also defined disciplinary actions to include any one, or a combination of, the following actions: reprimand, suspension without pay, reduction in grade or pay, or removal. The OPM’s final regulation also provides that irrespective of discrimination cases in Federal court, Federal agencies are to report the total number of employees disciplined and the specific nature of the disciplinary action taken in accordance with Agency policy that prescribes disciplinary action for discrimination, retaliation, or harassment conduct, and whistleblower protection law violations.

This FY a total of 10 disciplinary actions fell under the provision of No FEAR Act. Two resulted in reprimands and eight resulted in suspensions. Five complaints fell under sexual harassment and five fell under the prohibited personnel practices. A more detailed comparative can be found in [Appendix C](#).

d. Final Year-End Data Posted Under Section 301(c)(1)(B)

The final year-end data posted on DAF's web site pursuant to Section 301(c) (1) (B) of the No FEAR Act is included in [Appendix E](#). The following is a synopsis of the final report.

Complaint Activity

Overall, FY12 complaint activity of 472 reflects of a decrease of 23.3 % or 143 fewer cases filed. This total includes ten remanded cases. In FY11, 615 complaints were filed, 546 were filed in FY10. Complaint activity has been on the decline since FY09, when 509 cases were filed.

Complaints by Basis

The largest decrease this reported period was reflected in the basis of retaliation where 196 claims were filed instead of 289 reported in FY11. In race-based complaints, 175 cases were filed compared to 238 in FY11. This represents a decrease of 26.5%. There were not any significant increases this reporting period. All bases reflected a decrease except for national origin which only went up by 9%. Also showed a significant decrease was disability claims 208 claims were filed in FY11 this reporting period only 137 claims were filed a decrease of 34.4%.

Complaints by Issue

Although non-sexual harassment went down by 2.5% or 4 claims it continues to be the most prevalent claim identified. One hundred sixty three filed this reporting period while 167 was filed in FY11. Several personnel actions should double digits decreases; appointments, assignments, awards, evaluation/appraisal, denied reassignment, termination, reasonable accommodation, and in terms/conditions of employment.

Processing Time

All categories in the processing time increased. The most significant was "complaints pending during fiscal year (average number of days in final action stage)." In FY11, numbers of days in final action stage were 217; this reporting period 306 days were spent in the final action stage, an increase of 158 days. Another significant increase was reflected in "average number of days in investigation stage"; in FY11 216 days were reported this FY, 260 days is reported. The overall average number of days in final action stage was up by 158 days or 51.0%.

Complaints Dismissed by Agency

The agency dismissed a total of 61 complaints on the merits, average days pending prior to dismissal was 69 days and the number of complaints withdrawn by the complainants was 53.

Total Final Actions Finding Discrimination

There were a total of seven findings of discrimination one was without a hearing and six as with a hearing. The bases identified in the findings were: retaliation and age. The issues complained of: were assignment, disciplinary action, duty hours and non-sexual harassment.

Pending Complaints Filed in Previous Fiscal Years by Status

Total complaints carried over from previous year was 374, which equated to 326 complainants; complaints pending in investigation were 37 compared to 25 in FY11; complaints pending in hearing 220 compared to 167 in FY11; complaints pending in final action 116 and complaints pending appeal with EEOC Office of Federal Operations, 235 compared to 206 cases in FY11.

Complaint Investigations

Overall, complaints exceeding the required timeframes increased this reporting was 315 this FY while 213 was reported in FY11, an increase of 48%, or 102 complaints.

e. Description of Policy on Disciplinary Actions and Selecting the Penalty

Section 203(a) (6) of the No FEAR Act requires that Federal agencies include in their Annual Report to Congress a detailed description of the policy implemented by the Agency relating to disciplinary actions imposed against a Federal employee who discriminated against any individual in violation of any of the laws cited under section 201(a) (1) or (2), or committed another prohibited personnel practice that was revealed in the investigation of a complaint claiming a violation of any of the laws cited under section 201(a) (1) or (2).

[Appendix D](#) references the agency's disciplinary action and guidance on selecting the appropriate penalty. [Appendix C](#) provides number of DAF employees disciplined this reporting period for prohibitions of unlawful discrimination and discriminatory practices.

f. No FEAR Training

Section 202(c) of the No FEAR Act requires Federal agencies to provide training to their employees on the rights and remedies under Federal antidiscrimination, retaliation, and whistleblower protection laws. Under 5 C.F.R. § 724.203, Federal agencies were required to develop a written training plan and to have trained their employees by December 17, 2006, and every two years thereafter. Under implementing regulations, new employees are to receive No FEAR training within 90 days of appointment, which can be met through an Agency orientation or training program. [Appendix F](#) provides a detailed description of the agency's No FEAR training plan. The No FEAR training statistical report for civilian employees trained was 89.0% and military civilian supervisor 86.5% were trained giving the agency a combined 88.0% see [Appendix G](#), a reporting of 100% of our major commands (MAJCOM), and 99% of our installations.

V. Analysis of Trends, Causal Analysis, and Practical Knowledge Gained Through Experience

Section 203(a) (7) of the No FEAR Act requires that Federal agencies undertake “an examination of trends, causal analysis, and practical knowledge gained through experience and any actions planned or taken to improve complaint or civil rights programs of the agency.” See; **VII. DAF’s Actions Planned or Taken to Improve Complaint or Civil Rights Programs Pursuant to Section 203 (a)(7)(D)**

This reporting period showed that complaint filings down 28% from FY11. The agency’s MD-715 reported that White females, Hispanic males and females, and individuals with disabilities departure from the agency decreased from FY 2011 to FY 2012. White females filed 13.2% while Hispanic males and females made up 10.5% of complaints filed this FY12.

Additionally, there are low participation rates of some EEO groups of employees and individuals with disabilities in various major occupations and at the mid-manager (GS-13 to GS-15) grades and SES levels. See; **VII. DAF’s Actions Planned or Taken to Improve Complaint or Civil Rights Programs Pursuant to Section 203 (a)(7)(D)**

VI. Adjustment to Budget

Section 203(a) (8) of the No FEAR Act requires that Federal agencies include in their Annual Report to Congress information regarding “any adjustment (to the extent the adjustment can be ascertained in the budget of the agency) to comply with the requirements under section 201.”

The DAF has not made such an adjustment to its budget.

VII. DAF’s Actions Planned or Taken to Improve Complaint or Civil Rights Programs Pursuant to Section 203 (a)(7)(D)

Air Force Equal Opportunity continued to make progress toward achieving a model EEO program during FY 2012 despite such challenges as civilian hiring freezes, reductions in manpower authorizations, and funding shortages. A list of accomplishments and initiatives to provide equal opportunity for all employees and promote an inclusive and diverse workforce that maximizes employees’ potential is shown below.

EO Process Improvement.

1. Timeliness of Processing EEO Complaints. In FY2012 the Air Force implemented efficiencies developed in FY2011 for reducing EEO processing times from 180 to 150 days and to reduce Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) times from 90 to 60 days. Efficiencies included an expedited processing pilot, more frequent tracking of open cases, reassigning some functions, and increased accountability. Six Air Force bases are being used as to test the expedited processing pilot.

a. One result was over 90% of informal complaints (i.e., pre-complaint inquiries) were processed in a timely manner.

b. Air Force is working with the DoD Investigation Resolution Division (IRD) in a process improvement effort to reduce the backlog of EEO complaint investigations. One initiative is a “blitz” where IRD investigators perform investigations on at least seven formal complaints at one time in one location. Efforts had just begun as of the beginning of the first quarter of FY2013.

c. Final Agency Decisions (FADs). The AF Civilian Appellate Review Agency hired a contract Analysts to help with writing of FADs in November 2011. As of October 2012, the backlog of FADs to be written had been eliminated.

d. DAF 0260 and 3S171 Survey. The AF conducted the first ever survey of all AF specialists, directors and managers in the 0260 (civilian) and 3S171 (military) career field. The specific purpose of the survey to determine career field health and receive direct feedback on issues EO professionals are experiencing since the merger of EEO and MEO. A Strategic Advisor Working Group was formed to address challenges and issues facing the EO Community. The Group is led by AF/A1Q and AFPC/EO with six teams to work actionable items reported on a periodic basis. A description of each team is provided.

(1) **The Compliance Team** will review and make recommendations on issues relating to legal and regulatory compliance requirements for military EO and civilian EEO programs.

(2) **The Training Career Development Team** will review and make recommendations on training of the AF workforce and EO professional development.

(3) **The Technology Team** will review and make recommendations on issues relating to information technology.

(4) **The Communications Team** will review and analyze information for enhanced internal and external communication.

(5) **The Manning and Assignments Team** will review and make recommendations to issues relating to the EO workforce manning, resources and assignments.

(6) **The EO Climate Assessment/Miscellaneous Issues Team** will review and analyze the results of the 2012 EO Climate Assessment results and issues not assigned to other teams for implementation into actionable items.

Air Force Barrier Analysis Working Group (AFBAWG):

2. **Air Force Barrier Analysis Working Group (AFBAWG):** The AFBAWG was restructured to add such relevant teams as the Hispanic Employment Analysis Team (HEAT) and Women's Issues Team (WIT) for greater efficiency. The AFBAWG executive team met with their respective team members at headquarters, major command, and local base levels for various perspectives. Actions taken include: Requested, and the Air Force Audit Agency (AFAA) approved, a project audit to gather information through "samplings" (like focus groups) of current and former AF employees to identify barriers affecting Air Force's ability to attract and retain specific Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) Groups and Individuals with Disabilities (IwDs). The overall objective is to determine whether the Air Force hired and retained a workforce as diverse, in terms of race, ethnicity, and gender, when compared with the civilian labor force.

a. **MD715 Transformation:** Some projects were begun to effectively execute the development of the annual MD715 report.

(1) An IT initiative was proposed to develop an on-line tool to roll up the following from base level to headquarters: regulatory compliance checklist, barrier analysis, and best practices. The proposal is in progress.

(2) The Air Force Personnel Center has pulled MD715 data tables for major command (MAJCOM) use in barrier analysis. Such tables are being developed for local base use.

b. **Observation of DoD SEP Manager Training.** The Director of EO attended the SEP Managers (SEPMs) Course held by the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute as a subject matter expert. Observations and recommendations were provided to DEOMI management for use in course enhancement.

c. **Participation in Asian American/Pacific Islander (AA/PI) White House Initiatives.** The Director of EO initiated a meeting with representatives of the White House Initiatives (WHI) for AA/PI in an effort to enhance Air Force efforts. One unintended outcome was for the commander of the Air Force District of Washington, an Air Force major general, to serve as a military senior leader advisor for the AA/PI WHI.

3. Disability Program. The Air Force continued to execute the five-year plan for increasing employment of individuals with disabilities (IwDs) in accordance with Executive Order 13548. Specific accomplishments include:

a. Air Force won the 2012 Secretary of Defense trophy for outstanding achievement in the employment of individuals with disabilities, best military department category. The trophy is awarded to encourage progress and reward success in affirmative action (disability) programs.

b. The participation rate for IwDs increased by 1.4% from FY2011 (5.9%) to FY2012 (7.3%).

c. Air Force set a new record by hiring 82 employees for the Workforce Recruitment Program for College Students with Disabilities (WRP); a new Air Force record. Four of the employees were selected for permanent employment.

d. As of November 1, 2011, Schedule A eligible Individuals with Disabilities (IwDs) are now automatically included for consideration (their resumes forwarded) when selecting officials recruit externally (outside of DoD).

e. The Air Force resurveyed of the disability status of its civilian workforce for the second year in a row.

f. A full-time Disability Program Manager was selected through a partnership agreement with DoD.

g. The Headquarters AF Employees with Disabilities Resource Group (DRG) was established and held their first meeting in March 2012. The DRG is a first in DoD. Members provide increased awareness of issues facing IwDs to the Air Force DPM.


h. The DPM established procedures for manually tracking reasonable accommodation requests on a monthly basis throughout the Air Force.

VIII. No FEAR Plan.

The agency's training plan is found at [APPENDIX F](#). The Air Force has developed on its Advanced Distributed Learning Service (ADLS) an online "No FEAR Act" training course to carry out the requirements of the No FEAR Act Training Plan. The 30 minutes course provides instruction on all topics required by the No FEAR Act. All DAF civilian employees (executives, managers, and supervisors), and military members that supervises civilians, must accomplish training as required by 5 CFR § 724.203(d). The on-line training satisfies the initial and the biennial training requirements of 5 CFR § 724.203(e). Additionally, there is a ten question quiz with a minimum passing score of 70%. For employees without ADLS accounts (non-appropriated funds employees), the Equal Opportunity offices conduct on-site briefings using Air Force-approved No FEAR Act training lesson plans. Attendees at on-site briefing do not have to take the quiz. EO offices must train new employees as part of its orientation program within 90 calendar days of the new employees' appointment. At all on-site briefings, the EO offices must track numbers of individuals

trained and report the statistics when required by AFPC/EO or high headquarters. This reporting period will not reflect the statistical data for training.

APPENDIX A: Pending Federal Court Cases by Alleged Violation



Note: Additionally, under Title VII; Eleven (11) alleged reprisal and Six (6) alleged sex discrimination.

APPENDIX B: Reimbursement of Judgment Fund

5 CFR §724.302 (a) (2)						
Amount of Money Reimbursed to the Justice Fund (In Thousands) * Only one case separated Attorney Fees						
Fiscal Year Data	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Employee	\$483	\$2,550	\$1,502	\$190	\$660	\$575
Attorney	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	\$37

APPENDIX C: Disciplinary Actions Taken

Federal Employee Discrimination and Retaliation - Disciplinary Actions Relating to Discrimination, Prohibited Personnel Practice, Whistleblower	Comparative Data					2012
	Previous Fiscal Year Data					
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	
Total Disciplinary Actions	14	7	10	14	8	10
Reprimand	8	1	3	2	0	2
Suspension	5	6	6	12	8	8
Removal	1	0	0	0	0	0
Demoted	0	0	1	0	0	0
Respective Provisions of No FEAR						
Discrimination	3	1	1	3	4	0
Prohibited Personnel Practice	9	2	5	5	2	5
Sexual Harassment	2	4	4	6	2	5

Note: Source document CPO's Adverse Action 2012

APPENDIX D: AFI 36-704, 22 July 1994, Civilian Personnel; Discipline and Adverse Actions: Guide to Disciplinary Actions, pgs 34 – 40

Attachment 3

GUIDE TO DISCIPLINARY ACTIONS

NOTE: See **Section F** of this regulation for information concerning use of this guide and selection of appropriate penalties in disciplinary actions:

A3.1. Cause of Action Column:

A3.1.1. **IT IS NOT NECESSARY TO STATE A CAUSE OF ACTION EXACTLY AS SHOWN IN THIS COLUMN.** What is important is to state exactly what the employee did wrong, preferably without using legal terms suggesting crime. If such legal terms were used, it might be necessary to prove all the elements necessary to establish that the crime has been committed, including felonious intent.

A3.1.2. Cause is best identified by a specific charge or label for the offense IF that charge or label is relevant. **BE CAREFUL TO SELECT A LABEL WHICH FITS THE FACTS AND NOT TO DISTORT THE FACTS TO FIT A SPECIFIED OFFENSE IN THE GUIDE.**

Selecting the Penalty

SELECTING THE PENALTY

Use this attachment along with **Attachment 3**. It shows the interrelationships of some key factors in the disciplinary system but neither establishes additional procedural requirements nor automatically sets penalties. Other factors may also be weighed.

<p>Information on how basic penalty¹ was derived and on how favorable elements² were considered need not be included in notices but must be available for subsequent use. ³</p>	<p>Information must be included in the notices of any consideration used to increase the severity of the basic penalty. ⁴</p>
---	--

<p>1. Basic penalty is the one that would be used if there were no other considerations. It is based on:</p>	<p>2. Favorable elements are those considerations which tend toward the imposition of less severe penalties. Included are:</p>	<p>3. Unfavorable elements are considerations which tend to</p>	<p>4. Penalty assessed results from weighing of favorable and unfavorable factors in relationship to the offense.</p>
--	--	---	---

<p>a. Offense:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Character. 2. Seriousness. 3. Consequences. <p>b. Rehabilitative potential of penalty.</p> <p>c. Character of employee's position</p>	<p>a. Situation.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Possibility of genuine misunderstanding. 2. Enticements or provocations. 3. Mitigating circumstances. <p>b. Employee:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Length of service. 2. Quality of work history. 3. Personal reputation. 4. Past contributions. 5. Record of cooperativeness. 6. Record of achievements. 	<p>show a need for more severe action than is usually taken.</p> <p>Included are:</p> <p>a. Penalties for past offenses within:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Suspension - 3 years. 2. Reprimand - 2 years. 3. Admonishment - 2 years.⁵ <p>b. Combination of offenses.</p> <p>c. Series of offenses.</p> <p>d. Character of other offenses.</p> <p>e. Recency of other offenses.</p> <p>f. Employee willfulness.</p>	<p>a. Proposed penalty is determined on the basis of all information available at time of institution of action, and penalty is specifically stated in notice of proposed action.</p> <p>b. Penalty decided upon is determined based on all available information including employee's answer to notice of proposed action. Give consideration to request for compassion. State penalty decided upon and effective date in notice of decision.</p>
--	--	--	--

APPENDIX E: No FEAR Act Report

Equal Employment Opportunity Data Posted Pursuant to the No FEAR Act

Equal Employment Opportunity Data Posted Pursuant to Title III of the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 (No FEAR Act), Pub. L. 107-174

Complaint Activity	Comparative Data					
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Number of Complaints Filed in Fiscal Year	486	466	505	542	611	472
Number of Complainants	446	426	451	475	547	446
Repeat Filers	33	30	35	51	43	23

Complaints by Basis	Comparative Data					
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Race	177	192	207	192	235	175
Religion	15	10	18	15	19	17
Retaliation	239	201	226	269	284	196
Sex	165	152	187	165	165	154
National Origin	72	65	65	62	49	56
Color	60	59	44	57	56	41
Age	130	119	133	148	178	133
Disability	121	102	120	132	206	137
Equal Pay Act	3	2	6	4	5	3

Complaints By Issues	Comparative Data					
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Appointment	14	13	15	22	40	28
Assignment	59	76	63	76	88	73
Awards	13	13	11	10	11	13
Conversion	3	0	0	1	3	1
Disciplinary Action - Demotion	3	3	2	3	1	1
Disciplinary Action - Reprimand	18	27	28	23	31	22
Disciplinary Action - Suspension	27	24	25	29	29	34
Disciplinary Action - Removal	16	11	9	14	9	18
Disciplinary Action - Other	21	30	20	33	32	34
Duty Hours	20	18	21	27	21	25
Evaluation/Appraisal	94	107	115	91	99	71
Examination/Test	0	0	2	2	2	3
Non Sexual Harassment	187	134	141	168	164	163
Sexual Harassment	20	30	28	21	20	23
Medical Examination	10	3	4	9	4	6
Pay Including Overtime	19	8	23	20	29	20
Promotion/Non-Selection	89	66	107	83	95	58
Denied Reassignment	10	8	13	10	11	8
Directed Reassignment	15	23	16	28	21	19
Reasonable Accommodation	16	18	24	27	45	25
Reinstatement	2	2	0	4	3	2
Retirement	5	3	4	2	5	3
Termination	35	30	34	42	53	42
Terms/Conditions of Employment	47	69	52	73	83	65
Time and Attendance	38	34	35	26	33	29
Training	21	23	21	25	32	39
Other	112	104	125	145	155	124

Processing Time	Comparative Data					
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Complaints Pending During Fiscal Year						
Average Number of Days in Investigation Stage	182	188	197	203	222	259
Average Number of Days in Final Action Stage	263	235	328	355	214	306
Complaints Pending During Fiscal Year Where Hearing was Requested						
Average Number of Days in Investigation Stage	201	200	210	206	226	257
Average Number of Days in Final Action Stage	187	90	201	106	112	153
Complaints Pending During Fiscal Year Where Hearing was not Requested						
Average Number of Days in Investigation Stage	165	184	186	202	217	260
Average Number of Days in Final Action Stage	342	339	410	486	313	466

Complaints Dismissed by Agency	Comparative Data					
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Total Complaints Dismissed by Agency	59	64	62	84	84	61
Average Days Pending Prior to Dismissal	140	100	59	105	61	69
Total Complaints Withdrawn by Complainants	62	51	47	51	71	53

Total Final Action Finding Discrimination	Comparative Data					
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Total Number Finding	2	1	2	2	1	7
Without Hearing	0	0	1	1	0	1
With Hearing	2	1	1	1	1	6

Findings of Discrimination Rendered by Basis	Comparative Data					
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Total Number of Findings	2	1	2	2	1	7
Race	0	1(100.00%)	0	1(50.00%)	1(100.00%)	0
Religion	0	0	0	0	0	0
Retaliation	0	0	2(100.00%)	1(50.00%)	0	4(57.14%)
Sex	2(100.00%)	1(100.00%)	0	0	0	0
National Origin	0	0	0	0	0	0
Color	0	0	0	1(50.00%)	0	0
Age	0	0	0	0	1(100.00%)	1(14.29%)
Disability	0	0	0	0	0	0
Equal Pay Act	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note: Complaints can be filed alleging multiple bases. The sum of the bases may not equal total complaints and findings

Findings of Discrimination Rendered by Basis	Comparative Data					
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Findings After Hearing	2	1	1	1	1	6
Race	0	1(100.00%)	0	0	1(100.00%)	0
Religion	0	0	0	0	0	0
Retaliation	0	0	1(100.00%)	1(100.00%)	0	4(66.67%)
Sex	2(100.00%)	1(100.00%)	0	0	0	0
National Origin	0	0	0	0	0	0
Color	0	0	0	0	0	0
Age	0	0	0	0	1(100.00%)	1(16.67%)
Disability	0	0	0	0	0	0
Equal Pay Act	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note: Complaints can be filed alleging multiple bases. The sum of the bases may not equal total complaints and findings

Findings of Discrimination Rendered by Basis	Comparative Data					
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Findings Without Hearing	0	0	1	1	0	1
Race	0	0	0	1(100.00%)	0	0
Religion	0	0	0	0	0	0
Retaliation	0	0	1(100.00%)	0	0	0
Sex	0	0	0	0	0	0
National Origin	0	0	0	0	0	0
Color	0	0	0	1(100.00%)	0	0
Age	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disability	0	0	0	0	0	0
Equal Pay Act	0	0	0	0	0	0

Note: Complaints can be filed alleging multiple bases. The sum of the bases may not equal total complaints and findings

Findings of Discrimination Rendered by Issues	Comparative Data					
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Total Number of Findings	2	1	2	2	1	7
Appointment	0	0	0	1(50.00%)	0	0
Assignment	0	0	0	0	0	2(28.57%)
Awards	0	0	0	0	0	0
Conversion	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disciplinary Action - Demotion	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disciplinary Action - Reprimand	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disciplinary Action - Suspension	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disciplinary Action - Removal	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disciplinary Action - Other	0	0	0	0	0	1(14.29%)
Duty Hours	0	0	0	0	0	1(14.29%)
Evaluation/Appraisal	1(50.00%)	0	0	0	1(100.00%)	2(28.57%)

Examination/Test	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non Sexual Harassment	1(50.00%)	1(100.00%)	0	1(50.00%)	0	1(14.29%)
Sexual Harassment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medical Examination	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pay Including Overtime	0	0	0	0	0	1(14.29%)
Promotion/Non-Selection	1(50.00%)	1(100.00%)	0	0	0	0
Denied Reassignment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Directed Reassignment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reasonable Accommodation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reinstatement	1(50.00%)	0	0	0	0	0
Retirement	0	0	0	0	0	0
Termination	0	0	0	0	0	0
Terms/Conditions of Employment	0	0	0	0	0	1(14.29%)
Time and Attendance	0	0	1(50.00%)	0	0	2(28.57%)
Training	1(50.00%)	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	1(50.00%)	0	0	2(28.57%)

Findings of Discrimination Rendered by Issues	Comparative Data					
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Findings After Hearing	2	1	1	1	1	6
Appointment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Assignment	0	0	0	0	0	2(33.33%)
Awards	0	0	0	0	0	0
Conversion	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disciplinary Action - Demotion	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disciplinary Action - Reprimand	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disciplinary Action - Suspension	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disciplinary Action - Removal	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disciplinary Action - Other	0	0	0	0	0	1(16.67%)
Duty Hours	0	0	0	0	0	1(16.67%)
Evaluation/Appraisal	1(50.00%)	0	0	0	1(50.00%)	2(33.33%)

Examination/Test	0	0	0	0	0	0
Non Sexual Harassment	1(50.00%)	1(100.00%)	0	1(100.00%)	1(14.29%)	1(16.67%)
Sexual Harassment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medical Examination	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pay Including Overtime	0	0	0	0	0	1(16.67%)
Promotion/Non-Selection	1(50.00%)	1(100.00%)	0	0	0	0
Denied Reassignment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Directed Reassignment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reasonable Accommodation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reinstatement	1(50.00%)	0	0	0	0	0
Retirement	0	0	0	0	0	0
Termination	0	0	0	0	0	0
Terms/Conditions of Employment	0	0	0	0	0	1(16.67%)
Time and Attendance	0	0	1(100.00%)	0	0	2(33.33%)
Training	1(50.00%)	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	1(100.00%)	0	0	2(33.33%)

Findings of Discrimination Rendered by Issues	Comparative Data					
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Findings Without Hearing	0	0	1	1	0	1
Appointment	0	0	0	1(100.00%)	0	0
Assignment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Awards	0	0	0	0	0	0
Conversion	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disciplinary Action - Demotion	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disciplinary Action - Reprimand	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disciplinary Action - Suspension	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disciplinary Action - Removal	0	0	0	0	0	0
Disciplinary Action - Other	0	0	0	0	0	0
Duty Hours	0	0	0	0	0	0
Evaluation/Appraisal	0	0	0	0	0	0
Examination/Test	0	0	0	0	0	0

Non Sexual Harassment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Sexual Harassment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Medical Examination	0	0	0	0	0	0
Pay Including Overtime	0	0	0	0	0	0
Promotion/Non-Selection	0	0	0	0	0	0
Denied Reassignment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Directed Reassignment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reasonable Accommodation	0	0	0	0	0	0
Reinstatement	0	0	0	0	0	0
Retirement	0	0	0	0	0	0
Termination	0	0	0	0	0	0
Terms/Conditions of Employment	0	0	0	0	0	0
Time and Attendance	0	0	0	0	0	0
Training	0	0	0	0	0	0
Other	0	0	1(100.00%)	0	0	0

Pending Complaints Filed in Previous Years by Status	Comparative Data					
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Total Complaints From Previous Fiscal Years	222	199	210	240	277	374
Total Complainants	208	188	197	219	233	326
Number of Complaints Pending in Investigation	17	12	8	6	22	37
Number of Complaints Pending in Hearing	75	82	121	144	164	220
Number of Complaints Pending in Final Action	124	102	81	85	91	116
Number of Complaints Pending in Appeal with EEOC Office of Federal Operations	158	166	170	184	200	235

Complaint Investigations	Comparative Data					
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
Pending Complaints Where Investigation Exceeds Required Time Frames	124	117	124	155	204	315

APPENDIX F: No FEAR Act Training Plan

No FEAR Training Plan

This document sets forth the Department of the Air Force's (DAF) training plan, pursuant to the Notification and Federal Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 ("No FEAR Act"), Public Law 107-174, and 5 CFR Part 724.203.

Requirements of the No FEAR Act

Specifically, Section 202(c) of Title II of the No FEAR Act sets forth the following requirement: "Each Federal agency shall provide to the employees of such agency training regarding the rights and remedies applicable to such employees under the [Federal antidiscrimination and retaliation statutes and other legal authority]."

Requirements of 5 CFR Part 724

5 CFR § 724.203(a) requires the following: "Each agency must develop a written plan to train all of its employees (including supervisors and managers) about the rights and remedies available under the Antidiscrimination Laws and Whistleblower Protection Laws applicable to them."

5 CFR § 724.203(b) further specifies: "Each agency training plan shall describe: (1) The instructional materials and method of the training, (2) The training schedule, and (3) The means of documenting completion of training."

Next, 5 CFR § 724.203(d) requires each agency "to complete the initial training under this subpart for all employees (including supervisors and managers) by December 17, 2006. Thereafter, each agency must train all employees on a training cycle of no longer than every 2 years."

Finally, 29 CFR § 724.203(e) sets forth the following requirement: "After the initial training is completed, each agency must train new employees as part of its agency orientation program or other training program. Any agency that does not use a new employee orientation program for this purpose must train new employees within 90 calendar days of the new employees' appointment."

The Air Force has developed on its Advanced Distributed Learning Service (ADLS) an online “No FEAR Act” training course. The 30 minutes course provides instruction on all topics required by the No FEAR Act. All AF civilian employees (including executives, managers, and supervisors) to include military members that supervises civilians must accomplish training as required by 5 CFR § 724.203(d). The on-line training satisfies the initial and the biennial training requirement of 5 CFR § 724.203(e). Additionally, there is a ten question quiz with a minimum passing score of 70%. For employees without ADLS accounts (non-appropriated funds employees), the Equal Opportunity offices conducts on-site briefings using Air Force approved No FEAR Act training lesson plans. Attendees at on-site briefings do not have to take the quiz. EO offices must train new employees as part of its orientation program within 90 calendar days of the new employees’ appointment. All on-site briefings, the EO offices must track numbers of individuals trained and report the statistics when required by AFPC/EO or high headquarters.

APPENDIX G: Documentation of No FEAR Act Training

Biennial No FEAR Act Training FY12

MAJCOM	# of Civilian Employees required training	# of Civilian employees current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Completion Rate Civilian	# of Military supervisors required training	# of Military supervisors current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Complete Rate Military	Overall Completion Rate Civilian + Military
AMC	10,791	7,669	76.4%	6,331	2,454	80.5%	78.4%
AFMC	47,242	43,395	91.4%	8,328	5,360	73.0%	83.2%
ACC	16,130	14,711	96.5%	3,222	2,822	93.6%	96.0%
PACAF	5,214	4,038	84.2%	8,807	2,542	79.8%	79.2%
AETC	19,181	14,515	84.1%	6,430	5,168	71.9%	83.8%
USAFE	4,141	3,836	90.9%	554	481	83.6%	87.3%
AFSPC	7,131	6477	93.4%	1751	1,581	85.2%	90.5%
AFAA	140	519	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	100.0%
AFISRA	37	35	94.6%	10	10	100.0%	95.7%
AFSOC	1547	1510	98.3%	690	680	99.2%	98.6%
USAFA	1370	1085	79.2%	358	231	64.5%	76.2%
AFGSC	2,977	2,906	97.6%	595	560	94.1%	97.0%
ANG	393	369	93.9%	14	14	100.0%	94.1%
AFDW	1,141	1,128	98.9%	1,345	1,345	100.0%	99.5%
AFRC	191	100	52.4%	167	143	85.6%	67.9%
AF Completion Rate	117,626	102,293	89.0%	38,602	23,391	86.5%	88.0%

Air Mobility Command (AMC)

Base Name	# of Civilian Employees required training	# of Civilian employees current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Completion Rate Civilian	# of Military supervisors required training	# of Military supervisors current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Complete Rate Military	Overall Completion Rate Civilian + Military
Charleston	1154	518	44.9%	172	91	52.9%	45.9%
Dover	810	640	79.0%	117	99	84.6%	79.7%
Fairchild	550	522	94.9%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
Grand Forks	441	400	90.7%	49	47	95.9%	91.2%
Little Rock	251	12	4.8%	0	0	0.0%	0.0%
MacDill	1854	1023	55.2%	198	141	71.2%	56.7%
McChord	311	308	99.0%	40	33	82.5%	97.2%
McConnell	668	641	97.0%	45	44	98.0%	97.5%
McGuire	1683	1323	78.6%	161	140	87.0%	79.3%
Pope	68	68	100.0%	26	26	100.0%	100.0%
Scott	2026	1432	92.9%	33	33	100.0%	96.4%
Travis	975	782	80.2%	5490	1800	32.8%	39.9%
TOTAL	10,791	7,669	76.4%	6,331	2,454	80.5%	78.4%

Air Force Material Command (AFMC)

Base Name	# of Civilian Employees required training	# of Civilian employees current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Completion Rate Civilian	# of Military supervisors required training	# of Military supervisors current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Complete Rate Military	Overall Completion Rate Civilian + Military
Arnold	319	310	97.2%	10	10	100.0%	97.3%
Edwards	3553	3429	97.0%	179	170	95.0%	96.4%
Eglin	4418	4224	95.6%	194	167	86.1%	90.8%
Hanscom	1623	1292	79.6%	786	368	46.8%	68.9%
Hill	9316	8790	94.0%	1537	1112	72.0%	91.2%
Kirtland	1431	1238	87.0%	1545	959	62.1%	74.5%
Robins	0	0	0.0%	1465	768	52.4%	52.4%
Tinker	14483	13442	92.8%	1574	1066	67.7%	90.4%
Wright-Patterson	12099	10670	88.2%	1038	740	71.3%	86.9%
TOTAL	47,242	43,395	91.4%	8,328	5,360	73.0%	83.2%

Air Combat Command (ACC)

Base Name	# of Civilian Employees required training	# of Civilian employees current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Completion Rate Civilian	# of Military supervisors required training	# of Military supervisors current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Complete Rate Military	Overall Completion Rate Civilian + Military
Beale	537	503	94.0%	0	0	0.0%	94.0%
Davis-Monthan	1505	1505	100.0%	184	184	100.0%	100.0%
Dyess	391	391	100.0%	57	57	100.0%	100.0%
Ellsworth	737	737	100.0%	108	108	100.0%	100.0%
Holloman	1095	1095	100.0%	132	132	100.0%	100.0%
Langley	4551	3,269	72.0%	1,526	1,325	87.0%	75.0%
Moody	475	475	100.0%	51	30	58.8%	96.0%
Mt Home	440	440	100.0%	58	58	100.0%	100.0%
Nellis	1146	1146	100.0%	53	53	100.0%	100.0%
Offutt	2860	2860	100.0%	52	52	100.0%	100.0%
Seymour Johnson	887	866	97.6%	70	70	100.0%	97.8%
Shaw	572	572	100.0%	118	118	100.0%	100.0%
Tyndall	934	852	91.2%	813	635	78.1%	85.1%
TOTAL	16,130	14,711	96.5%	3,222	2,822	93.6%	96.0%

Pacific Air Forces (PACAF)

Base Name	# of Civilian Employees required training	# of Civilian employees current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Completion Rate Civilian	# of Military supervisors required training	# of Military supervisors current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Complete Rate Military	Overall Completion Rate Civilian + Military
Andersen	87	83	95.4%	23	22	95.7%	95.5%
Eielson	485	309	63.7%	1790	522	29.2%	36.5%
Elmendorf	1852	1289	69.6%	6509	1444	22.2%	32.7%
Hickam	879	625	71.0%	175	161	92.0%	81.5%
Kadena	915	863	94.0%	80	67	99.0%	97.1%
Kunsan	19	19	100.0%	11	11	100.0%	100.0%
Misawa	113	103	91.2%	20	16	80.0%	89.5%
Osan	438	321	73.3%	158	258	100.0%	80.4%
Yokota	426	426	100.0%	41	41	100.0%	100.0%
TOTAL	5,214	4,038	84.2%	8,807	2,542	79.8%	79.2%

Air Education Training Command (AETC)

Base Name	# of Civilian Employees required training	# of Civilian employees current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Completion Rate Civilian	# of Military supervisors required training	# of Military supervisors current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Complete Rate Military	Overall Completion Rate Civilian + Military
Altus	1284	845	65.8%	1400	330	23.6%	44.7%
Columbus	609	260	42.7%	53	13	24.5%	41.2%
Fort Sam Houston	818	751	91.8%	45	36	80.0%	91.2%
Goodfellow	657	586	89.2%	33	3	9.1%	85.4%
Keesler	1780	1020	57.3%	104	60	57.7%	57.3%
Lackland	6178	3539	57.0%	1956	1956	100.0%	78.5%
Laughlin	903	903	100.0%	18	18	100.0%	99.8%
Luke	748	657	87.8%	106	99	93.4%	88.5%
Maxwell	1913	1817	95.0%	541	467	86.3%	93.1%
Randolph	3781	3364	96.0%	427	415	81.0%	96.0%
Sheppard	874	806	92.0%	1780	1772	99.6%	97.1%
Vance	245	227	92.7%	20	12	60.0%	90.2%
TOTAL	19,181	14,515	84.1%	6,430	5,168	71.9%	83.8%

US Air forces Europe (USAFE)

Base Name	# of Civilian Employees required training	# of Civilian employees current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Completion Rate Civilian	# of Military supervisors required training	# of Military supervisors current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Complete Rate Military	Overall Completion Rate Civilian + Military
Alconbury	325	279	85.8%	29	28	96.6%	91.2%
Aviano	201	189	94.0%	42	40	95.2%	94.6%
Incirlik	127	116	91.3%	18	18	100.0%	95.6%
Lajes Field	102	102	100.0%	16	16	100.0%	100.0%
Lakenheath	653	549	84.1%	29	21	72.4%	78.3%
Mildenhall	276	251	90.9%	30	10	33.3%	61.7%
Ramstein	1890	1888	99.9%	260	251	96.5%	98.2%
Spangdahlem	567	462	81.5%	130	97	74.6%	78.5%
TOTAL	4,141	3,836	90.9%	554	481	83.6%	87.3%

Air Force Space Command (AFSPC)

Base Name	# of Civilian Employees required training	# of Civilian employees current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Completion Rate Civilian	# of Military supervisors required training	# of Military supervisors current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Complete Rate Military	Overall Completion Rate Civilian + Military
Buckley	417	409	98.1%	51	51	100.0%	99.0%
Los Angeles	1761	1635	93.0%	861	766	89.0%	91.6%
Patrick	1216	1205	99.1%	46	44	95.7%	97.4%
Peterson	2577	2140	83.0%	296	223	75.3%	82.2%
Schriever	No Data Provided						
Vandenberg	1160	1088	93.8%	497	497	100.0%	96.9%
TOTAL	7,131	6477	93.4%	1751	1,581	85.2%	90.5%

Air Force Audit Agency (AFAA)

Base Name	# of Civilian Employees required training	# of Civilian employees current/com pleted training as of 31 Dec 12	Completi on Rate Civilian	# of Military supervisors required training	# of Military supervisors current/com pleted training as of 31 Dec 12	Complete Rate Military	Overall Completion Rate Civilian + Military
AFAA	140	519	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	100.0%
TOTAL	140	519	100.0%	0	0	0.0%	100.0%

Air Force Intelligence Surveillance Reconnaissance Agency (AFISRA)

Base Name	# of Civilian Employees required training	# of Civilian employees current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Completion Rate Civilian	# of Military supervisors required training	# of Military supervisors current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Complete Rate Military	Overall Completion Rate Civilian + Military
Lackland	1591	1556	97.8%	360	350	97.2	97.7
Ft Meade	37	35	94.6%	10	10	100.0%	95.7%
TOTAL	1628	1591	96.2%	370	360	98.6%	96.7%

Air Force Special Operations Command (AFSOC)

Base Name	# of Civilian Employees required training	# of Civilian employees current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Completion Rate Civilian	# of Military supervisors required training	# of Military supervisors current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Complete Rate Military	Overall Completion Rate Civilian + Military
Cannon	443	443	100.0%	96	96	100.0%	100.0%
Hurlburt	1104	1067	96.6%	594	584	98.3%	97.2%
TOTAL	1547	1510	98.3%	690	680	99.2%	98.6%

US Air Force Academy (USAFA)

Base Name	# of Civilian Employees required training	# of Civilian employees current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Completion Rate Civilian	# of Military supervisors required training	# of Military supervisors current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Complete Rate Military	Overall Completion Rate Civilian + Military
USAFA	1370	1085	79.2%	358	231	64.5%	76.2%
TOTAL	1370	1085	79.2%	358	231	64.5%	76.2%

Air Force Global Strike Command (AFGSC)

Base Name	# of Civilian Employees required training	# of Civilian employees current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Completion Rate Civilian	# of Military supervisors required training	# of Military supervisors current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Complete Rate Military	Overall Completion Rate Civilian + Military
Barksdale	876	867	99.0%	251	243	96.8%	98.5%
F.E. Warren	539	539	100.0%	104	104	100.0%	100.0%
Malmstrom	561	560	99.8%	82	77	93.9%	99.1%
Minot	574	542	94.4%	96	77	80.2	92.4%
Whiteman	427	398	93.2%	62	59	95.2%	93.5%
TOTAL	2,977	2,906	97.6%	595	560	94.1%	97.0%

Air National Guard (ANG)

Base Name	# of Civilian Employees required training	# of Civilian employees current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Completion Rate Civilian	# of Military supervisors required training	# of Military supervisors current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Complete Rate Military	Overall Completion Rate Civilian + Military
ANG	393	369	93.9%	14	14	100%	94.1%
TOTAL	393	369	93.9%	14	14	100%	94.1%

Air Force District Washington (AFDW)

Base Name	# of Civilian Employees required training	# of Civilian employees current/com pleted training as of 31 Dec 12	Completi on Rate Civilian	# of Military supervisors required training	# of Military supervisors current/com pleted training as of 31 Dec 12	Complete Rate Military	Overall Completion Rate Civilian + Military
AFDW	1141	1128	98.9%	1345	1345	100.0%	99.5%
TOTAL	1,141	1,128	98.9%	1,345	1,345	100.0%	99.5%

Air Force Reserve Center (AFRC)

Base Name	# of Civilian Employees required training	# of Civilian employees current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Completion Rate Civilian	# of Military supervisors required training	# of Military supervisors current/completed training as of 31 Dec 12	Complete Rate Military	Overall Completion Rate Civilian + Military
Niagara Falls	191	100	52.4%	167	143	85.6%	67.9%
TOTAL	191	100	52.4%	167	143	85.6%	67.9%