

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service



Anti-Harassment Action Plan

Introduction

The Department of the Interior (DOI) conducted a survey of employees to assess employee attitude and perceptions of harassing behaviors experienced within the work environment. Based on the results of these surveys, the Secretary has asked the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) to generate an action plan to address their challenges in creating a respectful workplace that does not tolerate harassment.

In considering the approach to responding to the survey results, FWS evaluated its data and gathered input on how other agencies have positioned themselves to address workplace harassment and evaluated the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC's) risk factors for harassment. Based on this analysis, FWS will continue to develop risk mitigation strategies and will follow the framework developed by the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and used by the Department of Defense (DOD) for its anti-harassment strategy. By focusing on risk factors, protective factors, prevention strategies and long-term accountability, FWS's plan aims to address the root causes within the organization and ensure that this does not become a check the box exercise. FWS's actions combine training and outreach so the standards are known and the tools are easy to use, reforming the work environment to promote respect at all levels and ensure leadership accountability for addressing harassment concerns.

Risk Factors for Harassment

A key evaluation component that looks at the workforce as a whole is the EEOC's Risk Factors for Harassment. FWS evaluated these for each Executive's organization and drafted mitigation strategies. Additionally, each Executive will review their prior assessments and update them as necessary while determining how the mitigation strategies are working. FWS will perform an assessment that will objectively determine the current risk level (Low, Medium, High) for each risk factor outlined below.

Risk Factor	FWS-Mitigation Strategies
Homogenous workforce	FWS has continued to make a significant effort to increase diversity across the bureau, especially in its entry and mid-level scientist positions. While results have been mixed, there are continued strategies to expand outreach, target Veterans hiring and use other tools to improve the gender and racial diversity within FWS.
Workplaces where some employees do not conform to workplace norms	FWS is managed under a line-authority organization with extensive policies and manuals that describe proper actions and performance. Improving the "Tone at the Top" will reinforce to employees the seriousness of FWS's commitment to addressing harassment in the workplace.
Coarsened Social Discourse Outside the Workplace	In many parts of FWS, there are social gatherings and events outside of the office setting. These activities can create opportunities for inappropriate behavior. FWS will stress through policy and training that standards of conduct are critical in all settings where the workforce is involved.
Young workforces	FWS has a relatively more seasoned workforce, but will ensure that managers and employees are trained in the appropriate behaviors expected in the work environment.
Workplaces with significant power disparities	Given the grade structure in FWS and the line-authority in the Refuge and other programs, there is a perception of high-value employees having power over others. To mitigate this risk, FWS has issued (and will strengthen) policies for conducting investigations of harassment and swiftly addressing findings regardless of the position involved.
Isolated workplaces	FWS's workforce is widely distributed in many remote areas. Control over those workplaces can be challenging. Through effective training and orientation, FWS will speak with one voice on acceptable behavior and ensure that employees know prevention

	strategies as well as how to respond to any issues of harassment.
Workplaces that tolerate or encourage alcohol consumption	FWS has some housing for employees and managed the National Conservation and Training Center (NCTC) where alcohol is available during non-work hours. FWS is in the process of developing a policy regarding the consumption of alcohol on off-duty and TDY assignments.
Decentralized workplaces	FWS's workforce is widely distributed in many remote areas. Control over those workplaces can be challenging. Through effective training and orientation, FWS will speak with one voice on acceptable behavior and ensure that employees know prevention strategies as well as how to respond to any issues of harassment.
Workplaces with "high value" employees	Ensure that the same rules apply everywhere in the organization. Raise awareness among management that "high value" employees are not to be excluded from discipline for their misconduct. Holding all employees accountable, regardless of perceived status, will serve as a tool to convey to the workforce that leadership is committed to responding to harassment in a fair manner.

Developing a Strategic Action Plan

The CDC developed principles when addressing harassment in an organization, and these have been used by the DOD¹ in its efforts to address workplace violence and harassment. FWS adapted the framework to address the broader description of harassment outlined in the Work Environment Survey (WES)². The adapted framework consists of the following principles:

- **Risk Factors:** Factors that may put people at risk for harassment perpetration or victimization, such as organizational climate that either explicitly or implicitly condones sexual harassment.
- **Protective Factors:** Factors that may protect high-risk employees from harassment, such as an organizational climate that promotes respect amongst personnel at all levels.
- **Prevention Strategies:** Strategies that occur before harassment takes place to prevent initial perpetration, such as harassment prevention training.
- **Response Strategies for prevention:** Immediate responses after harassment has occurred to address the early identification of victims and the short-term consequences of harassment, such as mechanisms for reporting instances of harassment and immediate interventions.
- **Consistency for the Long-term:** Long-term responses after harassment has occurred to address the lasting consequences of harassment on organizational and work unit climate. This includes measuring progress on addressing harassment and improving the organizational profile.



¹ Actions Needed to Improve DOD's Efforts to Address the Continuum of Unwanted Sexual Behaviors, [GAO-18-33](#) (Washington, D.C.: Dec, 2017).

² [Supplemental Statistical Report](#), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), Work Environment Survey (January-March 2017)

Critical Components of Anti-Harassment Action Plan

Key:

- **Time:**
 - Short = 0-1 Year
 - Med = 1-2 Years
 - Long= 2-3 Years
 - Continual = Ongoing/Cyclical Requirement
- **Strategic Objective:** Critical component from the CDC anti-harassment framework being addressed.

Summarized Actions: Many of the activities outlined below have already begun and are noted as on-going in the sections below since FWS is building on some of these efforts and expanding the workload and responsibilities. This table is meant to show how the actions are being targeted to the goals of addressing risk factors, prevention, response, etc.

Activity	Strategic Objective	Time
Reassess objectives and activities of Directorate Anti-Harassment Team	Risk Factors	Short
Promote Zero Tolerance Anti-Harassment Policy	Protective	Short
Anti-Harassment Training	Prevention	Short
Launch National Harassment Hotline and expand other communication channels	Response	Short
Increase the Quality and Quantity of Anti-Harassment Communication	Prevention	Medium
Establish a minimum discipline requirement when misconduct has been determined	Response	Short
Introduce an independent panel into management inquiry process	Response	Short
Produce and distribute an anti-harassment video as part of onboarding	Protective	Short
Streamline reporting mechanism utilizing a database approach to support ongoing oversight and accountability	Consistency	Short

Components of FWS's Anti-Harassment Action Plan

The following tables offer a high-level summary of ongoing and future efforts at FWS to combat harassment. This is not an expansive list. The Directorate Anti- Harassment Team is reviewing additional proposals as part of a Service-wide action plan to combat harassment which may include other initiatives in addition to the ones described below.

Key:

	Data Requested by OIG
	Data Requested by DOI Deputy Secretary

Activity 1:	<u>Reassess Objectives and Activities of Directorate Anti-Harassment Team</u>
Ongoing/Future:	Ongoing
Accountability: Points of Contact:	Deputy Director, Operations FWS Directorate Anti-Harassment Team: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Janine Velasco - Assistant Director, Office of Business Management and Operations (BMO) • Noreen Walsh - Regional Director, Region 6 (Mountain-Prairie Region) • Gary Frazer - Assistant Director, Ecological Services • Barbara Wainman – Assistant Director, External Affairs • Jay Slack – Director, National Conservation Training Center Advisors: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rebekah Giddings - Deputy Assistant Director for Budget, Planning and Human Capital • Inez Uhl - Chief, Office of Diversity and Inclusive Workforce Management
Description	
<p>Objective: The Directorate Anti-Harassment Team is tasked with finding how FWS can engage in a structured, organized discussion within units of the agency where there is a high or moderate risk of potential harassment. For example: fire, law enforcements, pilots, disaster response, waterfowl, interns/summer students. Directorate Anti-Harassment Team is focusing on understanding and addressing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The degree to which harassment is currently reported and the potential for harassment to develop. • Cultural circumstances or attitudes in the agency that may foster a climate that allows harassment. • Barriers to reporting, effectively responding to, and advising senior leadership of harassment when it occurs. <p>Summary: FWS believes that leadership commitment and visibility is crucial to supporting a no-tolerance environment which demonstrates that harassment is unacceptable and which validates employee decisions to raise concerns. FWS established a Directorate Anti- Harassment Team with Senior Managers to engage FWS in structured analysis and formulate recommendations with the goal of lowering the risk of potential harassment. The team identified professions and characteristics where there could be high risk of potential harassment. Professions in fire, law enforcement, disaster response, among others, may be at an increased risk. Interns and students may also be high risk for potential harassment. These risks may be compounded by the multiple types of workplaces that FWS has, from traditional urban offices, to rural field stations, to isolated wilderness field camps. The Directorate Anti-Harassment Team will engage all FWS employees in a structured discussion about harassment, recognizing that all employees may be affected and some of them may be reluctant to apply for jobs in these high-risk situations unless strong prevention and protective measures are in place.</p>	

Status:

- The Director established a FWS Directorate Anti-Harassment Team to combat harassment Service-wide. The FWS Directorate Anti-Harassment Team convened the week of January 15th, 2018 to discuss and agree on an action plan to combat harassment Service-wide. The Team is also committed to ongoing collaboration to address these needs.

Action Items:

The FWS Directorate Anti-Harassment Team is responsible for: 1) implementing the FWS Anti-Harassment Strategic Action Plan; and 2) assessing the actions that FWS is executing to determine success or if course corrections are needed.

Cost and Extent:	Leadership time for regular meetings.
Level and extent of review or other forms of independent oversight:	Director.
External factors or conditions that could directly affect the effort:	None.
Schedule:	FWS Directorate Anti- Harassment Team meets once a month to ensure that actions in the plan are being implemented.
Success Measure:	Improvement in survey responses (Exit Survey, Employee Viewpoint Survey, Climate Survey, Work Environment Survey), Focus Groups, Barrier Analysis, increased workplace productivity, employee satisfaction, retention rates and a decrease in allegations of harassment.

Activity 2:	<u>Promote Zero Tolerance Anti-Harassment Policy</u>
Ongoing/Future:	Ongoing
Accountability:	Deputy Director Operations
Points of Contact:	HR, ODIWM
Description	
<p>Objective: The objectives of our policy are to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a clear process for employees to report harassment; • Describe what a manager or supervisor must do when they receive an allegation of harassment or witness harassment of an employee; • Define conduct that violates Service policy and outline the procedures for addressing it; • Ensure that appropriate officials are notified and have the opportunity to promptly correct hostile or abusive conduct; • Establish a quarterly harassment reporting requirement to identify harassment allegations and action taken for misconduct; and • Establish a process that is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Distinct and does not exist for the same purpose as the Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) complaint process, and ○ Intended for management to take immediate and appropriate corrective action to eradicate harassment, regardless of whether the harassment rises to the level of violating the law (i.e., even if it is simply inappropriate). <p>Summary: The FWS Anti-Harassment Policy was issued on December 15, 2015 and is disseminated annually via an all-employee memorandum from the Director. (See attached: Memorandum from FWS Director, “Zero Tolerance Harassment Policy”, December 11, 2017).</p> <p>The FWS Anti-Harassment Policy: (1) informs employees as to what type of behavior is prohibited and</p>	

the steps to take if faced with a harassment situation; (2) provides for multiple avenues of redress, not just the EEO complaint process; (3) provides for a prompt management inquiry and appropriate corrective and disciplinary action; and, (4) prohibits acts of retaliation against employees and witnesses.

FWS disseminated guidance to employees to read and verify to their supervisor that they understood their responsibility for compliance with the FWS Anti-Harassment Policy. To ensure implementation of the policy, a requirement was disseminated to the Directorate requiring quarterly reporting.

Action Items:

- Director issues informative policy memorandums to all employees annually. The Director will hold managers and supervisors accountable for having a conversation with employees about the policy at a minimum annually when disseminated.
- The Director will review
- **Distribute fact sheets:** Distribute two fact sheets, one for employees and one for supervisors, on preventing harassment
- **Distribute wallet size cards:** distribute wallet-sized cards, one for employees and one for supervisors, on preventing harassment.

Status: Content of Anti-Sexual Harassment fact sheets and wallet-sized cards have been generated, these will have to be edited to address all harassment and will need to be reviewed by HR, ODIWM, and Directorate Anti-Harassment Team.

Cost and Extent:	Time for staff in HR, ODIWM and External Affairs.
Level and extent of review or other forms of independent oversight:	FWS Directorate Anti-Harassment Team, EEOC.
External factors or conditions that could directly affect the effort:	FWS has not identified any external factors that would impact this effort.
Schedule:	The policy was put in place on December 15, 2015 and is reissued on an annual basis each December.
Success Measure:	Improvement in survey responses (Exit Survey, Employee Viewpoint Survey, Climate Survey, Work Environment Survey), Focus Groups, Barrier Analysis, increased workplace productivity, employee satisfaction, retention rates and a decrease in allegations of harassment.

Activity 3:	<u>Anti-Harassment Training</u>
Ongoing/Future:	Ongoing
Accountability:	Managers, Supervisors
Points of Contact:	NCTC, HR, and ODIWM

Description

Objective: Prevention of harassment through training.

Summary: FWS uses multiple approaches and channels for continuous reinforcement. Training includes sessions focused on prevention of harassment as well as sessions that address relevant topics to help foster an inclusive and safe workplace. FWS offered mandatory training in FY 2017 and FY 2018 on Civil Treatment for Leaders (CTL) and Civil Treatment for Employees (CTE) through the National Conservation Training Center (NCTC). FWS includes harassment prevention modules in courses on supervision, leadership courses, and academies offered at NCTC. In addition, there are modules with a broader focus dedicated to fostering a civil and safe environment. For instance, the Refuge Management Academy contains a module titled Personnel Matters which addresses conduct problems and diversity issues in the workplace. See attached description of NCTC course content related to harassment

prevention.

FWS EEO staff facilitate on-site and off-site training through webinars and teleconferencing for supervisors and managers. Training includes Prevention of Sexual Harassment, Reprisal, complaints and training programs on diversity, equal employment opportunity, and ethics. The FWS learning management system, DOI Learn, provides on-demand training on the following:

- Sexual Harassment Prevention for Federal Employees
- Sexual Harassment Prevention for Federal Managers
- Workplace Harassment Prevention for Employees - Video Enhanced
- Workplace Harassment Prevention for Managers
- Workplace Harassment Prevention for Supervisors and Managers-Multi-State Edition

FWS Regional and Program offices also take the lead in facilitating prevention of sexual harassment training. For example, Budget, Planning, and Human Capital (BPHC) offers “Trusting Your Intuition”, a 1-day training that introduces strategies to help recognize, predict, and avoid workplace sexual harassment, trauma, and violence.

FWS policy states managers and supervisors must take a minimum of 8 hours of training annually as follows: (A) 4 hours related to EEO, including 1 hour related to the No FEAR Act (biennially), and (B) 4 hours related to diversity. Non-supervisory employees must take a minimum of 4 hours of training annually as follows: (A) 2 hours related to EEO, including 1 hour related to the No FEAR Act (biennially), and (B) 2 hours related to diversity.

FWS recommends to managers and supervisors to focus their EEO training to include the following topics: reasonable accommodations, reprisal, anti-harassment (including prevention of sexual harassment), and No FEAR. Although FWS sets a minimum standard for training, supervisors and employees are frequently encouraged through different communication channels to participate in training beyond the minimum requirement.

The FWS Anti-Harassment policy requires that responsible officials act promptly and appropriately in response to allegations of harassment whether sexual in nature or not. FWS also engages in a variety of actions to overhaul organizational structures and cultures that might support sexual harassment. These actions include a variety of employee surveys; revitalized policies; solid in-reach communication; carefully crafted training; risk-free reporting processes; and a willingness from leadership to support a no-tolerance environment where overt acts of sexual aggression, misogyny, and obscenity, including subtle devaluation and derision of members of either sex are unacceptable.

Cost and Extent:	Update on training costs will be provided. NCTC, HR and ODIWM staff time for developing materials / curriculum and employee time for training.
Level and extent of review or other forms of independent oversight:	FWS Directorate Anti-Harassment Team, EEOC.
External factors or conditions that could directly affect the effort:	Technology challenges for field stations in remote locations.
Schedule:	Annual training requirements are issued in October of each year. Training is offered throughout the fiscal year.
Success Measure:	Updates on completion status are issued quarterly.

Activity 4:	<u>Launch National Harassment Hotline and expand other communication channels</u>
Ongoing/Future:	March 1, 2018
Accountability:	HR, IRTM

Points of Contact:	HR, IRTM
Description	
<p>Objective: To provide a mechanism for FWS employees to report allegations of harassment and expeditiously address and investigate these allegations.</p> <p>Summary: FWS is expanding the lines of communication between employees at all levels. This helps mitigate isolation in remote workplaces with high risk of harassment. Readily available communication tools can deter potential harassment. An FWS-wide Hotline is being developed to provide direct channels for employees to report any harassment incidents. These are other initiatives which are increasing the number of channels for employees to communicate with leadership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your Voice: FWS launched a feedback application, Your Voice, to provide an opportunity for employees to give feedback on all subjects where they have concerns. Inform employees that Your Voice is accessible through a Desktop icon that is automatically loaded to every employee's Windows profile. The feedback provides an opportunity to celebrate the good things as well as identify where FWS needs to improve. Feedback can be anonymous or personalized. This initiative involves leaders and employees in a holistic approach to create an organizational culture that will prevent harassment. • Mutual Respect and Inclusion Suggestion Box: FWS launched a Mutual Respect and Inclusion Suggestion Box that employees can access online at any time to provide feedback on how to foster a respectful and inclusive environment. This provides a line of communication between employees throughout FWS. The Suggestion Box strengthens leadership visibility and commitment in remote areas and comprehensively addresses the cultural risk factors of harassment. <p>Current Status: Hotline infrastructure has been tested is ready to go live.</p> <p>Action Items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Validate that the Hotline POCs are "on the same page". • Develop a standard set of operating procedures that POCs will use when replying to Hotline calls. • Define response time. • Develop Protocol for handling calls. • Define any specific inter-team communications that should occur when an incident is reported. • Create an announcement email (to all staff) informing them of the availability of the Harassment Hotline. 	
Cost and Extent:	Staff time to develop procedures and responding to calls. We will determine costs by end of FY18.
Level and extent of review or other forms of independent oversight:	FWS Directorate Anti-Harassment Team.
External factors or conditions that could directly affect the effort:	Accessibility to phone service in remote locations.
Schedule:	March 1, 2018
Success Measure:	Usage of hotline. Seek formal feedback from those who use it, via surveys and interviews.

Activity 5:	<u>Increase the Quality and Quantity of Communication</u>
Ongoing/Future:	Future
Accountability:	FWS Directorate Anti-Harassment Team
Points of Contact:	External Affairs
Description	
<p>Objectives: To communicate anti-harassment policies and training materials regularly through multiple avenues.</p>	

To clearly outline management responsibilities of increasing the commitment and visibility that is crucial to supporting a no-tolerance environment.

To clearly communicate that at all levels, across all positions, systems are in place that hold Service employees accountable for their actions (or inaction).

To communicate actions being taken to eliminate harassing and/or assault behaviors experienced and/or witnessed in the agency, as reported in the DOI Work Environment Survey (WES).

Summary: According to the FWS Directorate Anti-Harassment Team, workplace culture has the greatest impact on allowing harassment to flourish, or conversely, in preventing harassment. The existence of a social climate that is permissive of harassment might be a necessary condition for behaviors to occur. Organizations should have policies and supporting materials that define what harassment is and is not, for research shows that employees are not always aware of the full definition of harassment.

Accountability systems must ensure that those who engage in harassment are held responsible in a meaningful, appropriate, and proportional manner, and that those whose job it is to prevent or respond to harassment, directly or indirectly, are rewarded for doing that job well, or penalized for failing to do so.

Conducting a climate survey (e.g., DOI WES) communicates a sense of urgency by showing the agency is serious about determining whether employees feel that harassment exists in the workplace and is tolerated. After a holistic approach to prevention has been put into place, such climate surveys can be repeated, and the results shared, to demonstrate that change has occurred and is being maintained.

Use Plain Language: Employees should be given realistic and relatable examples to learn how to spot harassment in their workplace or behaviors that encourage a work culture where harassment can occur. For example, if an employee is worried that they may inadvertently be committing harassment or are unsure of whether they witnessed harassment, they can think about questions such as “Would the behavior be appropriate in front of others? In front of family? In front of a wider audience?” – a “No” to any of these is a red flag.

Make the Business Case for Tackling Harassment: Organizations should explain the business necessity of a civil, respectful, and inclusive workforce. Harassment and/or a culture where harassment is tolerated negatively impacts workforce morale and productivity. The negative effects reach far wider than the perpetrator and the victim, affecting entire work units.

Action Items:

- Establish an agency-wide internal and external webpage for all information related to anti-harassment.
- Develop a communication plan from senior leadership regarding harassment prevention and response.
- Develop timelines and artwork for the nationwide anti-harassment effort that employees can recognize and coalesce around.

Cost and Extent:	Update on costs will be provided. Staff time for establishing web page and communication plan.
Level and extent of review or other forms of independent oversight:	FWS Directorate Anti-Harassment Team.
External factors or conditions that could directly affect the effort:	None identified at this time.
Schedule:	Initiated in FY18 and implemented in early FY19.
Success Measure:	Surveys (Exit Survey, EVS, Climate Survey, WES), Focus

	Groups, Barrier Analysis, increased workplace productivity, improved retention rates.
--	---

Activity 6:	<u>Establish a minimum of 5 days suspension as the disciplinary requirement when misconduct has been determined</u>
Ongoing/Future:	April 1, 2018
Accountability:	FWS Directorate Anti-Harassment Team
Points of Contact:	HR
Description	
<p>Objective: To provide additional guidance to the table of penalties, requiring a higher mandatory minimum within the established range of disciplinary actions, to ensure swift and certain punishment when misconduct has been determined. In addition, the disciplines should include actions taken to address a manager/supervisor for not following up on the misconduct after it has been reported to them.</p> <p>Summary: The Table of Penalties establishes a range of disciplinary actions to address harassment and FWS can strengthen this by distributing guidance to establish a higher minimum disciplinary action, within the range provided by the penalties.</p>	
Cost and Extent:	Minimal administrative time.
Level and extent of review or other forms of independent oversight:	FWS Directorate Anti-Harassment Team.
External factors or conditions that could directly affect the effort:	None identified at this time.
Schedule:	April 1, 2018
Success Measure:	Increased trust in leadership. Initially there should be an increase in the reporting of allegations of harassment, followed by a stark decrease in incidents.

Activity 7:	<u>Introduce an independent panel into the management inquiry process.</u>
Ongoing/Future:	This action will be fully initiated no later than September 30, 2018.
Accountability:	FWS Directorate Anti-Harassment Team
Points of Contact:	HR, ODIWM
Description	
<p>Objective: To ensure appropriate disciplinary actions are taken to increase confidence of employees regarding fairness of management inquiry process.</p> <p>Summary: An independent panel, outside of the line of management corresponding to each allegation, would be introduced into the management inquiry process to identify cases in which misconduct occurred and to recommend disciplinary action. To override an independent panel recommendation on disciplinary action, a manager would be required to explain their rationale in writing.</p>	
Cost and Extent:	Update on costs will be provided. Staff time to establish the panel.
Level and extent of review or other	FWS Directorate Anti-Harassment Team,

forms of independent oversight:	HR, ODIWM
External factors or conditions that could directly affect the effort:	None.
Schedule:	This action will be fully initiated no later than September 30, 2018.
Success Measure:	Surveys (Exit Survey, EVS, Climate Survey, WES), Focus Groups, Barrier Analysis, increased workplace productivity, employee satisfaction, and improved retention rates.

Activity 8:	<u>Produce and distribute an anti-harassment video as part of onboarding</u>
Ongoing/Future:	September 30, 2018
Accountability:	External Affairs
Points of Contact:	HR, and ODIWM
Description	
Objective: To ensure that all new employees are provided guidance and the FWS policies on anti-harassment.	
Summary: Acclimating new employees to FWS' anti-harassment policy and procedures through a deliberate onboarding process that includes an anti-harassment video will ensure employees are fully informed of the agency's commitment to zero tolerance.	
Cost and Extent:	Update on costs will be provided. Costs will include video production and staff time.
Level and extent of review or other forms of independent oversight:	FWS Directorate Anti-Harassment Team, HR.
External factors or conditions that could directly affect the effort:	None.
Schedule:	September 30, 2018
Success Measure:	All new employees are appropriately integrated into FWS.

Activity 9:	<u>Updating the reporting mechanism utilizing a database system</u>
Ongoing/Future:	June 30, 2018
Accountability:	FWS Directorate Anti-Harassment Team
Points of Contact:	HR, ODIWM
Description	
Objective: To improve tracking and measurement of management inquiries into harassment and enhance the data analytics.	
Summary: The current reporting process for management inquiries requires that HR enter information into an Excel spreadsheet. This information could be better tracked and reported through a data base that could generate multiple report templates.	
Action Items:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> FWS will configure a database system for management inquiries. 	

Cost and Extent:	Update on costs will be provided. Costs will be staff time to configure the database.
Level and extent of review or other forms of independent oversight:	FWS Directorate Anti-Harassment Team
External factors or conditions that could directly affect the effort:	None.
Schedule:	June 30, 2018
Success Measure:	Information can be better retrieved for generating multiple reports for FWS and the Department.

Appendix: Analysis of Workplace Environment Survey (WES)

Background: In determining FWS’s strategy for addressing discrimination and harassment, it is helpful to consider government-wide results and how this has changed. The Merit Systems Promotion Board (MSPB) has completed surveys of sexual harassment starting in 1994. In those surveys, 44% of women and 19% of men reported that they had experienced sexual harassment within the past two years. Those statistics decreased in the 2016 survey to 6% of men and 18% of women surveyed. MSPB’s survey across all Federal agencies creates a baseline for sexual harassment. These results somewhat correlate with the results from the WES survey. However, the questions in the WES survey gathered input on a larger range of data and organizational/individual differences with greater specificity for each organization and a focus on reporting/addressing harassment.

Service-Specific Results

An estimated 2,780 FWS employees, or 31.4% of the FWS workforce, experienced some kind of harassing or assault related behavior in past 12 months. An estimated 18.6% of the workforce witnessed someone else being harassed during that time. The most common type of harassment behavior experienced by FWS employees in the past 12 months was age-related. Gender harassment behaviors were the second most common (Table 1).

Table 1. FWS – Estimated experience rates and counts harassment experiences in past 12 months.

Basis	Percent experienced	Margin of Error	Estimated number of employees	Lower bound of estimate	Upper bound of estimate
Age	17.7%	±0.8	1,569	1,500	1,641
Racial/Ethnic	7.7%	±0.6	685	637	736
Religious	5.4%	±0.5	475	435	519
Disability	5.7%	±0.5	498	457	542
Sexual Orientation	2.9%	±0.4	255	226	288
Gender Harassment	15.5%	±0.8	1,370	1,304	1,438
Sexual Harassment	6.3%	±0.5	556	513	602
Sexual Assault	0.38%	±0.15	34	24	47

Harassment behavior or experience with greatest impact

- In order to keep the questionnaire to a manageable length, respondents were asked to identify the basis of the harassment experience or behavior in the past 12 months that had the greatest impact on them and were then given detailed questions about that experience.
- Although age related harassment behavior was the most commonly reported harassment behavior overall, when survey respondents were asked to identify the basis of the harassment behavior or experience that had the greatest impact on them, sex/gender related harassment behavior topped the list. (Table 2.)

Table 2. FWS – Primary Basis for Experience of Greatest Effect.

Q33 Thinking about the one behavior or experience that had the greatest effect on you in the past 12 months, what was the primary basis for the behavior or experience?			
Basis	Number respondents	Percent	Margin of Error
Your age	649	23.8%	±1.6
Your race or ethnicity	257	9.4%	±1.2

Your religious beliefs	142	5.2%	±0.9
Your disability status or condition	177	6.5%	±1.0
Your sexual orientation	60	2.2%	±0.6
Your sex/gender	907	33.2%	±1.8
Unknown	539	19.7%	±1.5

Responses to harassment: Just over 20% of employees experiencing harassment reported it. Despite this, most discussed the behavior with someone else in the organizations, most commonly with coworkers (50.9% of employees experiencing harassment related behavior), and 30.8% of employees also addressed the issue directly with the person engaging in the behavior.

Employees who indicated that they had seen someone else being harassed in the past 12 months were also asked about what action they took in response, if any. The most common course of action was to ask the target of the harassing behavior if they needed help (33.6% of respondents). The second most common response was to do nothing (27.6% of respondents) followed by telling person engaging in the harassing behavior that they “crossed the line” (23.3% of respondents). 19.8% of respondents indicated that they brought the situation to the attention of someone in a position of authority.

Reasons for not reporting:

- Most employees experiencing harassment or assault-related behavior indicated that they did not report it. The most commonly cited reasons for not reporting were the employee’s belief that the behavior was not serious enough to warrant reporting, the employee’s desire to forget about the experience and move on, and the behavior stopping on its own.
- Of the employees who indicated that sexual/gender harassment behavior had the greatest impact on them in the past 12 months, only 19.8% reported it. Again, the most common reason for not reporting, selected by over 75% of respondents, was the belief that the behavior was not serious enough. The second most common reason for not reporting was the desire to move on from the incident. Respondents were about equally likely to indicate that they did not report the behavior because it stopped on its own or because they did not believe anything would be done if they did report.

Outcomes of reporting:

- When employees did report harassment, they tended to turn to their supervisors/managers most often. The survey also asked all respondents, including those who had not experienced harassment, to consider what resources they would use in the future in order to report harassing behavior. Here too, most employees anticipated that they would report such behavior to a supervisor.
- Of those employees who did report harassment, 37.4% indicated that action was taken as a result of their report. The most common actions included explaining harassment policies to the entire office and conducting management investigation. The study authors caution that employees might not be aware of disciplinary actions in all cases.
- Some employees also indicated that they were discouraged from filing grievance reports (31.7%) or were advised to drop the issue (37.6%).

t

Comparison to other DOI Bureaus: Comparing the WES survey results across the larger bureaus (FWS, NPS, BLM, BOR, and USGS) with similar organizational profiles – widely distributed in different office settings, higher percentage of males (avg of 62%) and a distribution of employees fitting in the age categories of young (-39) and old (50+). Most had a similar diversity profile with BOR having the highest diversity (22% minority) to USGS (13% minority).

Organizational Makeup Percentages	FWS	NPS	BLM	USGS	BOR
-- Age (39 to younger and 50 +)	71.1	76.3	74.1	77.2	77.2

-- Racial or Ethnic Minority	16.9	18.5	17.4	13.3	21.9
-- Disability	10.4	9.4	9.7	7.2	14.7
-- Sexual orientation	3.9	NA	3.6	4.3	3.0
-- Female	39.7	37.5	36.2	38.4	32.3

WES Survey Results: The results are fairly similar with some organizations having higher/lower percentages in certain categories, some of which may be a result of the percentage of employees who are older/younger or sit in organizations that are more homogeneous (i.e. less diverse). Many respondents would have checked several boxes (i.e. a 52 year old female might have checked two boxes) so the results are not additive which has the effect of skewing the results.

Experienced Harassing Behavior based on	FWS	NPS	BLM	USGS	BOR
-- Age (39 and young and 50 +)	17.7	22.9	21.0	17.0	18.4
-- Racial or Ethnic Background	7.7	9.5	8.2	3.8	8.1
-- Religious Believe	5.4	7.2	9.1	3.9	8.6
-- Perceived/Actual disability	5.7	6.9	6.2	3.9	7.8
-- Sexual orientation	2.9	4.5	3.8	1.6	3.1
-- Gender	15.5	19.3	15.9	13.9	12.3
Reporting Harassment of any kind (not a sum)	31.1	38.7	35.5	28.4	31.1

For those who experienced but did not report the harassing behavior/experience, they indicated that the reason they didn't report was because they didn't consider it serious enough to report (on average 70%). The percent of employees who experienced harassment and made a complaint or grieved the harassing behavior varied but was low overall (this ranged from a low of 20% for FWS and USGS to a high of 29% for BOR). Respondents indicated that they reported/complained or grieved to Supervisors or through formal channels.

The most significant difference across the bureaus across all of the survey questions is how respondents answered the question of whether any action was taken when they reported the behavior. Actions taken could have involved explaining the rules to the staff, conducting a review or investigation, counseling, changing the work environment to minimize interaction or other administrative actions. Most bureaus had 35-39% of the respondents say that some action was taken following the decision of the employee to report the behavior. Only the BLM had a much higher percent (62%) indicating that an action was taken in response to a behavior being reported. While some of this is likely a perception that actions were taken because a disciplinary action would not have been shared publicly, it does seem worth it to see if this is handled differently or more proactively at BLM.

Comparison to FEVS Results: The Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey (FEVS) focuses more on employee perceptions of the workplace overall. It does include questions related to whether the work environment is supportive, open and fair. In the category that summarizes these questions into a measurement of how inclusive the environment is, FWS scores higher (65.4%) than the Department as a whole (60.7%) and across government (59.9%). FWS's scores on the FEVS have increased over the past several years and the results do not appear to correlate well with the WES results. Determining why that gap exists is one area of interest for FWS that could become part of the FEVS response work that each organization undertakes.