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Diversity at U.S. Foreign Affairs Agencies

Federal agencies tasked with carrying out U.S. foreign policy have made efforts in recent decades to reflect more closely the diverse characteristics of the American public—including race, ethnicity, gender, age, and disability—in their workforces. Interest in ensuring both equal opportunity for all Americans and maximum agency performance drive these efforts, which are generally a component of broader government-wide mandates and initiatives. Congress has taken an active interest in this issue, using both legislative and oversight authorities to promote and monitor agency diversity efforts. While workforce diversity can encompass numerous characteristics, federal diversity reporting requirements focus most consistently on race, ethnicity, and sex/gender, and these are the primary elements of diversity discussed in this report.

While advancing workforce diversity and inclusion is a whole-of-government effort, several Members of Congress and foreign affairs analysts assert that diversity among the agency staff who represent the United States abroad, or lack thereof, may have implications for U.S. foreign policy and global influence. Outside observers and agency officials alike have noted that heightened racial tensions in the United States, among other issues, have drawn renewed attention to the disparities between policy and practice with regard to social and economic inclusion, both domestically and internationally. In this context, Congress recently requested reports from the Government Accountability Office on State Department and U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) diversity and inclusion efforts, held hearings on challenges to workforce diversity at the State Department, and introduced legislation to promote diversity at the State Department. At the same time, several foreign policy organizations have released reports and statements calling for increased diversity and inclusion within U.S. foreign affairs agencies.

Foreign affairs agencies have longstanding policies and programs in place to recruit staff from underrepresented segments of society, to identify and prevent discrimination within their ranks, and to promote an inclusive work environment. Nevertheless, available data, which are not always comprehensive, suggest that on average the workforce at U.S. foreign policy agencies is less racially and ethnically diverse than the U.S. population as a whole, and even less so at the senior pay grades. Significant variation exists across agencies. The Civil Service workforce at State and USAID has more racial and ethnic minority employees, and more women, than the broader American workforce in aggregate, though some ethnicities, such as Hispanic (the term used in data reporting) workers, may be underrepresented. The Foreign Service at these agencies has fewer racial and ethnic minorities, as well as women, when compared with the general workforce, though there has been an increase in underrepresented groups over time. In both services, the portion of women and racial and ethnic minorities declines at the higher rungs of the pay scale, raising questions about efforts to promote and retain these populations. Data for other agencies display some anomalies. The Peace Corps volunteer force, for example, is much younger and more female than the American workforce, while the U.S. Agency for Global Media (USAGM) reports the most racial and ethnic diversity within its workforce.

Agency reports and congressional oversight have identified a number of challenges related to increasing diversity and inclusion at foreign affairs agencies. These include lack of comprehensive data allowing for accurate monitoring of workforce diversity, lack of agency personnel dedicated to diversity and equal opportunity programs, financial considerations, agency culture and leadership, poor information on why people choose to leave these agencies, and issues related to the foreign cultures in which many of these employees work. Previous Congresses have sought to address some of these concerns through legislative provisions, reporting requirements, and oversight activities, and the 117th Congress may be expected to address these issues as well.
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Introduction

For many decades, Congress and successive Administrations established laws and policies to achieve a federal workforce that reflects the diverse characteristics of the American public, including race, ethnicity, sex, age, and disability. While increased diversity is a stated goal across much of the federal workforce, it has unique implications for foreign policy agencies, whose personnel often represent the official face and voice of the United States abroad. Some Members of Congress and foreign policy commentators have long asserted that the persistent lack of workforce diversity at these agencies squanders opportunities to use the skills of a qualified and diverse range of Americans when advancing U.S. foreign policy priorities and national security objectives. They maintain that insufficient diversity may also undermine the efforts of U.S. diplomats and other senior officials to espouse the values of inclusion, equality, and good governance that arguably bolster U.S. influence abroad.

While diversity within foreign affairs agencies has increased since the days when the Foreign Service was nearly exclusively European-American and male, recent reviews by the Government Accountability Office (GAO), and data reported to the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC), suggest that this segment of the federal workforce still does not reflect the American public in many ways, and for many reasons. Recent protests related to racial injustice in the United States and internationally have also heightened interest in the representation of racial and ethnic minority groups in public institutions and have raised questions about how the diversity of those who represent the United States abroad may affect U.S. foreign relations.

This report discusses the relevance of workforce diversity in the U.S. foreign policy context and provides information and analysis on racial, ethnic, sex, and other aspects of diversity and minority representation within the workforces of the primary U.S. agencies responsible for international diplomacy and foreign assistance: the U.S. Department of State, U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), U.S. Agency for Global Media (USAGM), and the Peace Corps, among others. The report discusses diversity at these agencies in the context of whole-of-government efforts to promote a culture of diversity and inclusion, agency-specific policies and programs related to diversity, and how personnel diversity may affect each agency’s unique role in foreign policy. It ends with a discussion of related issues for Congress.

Definitions and Data

As U.S. government agencies have increasingly prioritized promoting a diverse workforce, data documenting agency demographics have proliferated but remain narrowly focused. Federal diversity reporting requirements focus most consistently on race, ethnicity, and sex/gender, making those the focus of most data analysis on diversity, including this report. Many other personnel characteristics may be considered in diversity discussion—including sexual orientation, gender identity, religion, socio-economic class, geographic origin, or even diversity of thought (conservative, progressive, etc.), among others—but may be precluded from significant analysis for lack of data. For example, employers are not required to collect data on sexual orientation or religion in their workforce. Similarly, Secretary of State Pompeo has repeatedly mentioned U.S. regional origin as an element of diversity he

---

1 This report does not address personnel diversity issues within the armed forces or intelligence agencies. For information and analysis on diversity within the U.S. Armed Forces, see CRS Report R44321, Diversity, Inclusion, and Equal Opportunity in the Armed Services: Background and Issues for Congress, by Kristy N. Kamarck.

2 Potential legal questions or constitutional issues that can arise with respect to measures or programs seeking to diversify a workforce are beyond the scope of this report. Questions about such issues may be directed to Christine Back or April Anderson in CRS’s American Law Division.
would like to focus on at the State Department, suggesting that a disproportionate number of U.S. diplomats are from the U.S. Northeast. However, the State Department does not collect such data.\(^3\)

The most prominent sources for personnel data relevant to foreign affairs agencies include recent GAO reporting on Department of State and USAID workforces, EEOC annual reports on the federal workforce, and the Office of Personnel Management’s (OPM’s) FedScope data portal. No single source includes data for all components of the workforce in foreign affairs agencies across fiscal years, precluding side-by-side analysis of agency demographic composition in most cases. Accordingly, this report focuses on the highest-quality data sources available for individual agencies, rather than sources that might allow for aggregated data. The sources used for data analysis of the agencies included in this report are summarized in Appendix A. In constructing comparisons between individual agencies and the federal workforce and civilian labor force, this report uses the same methodology implemented by the GAO in its reports on the Department of State and USAID.

**Minority/Nonminority:** For analysis purposes, some authoritative reporting sources on diversity within federal agencies divide racial and ethnic demographics into “minority” or “nonminority” groupings. Across all sources used in this report—and in line with OPM FedScope data guidelines—the “minority” category includes employees categorized as American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asian, Black/African American, Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, More than One Race, and Hispanic/Latino.\(^4\) The “nonminority” category refers to employees categorized as White. Using minority/nonminority categorization allows for time-series comparisons in spite of changes to racial and ethnic category definition, and ensures sample sizes are statistically significant. However, this type of categorization limits the capacity to analyze changes across racial groups over time.

**Race/Ethnicity:** Racial or ethnic categories in the figures in this report reflect the terms used in corresponding data sources. GAO uses the terms African American and Hispanic, while OPM and the EEOC reporting use the combined terms Black/African American and Hispanic/Latino, so there is variation in this usage throughout the report. These sources are consistent in their use of the categories Asian American and White.

**Sex/Gender:** Sex is a biologically defined term, while gender describes socially ascribed characteristics, but they are used somewhat interchangeably in many sources used for this report. Sex is a term used in federal statutes, while gender is used in agency data reports, so this report uses sex when discussing federal statutes and gender in the context of data analysis.

## Diversity as a Workforce Goal

Diversity in the workforce can mean different things and be sought for various purposes. In broad terms, promoting diversity often means seeking and valuing differences among employees in terms of demographic characteristics such as sex/gender, racial and ethnic background, physical abilities, and age. CRS review of both government and private-sector organization efforts to promote diversity and inclusion suggests these efforts are often driven by two primary goals: (1) demonstrating compliance with federal antidiscrimination laws that seek to provide equal employment opportunity for all Americans, and (2) a desire to maximize organizational performance.

**Legal requirements.** Over the years, Congress has taken several measures to address public and private workforce discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, pregnancy, disability, and age.\(^5\) These measures include enactment of laws such as Title VII of the

---

3 For more on this issue, see Glen Kessler, “Pompeo’s complaint about the ‘Boston-DC corridor’ is based on flawed data,” at https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2019/03/07/pompeos-complaint-about-boston-dc-corridor-is-based-flawed-data/.


5 These include Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352), as amended, which prohibits discrimination against individuals on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex or pregnancy, and is now interpreted to prohibit discrimination based on sexual orientation and gender identity. Other statutes include the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-112), as amended, which addresses discrimination based on disability in the federal sector; the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (P.L. 90-202), as amended, which addresses discrimination based on age; the Civil Service Reform Act Of 1978 (CSRA, P.L. 95-454, as amended), which sets out various legal protections and
Civil Rights Act of 1964, as well as laws specific to practices within certain federal employee personnel systems. Many of these statutory requirements are reflected in the State Department’s Foreign Affairs Manual regulations and apply to State Department Foreign Service and Civil Service personnel, as well as Foreign Service personnel of both USAID and USAGM (discussed in the agency-specific sections below). These statutory and regulatory requirements focus on creating equal employment opportunities for all Americans by addressing discriminatory practices, including those that have historically disadvantaged certain demographic groups.

Preventing discrimination is not the same as promoting diversity, but the two objectives are related. Antidiscrimination law is the source of many agency reporting requirements that provide the best available data on workforce diversity. In addition, a persistent lack of diversity may indicate discriminatory practices, and an EEOC report found that harassment is more likely to occur in less diverse workforces. Compliance with antidiscrimination laws is an important driver of current federal agency efforts to improve workforce diversity, and oversight of these whole-of-government efforts is aided by two primary reporting mandates:

- Annual agency reports to the EEOC, known as Management Directive 715, or MD-715 reports.
- The Government-Wide Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan (Executive Order 13583, signed by the Obama Administration in 2011), which built on several prior executive orders to establish a coordinated government-wide initiative to promote diversity and inclusion in the federal workforce, including a requirement that whole-of-government and individual agencies develop ways to improve diversity and review and report on their progress every four years.

Performance motive. Aside from compliance with federal law, efforts to increase workforce diversity may be driven by business considerations. Some studies of private sector organizations support the idea that a diverse workforce may be more profitable and innovative than a homogenous workforce. For example, a 2018 study looking at a broad range of diversity measures (gender, age, national origin, career path, industry background, and education) within companies around the globe found a statistically significant correlation between leadership diversity and innovation (and corresponding revenue) and further found that the relationship deepened as the dimensions of diversity increased.

---

requirements relating to federal employment; and Executive Order 11246, as amended, which prohibits federal contractors and certain subcontractors from discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, or national origin. Executive Order 11246, as amended, is available at https://www.dol.gov/agencies/ofccp/executive-order-11246-as-amended.

6 For more information, see CRS Report R46534, The Civil Rights Act of 1964: An Overview, by Christine J. Back. As discussed throughout this report, the Foreign Service Act of 1980, which governs the Foreign Service personnel system, includes several provisions intended to ensure that all Foreign Service personnel are free from discrimination and that all Foreign Service personnel actions are made in accordance with merit principles.


The effects of diversity on organizational performance have been less studied in the public sector, where profit is not a measure of success. Nevertheless, many analysts assert that diversity could have a positive impact on performance at government agencies, as explained below in the foreign policy context.

**Diversity in Foreign Policy**

Agency reporting on workforce diversity in recent years suggests that foreign affairs agency workforces tend to be somewhat less racially and ethnically diverse than the U.S. population and the U.S. civilian labor force. The proportion of racial and ethnic minority employees in the workforces of these agencies was less than that of the U.S. resident population in 2018.

The data indicate that even while the number of employees from underrepresented groups increased at these agencies, the overall racial/ethnic and gender composition of these agencies between 2002 and 2018 did not shift significantly compared with the overall U.S. resident population. For example, while the proportion of minority employees at USAID increased from 33% in 2002 to 37% in 2018, racial and ethnic minorities within the U.S. resident population increased from 32% to 40% during that period. As a result, even while the proportion of minority employees in the USAID workforce increased, the agency became less diverse relative to the resident population. There is some variance in this overall trend, with notable differences between agencies and among employment categories within agencies. For example, the Civil Service (primarily U.S.-based) workforce at State and USAID has more racial and ethnic minority employees, and more women, than the broader American workforce in aggregate. The Foreign Service (primarily foreign-based) at these agencies has fewer racial and ethnic minorities, as well as fewer women, than the nongovernment workforce. Comprehensive data and detailed analysis of these workforce trends are included in the specific agency sections of this report.

In recent years, many policy experts, academics, and agency leaders have reflected on how personnel diversity may affect U.S. foreign policy. A review of published commentary and analysis on this issue reveals several common themes.

**Misalignment with foreign policy goals.** Critics have long pointed out that U.S. global influence is derived in part from the nation’s demonstrated commitment to democracy and human rights, but that domestic inequities have the potential to undermine this source of authority.\(^{11}\) Discrimination within the United States against minorities, women, the LGBT community, and people with disabilities, observers maintain, contradicts political and cultural values espoused by the United States in foreign affairs—democracy, human rights, and social and economic inclusion. When this misalignment sparks social unrest in the United States, the apparent discrepancy between U.S. foreign policy and domestic practice risks undermining U.S. credibility. The American Academy of Diplomacy (AAD), a nonpartisan and nongovernmental organization, noted in a press release during the unrest following the May 2020 death of a Black man, George Floyd, in the custody of U.S. law enforcement that “the demonstrators and those who have spoken out remind us that America cannot lead the world unless at home we live up to the values we so proudly defend abroad.”\(^{12}\)

---

\(^{11}\) As stated by President of the Council on Foreign Relations Richard Haass, “Through example, a country communicates its values and furnishes a context for all that its representatives say and do.” Haass, Richard, “Foreign Policy by Examples: Crisis at Home Makes the United States Vulnerable Abroad,” *Foreign Affairs*, June 5, 2020.

Potentially exploited by adversaries. Diplomats and foreign policy professionals have similarly expressed concern that persistent inequality in the United States, and related unrest, has “handed adversarial governments—including those of China, Russia, Iran and North Korea—a powerful propaganda tool to paint a dark portrait of the United States.” Such concerns date back at least the early 20th century and are exemplified by the federal government’s 1952 amicus brief in Brown v. Board of Education arguing that “[r]acial discrimination [has] furnished grist for the Communist propaganda mills, and it raises doubts even among friendly nations as to the intensity of our devotion to the democratic faith.” Further, some analysts note that U.S. strategic rivals have already seized on racial unrest in the United States to justify their own undemocratic policies. The Chinese Communist Party, for example, facing international criticism for alleged human rights violations against both pro-democracy protesters in Hong Kong and ethnic Uyghur populations in Xinjiang Province, dubbed the United States the “double standard nation,” citing some local government responses to unrest. Some assert that increasing diversity in the U.S. foreign policy workforce may be a means of countering such messages.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Historic Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| While this report focuses on agency diversity in recent decades, during which time diversity goals became more prevalent and more data became available, a longer historic view demonstrates that diversity in foreign affairs agencies has been a longstanding and significant issue. In 1980, for example, women held fewer than 10% of USAID positions described as executive, managerial, or supervisory, and from 1961 to 1990 minority representation among Peace Corps volunteers and trainees never exceeded 10%. Going back further, agencies generally had workplace cultures and policies that fostered discrimination. Until the early 1970s, for example, the State Department expected women (but not men) in the Foreign Service to resign if they married, and women faced barriers in obtaining advanced language training and hardship posts, severely limiting both where they could be posted and their promotion opportunities. Discriminatory treatment against racial and ethnic minority employees was conditioned in the past as well, as evidenced by the informally named “Negro Circuit” and “Cucaracha Circuit”—shorthand for what was then the State Department practice of assigning Black FSOs only to Africa and the Caribbean and Hispanic FSOs only to Latin America. The Foreign Service Act of 1980 explicitly prohibited such practices, mandating that the Secretary of State shall not make assignments to Foreign Service positions on the basis of race or ethnicity.

---

17 See Section 502(a)(2) of P.L. 96-465 (22 U.S.C. §3982(a)).
Diversity as a U.S. strategic advantage. As a nation historically built on immigration, the United States citizenry is characterized by uncommon racial, ethnic, linguistic, and cultural diversity. This diversity, Brookings Institution scholars have noted, is an “underutilized source of strength to project moral authority and global leadership to address the most complex challenges.” A recent report on diversity and inclusion in the foreign policy sector notes that “a lack of diversity not only disenfranchises minority groups working for the world’s leading institutions, but also impacts how these institutions work with minority groups around the world.” The diverse population of the United States, some assert, places the United States and the State Department in a position to assemble a diplomatic corps from Americans whose racial or ethnic identity may provide them valuable insights into the cultures of many U.S. allies and adversaries. This is a comparative advantage, particularly as adversarial global powers, for example China or Russia, can draw only from more homogenous populations. As one ambassador put it when testifying before a House committee in 2020, “Our diplomats must represent the diverse composition of our nation … our power to influence flows from who we are.”

Criticism of Diversity and Inclusion Programs

While the benefits of workforce diversity are widely accepted, programs to promote diversity and inclusion are sometimes challenged. At a broad level, critics have argued that categorizing Americans by race, ethnicity, and other means of differentiation, although sometimes required by equal opportunity laws, fosters “identity politics” that encourage people to focus on individual differences rather than common national and agency interests. In some cases, lawsuits have claimed that certain policies and practices intended to increase the representation of underrepresented groups in the workforce constitute “reverse discrimination” against males and/or ethnic groups. In addition, the Trump Administration ordered a review of diversity training at federal agencies, asserting that such training may promote race and sex stereotyping (see the text box below).

Experts have also argued that diversity promotion programs may have unintended consequences. For example, some psychologists have asserted that diversity training within organizations creates

---


an “us versus them” response in many people that may actually increase discrimination. 28 There
are also reports of “diversity backlash,” which may take the form of resentment or anger among
workplace “majority” employees, undermining workforce cohesion and productivity. 29 Some
studies also indicate that affirmative action policies intended to promote workforce diversity
inadvertently stigmatize those they aim to assist, raising questions about whether employees from
underrepresented groups were hired on merit or to achieve diversity goals. 30 Analysts have also
argued that diversity programs and policies sometimes mask discrimination, leading some
workers and decision makers to feel the presence of these policies means their organization is fair
even when there is evidence of discrimination. 31

Criticism of diversity as a means of improving organizational effectiveness, as opposed to
promoting equal opportunity, is hard to come by, particularly in the foreign affairs context. There
is little data to support either side of the issue, as it is arguably impossible to measure how U.S.
global influence and success or failure in achieving diplomatic and development goals are
affected by the diversity of the Americans involved in the policymaking and implementation.
Nevertheless, efforts to improve workforce diversity are required by statute and agency policy,
and the issues surrounding their purpose and impact are the subject of ongoing congressional
interest.

Executive Order on Combating Race and Sex Stereotyping
While a general political consensus has emerged regarding the value of diversity and equal opportunity efforts,
some related activities have been controversial. In September 2020, President Trump issued Executive Order
13950 on Combating Race and Sex Stereotyping, which called for an end to diversity training programs at federal
agencies that President Trump asserted promote “race and sex stereotyping” and “race or sex scapegoating,”
both of which the order describes as “rooted in the pernicious and false belief that America is an irredeemably
racist and sexist country; that some people, simply on account of their race or sex, are oppressors; and that racial
and sexual identities are more important than our common status as human beings and Americans.” 32 The
executive order, and the implementing memo issued by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget,
require agencies to identify contracts for such training and related spending for FY2020, review whether they
promote the concepts of race and sex stereotyping and/or scapegoating as defined in the executive order, and
prevent such trainings going forward, except as specifically exempted. 33 It remains unclear how or if this will affect
various activities relating to diversity at foreign policy agencies in the long term. Both the State Department and
USAID reportedly suspended all diversity and inclusion training in October 2020 while reviewing their training
programs. 34

at https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/your-brain-work/201706/is-your-company-s-diversity-training-making-
you-more-biased.
29 See, for example, Carolyn Lawrence, “Diversity backlash is real. Here’s how to avoid it,” Deloitte Global, January 9,
57, no. 4, 964–989, at http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0940.
31 Tessa L. Dover, Brenda Major and Cheryl R. Kaiser, “Diversity Policies Rarely Make Companies Fairer, and They
policies-dont-help-women-or-minorities-and-they-make-white-men-feel-threatened.
33 M-20-34, issued by the Office of Management and Budget Director Russell T. Vought to heads of executive
departments and agencies on “Ending Employee Trainings that Use Divisive Propaganda to Undermine the Principle of
202009/M-20-37.pdf.
34 See “Why Diversity Training Has Been Suspended at USAID,” by Joanne Lu, National Public Radio, October 27,
Diversity by Agency

The bulk of congressional attention on diversity in the U.S. foreign policy establishment has been focused on the Department of State, whose diplomats are among the most prominent civilian representatives of the United States abroad. The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), the lead U.S. foreign assistance agency, has also been a recent focus of congressional inquiries about diversity. The role of workforce diversity at other foreign-facing U.S. agencies, including the U.S. Agency for Global Media, the Peace Corps, and others, has been less examined. This section discusses workforce diversity, agency policies and actions, and some unique considerations related to diversity at these agencies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>U.S. Resident Population vs. U.S. Civilian Labor Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Many figures in this section compare agency workforces to the U.S. population and U.S. workforce using U.S. Resident Population data reported by the U.S. Census Bureau and U.S. Civilian Labor Force reported in the Office of Personnel Management’s Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program report. The U.S. Civilian Labor Force is calculated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and comprises an estimate of the population of “non-institutionalized individuals 16 years of age or older” that is generally associated with the portion of the U.S. resident population available for employment. This definition is distinct from the private sector workforce, in that the Civilian Labor Force includes unemployed individuals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Department of State

The Department of State is the lead U.S. foreign affairs agency. It carries out its mission through a full-time permanent workforce (excluding contractors) that as of September 2020 totaled approximately 77,000, including around 24,000 Foreign Service and Civil Service personnel who have been the primary focus of efforts to measure diversity of the State Department’s workforce.\(^{35}\) Successive Secretaries of State and other senior department officials, regardless of Administration or political affiliation, have stated the importance of a diverse State Department workforce. In 2002, Colin Powell, the first Black Secretary of State, remarked that “[t]o advance America’s values and interests today, we must draw on the talents and the knowledge and experience of the widest possible range of Americans. The diversity of our diplomats can help us make the case all around the globe that the keys to a better future are … societies where citizens are equal under the law, and in which their contributions are valued.”\(^{36}\)

---

35 See U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Global Talent Management, “Global Talent Management Fact Sheet As Of 09/30/2020,” at https://www.state.gov/wp-content/uploads/2020/10/GTM_Factsheet0920.pdf. Around two-thirds of the State Department’s full-time permanent workforce comprises Locally Employed Staff (LES). LES are largely foreign nationals working at overseas posts and are thus not reflective of the diversity of the U.S. population. Section 103 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. §3903), as amended, authorizes the Secretary of State to appoint foreign national employees and states that “foreign nationals who provide ‘clerical, administrative, technical, fiscal, and other support at Foreign Service posts abroad’ shall be considered members of the Foreign Service.”

Similarly, former Secretary of State John Kerry noted that, “[i]n order to represent the United States to the world, the Department of State must have a workforce that reflects the rich composition of its citizenry. The skills, knowledge, perspectives, ideas, and experiences of all of its employees contribute to the vitality and success of the global mission.”

Current Secretary of State Mike Pompeo noted in 2020 the importance of ensuring that the State Department’s workforce reflects “the full glory and diversity of the United States of America.”

Following the death of George Floyd and ensuing protests in 2020, calls for the State Department to improve and expand its diversity and inclusion efforts have intensified. Press reports indicate that some State Department officials, including Black diplomats and other diplomats of color, expressed concern that senior department officials have failed to provide a robust, actionable commitment to combat what they characterize as pervasive prejudice and bias at the department. Both former and current State Department officials, including many from underrepresented backgrounds, have shared related concerns reflecting their experiences as employees at the State Department and proposed initiatives intended to increase the diversity of the department’s workforce and combat discrimination (see the text box above).

---


42 Robbie Gramer, “Fighting for U.S. Values Abroad, Black Diplomats Struggle With Challenges at Home.”
Diversity Data

Throughout 2020, senior State Department officials and several Members of Congress have remarked that, while the State Department has made progress on diversity and inclusion in recent decades, significant work remains. A congressionally requested GAO report released in January 2020 stated that from FY2002 to FY2018, the share of racial and ethnic minorities among the State Department’s full-time, permanent workforce had increased from 28% to 32%, while the share of women had declined from 44% to 43%. Relative to the U.S. population, the proportion of both women and ethnic minorities decreased in this period (Figure 1 and Figure 2). These aggregate percentage changes reflected declines in the share of both minorities and women in the Civil Service and increases in their representation within the Foreign Service workforce.43

Figure 1. Department of State Racial and Ethnic Diversity, 2002-2018
% Deviation from the U.S. Resident Population (0=U.S. Resident Population Percentage)

Figure 2. Department of State Gender Diversity, 2002-2018
% Deviation from the U.S. Resident Population (0=U.S. Resident Population Percentage)


Note: See “Definitions and Data” text box for an explanation of “minority” and “nonminority.”

A more detailed snapshot of the State Department workforce in 2018 shows that relative to the U.S. population, Black/African American employees were overrepresented in the Civil Service and Whites overrepresented in the Foreign Service, while Hispanic/Latinos were underrepresented in both employee groups (Figure 3). This distinction is particularly relevant to U.S. representation abroad, as Foreign Service officers are generally stationed abroad and are the most visible faces and voices of the U.S. Government in many foreign counties, while Civil Service positions are generally U.S.-based.

GAO’s findings further indicated that the proportion of racial and ethnic minorities and women in the Civil Service and the Foreign Service was negatively related to seniority (Figure 4 and Figure 5). The report revealed many instances where promotion rates were lower for minorities and women, especially in the Civil Service, although not all of these instances were “statistically significant” in GAO’s view. GAO further cautioned that its findings “do not establish a causal relationship between demographic characteristics and promotion outcomes,” as its analysis may have failed to capture “unobservable factors” that may explain differences in promotion outcomes.

Figure 3. Department of State, Racial and Ethnic Diversity, 2018
% Deviation from the U.S. Resident Population (0=U.S. Resident Population Percentage)

Policies and Programs

The State Department’s Foreign and Civil Service workforces are subject to Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (P.L. 88-352) and the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (P.L. 93-112), among other statutes that guide federal action on fair workplace practices (see “Diversity as a Workforce Goal”). The State Department’s Foreign Service workforce is also subject to Section 105 of the Foreign Service Act of 1980 (22 U.S.C. §3905), which instructs that all members of and applicants to the Foreign Service shall be free from discrimination “on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, national origin, age, handicapping condition, marital status, geographic or educational affiliation within the United States, or political affiliation,” and that all Foreign Service personnel actions shall be made in accordance with merit principles. These statutory requirements also apply to State Department Civil Service personnel, as well as personnel of both USAID and USAGM, and are further described in the State Department Foreign Affairs Manual regulations.46

In carrying out oversight of the State Department’s efforts to meet these statutory requirements, Congress has identified several issues of potential concern. In 1987, for example, Congress directed GAO to conduct an audit and inspection of the merit personnel system of the Foreign Service. GAO’s report, issued in 1989, indicated that while the State Department largely eliminated underrepresentation of women and most minority groups at the entry levels of the Foreign Service Officer Corps, underrepresentation remained endemic in the mid- and senior-level ranks (these observations are similar to GAO’s findings more than 30 years later that proportions of both women and minorities in the Foreign Service and Civil Service were generally smaller in the higher ranks).47 The State Department committed to implementing

46 U.S. Department of State, Foreign Affairs Manual, “3 FAM 1212 Equal Opportunity and the Merit System,” available at https://fam.state.gov. While the regulations provided in 3 FAM 1212.1 that apply to both the Foreign Service and Civil Service are discussed above, additional Civil Service-specific regulations are located at 3 FAM 1212.2.

GAO’s 1989 recommendations, which included carrying out renewed efforts to identify and eliminate artificial barriers to the hiring and advancement of minorities and women in the Foreign Service.48

One congressional action aimed at improving diversity at the State Department was the establishment of diversity-focused fellowship programs. In 1990, Congress amended the State Department Basic Authorities Act of 1956 (P.L. 84-885) to authorize the Secretary of State to make grants to postsecondary educational institutions or students to increase knowledge of and interest in employment with the Foreign Service, with a special focus on minority students.49 Pursuant to these authorities, the State Department launched the Thomas R. Pickering Foreign Affairs Fellowship and the Charles B. Rangel International Affairs Program in 1992 and 2002, respectively.50 On September 1, 2020, Secretary Pompeo announced that beginning in FY2021, the State Department would increase the Pickering and Rangel Fellowships by 50%, which would grow the number of new fellows each year from 60 to 90.51

The State Department has touted the success of the Rangel and Pickering programs, reporting to Congress in 2017 that they “have been responsible for increasing the representation of diverse groups in the Foreign Service by nearly 21% over a period of 20 years between 1993 and 2013.”52 The two programs offer incentives to potential fellows—including up to $42,000 annually for tuition, room, board, books, and mandatory fees while completing a two-year master’s degree—in exchange for a commitment to remain in the Foreign Service for a minimum of five years following graduation.53 In addition, fellows are provided mentoring when preparing for the Foreign Service Oral Assessment. Such arrangements may help alleviate any barriers within the Foreign Service examination process that unduly hinder minority or women candidates (as noted in the “Policy Issues” subsection, the State Department is currently investigating whether any such barriers exist related to the examination process).

Within the State Department, both the Bureau of Global Talent Management and the Office of Civil Rights oversee and implement efforts to improve diversity and inclusion. Figure 6 details the key responsibilities of these offices, as well as other relevant entities within the State Department.

---

48 GAO, State Department: Minorities and Women Are Underrepresented in the Foreign Service, p. 5.
49 See Section 150 of P.L. 101-246.
50 While the Rangel and Pickering Fellowships are very similar, a key difference between the programs is the internship opportunities offered. For example, in the summer before their first year of graduate study, Rangel Fellows generally intern in a congressional office. Congressional internships are currently not part of the Pickering Fellowship.
52 Information submitted to Congress by the Department of State on June 12, 2017 pursuant to Section 410 of the Department of State Authorities Act, Fiscal Year 2017 (P.L. 114-323).
53 For example, see http://rangelprogram.org/graduate-fellowship-program/.
Figure 6. Diversity and Inclusion Responsibilities at the Department of State


Policy Issues

Recent congressional oversight activities have led to both policy recommendations and proposals pertaining to diversity and inclusion matters at the Department of State. At a hearing on diversity and inclusion at the State Department held by the House Foreign Affairs Committee’s Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations on September 22, 2020, Director General of the Foreign Service Ambassador Carol Z. Perez and Director of the State Department’s Office of Civil Rights Gregory Smith testified that the State Department had made significant progress in recruiting a more diverse workforce. However, they acknowledged more work was needed to foster a culture of inclusion at the department to better ensure the retention and advancement of diverse personnel in both the Foreign Service and Civil Service.54 Director General Perez also mentioned several initiatives the State Department was undertaking to improve inclusion, for example

- establishing Diversity and Inclusion Councils at individual bureaus and posts to facilitate department-wide implementation of diversity and inclusion programs,

launching a new centralized exit survey process to better discern any systemic reasons causing members of underrepresented groups to leave the State Department, and

- implementing a Meritorious Service Increase pilot program that anonymizes nominations for merit-based pay increases to make them more gender-neutral.  

Director General Perez also noted that the State Department is planning to release its Diversity and Inclusion Strategic Plan for 2020-2022, which Secretary Pompeo has referred to as a “comprehensive strategic framework” that will further guide department-wide diversity and inclusion efforts.

Members of Congress have generally expressed their support for the State Department’s initiatives, agreeing that more work is needed to enhance the department’s ability to retain and promote personnel from underrepresented backgrounds. Some Members and other observers, however, have expressed concerns regarding certain aspects of the State Department’s policies. For example, some have noted what they characterize as the State Department’s limited success in recruiting diverse candidates through the conventional Foreign Service application and intake process. Others have noted the possibility that assignment restrictions, which are measures prohibiting employees that may be vulnerable to foreign influence or targeting and harassment by foreign intelligence services from working in certain positions, may be unfairly limiting the eligibility of Asian-American Foreign Service Officers to serve in Asia or work on Asia-related issues. Other organizations and stakeholders have also shared their own views and recommendations. These include the American Academy of Diplomacy, a group of former senior ambassadors and leaders in U.S. foreign policy. The AAD has called on the State Department to, among other actions, establish a senior level Chief Diversity and Inclusion Officer (CDIO) to act as the Secretary of State’s principal advisor on diversity and inclusion matters and serve as a voting member on committees tasked with recommending candidates for senior positions, including ambassadorships. Some of these concerns are discussed in more detail in the “Issues for Congress” section.

U.S. Agency for International Development

USAID is the primary agency implementing U.S. foreign assistance and international development programs, and is a prominent representative of the United States in developing countries in particular. The agency’s workforce comprises more than 10,000 people,

---


approximately two-thirds of whom serve at USAID missions overseas. Of the total workforce, approximately 30% are U.S. direct hires—Foreign Service and Civil Service Officers, and Foreign Service Limited staff—while the remainder are Foreign Service Nationals (~40%; non-U.S. citizen employees hired by USAID Missions abroad) and contractors (~30%). USAID has cited diversity and inclusion as an agency priority; its Office of Civil Rights and Diversity (OCRD) is tasked with leading workforce diversity efforts and works closely with its Office of Human Capital and Talent Management (HCTM), which manages the agency’s recruitment, workforce development, and retention efforts.

**Diversity Data**

In June 2020, GAO completed an audit of USAID’s diversity efforts. The audit report identified a number of challenges, including decreasing representation of racial or ethnic minority employees as rank increased (Figure 7), lower promotion outcomes for mid-career employees who are racial or ethnic minorities, and a lesser proportion of women in the higher ranks of both the Civil Service and Foreign Service (Figure 8).

**Figure 7. USAID’s Minority Workforce, by Pay Grade, 2018**

**Figure 8. USAID’s Female Workforce, by Pay Grade, 2018**

Source: CRS, adapted from GAO, USAID: Mixed Progress in Increasing Diversity, and Actions Needed to Consistently Meet EEO Requirements.

Notes: Percentages calculated in-grade as the share of that grade composed of minority employees. See “Definitions and Data” text box for a definition of “minority.”

---

59 USAID’s FY2019 Annual Financial Report (most recent available) reports the agency’s staffing level at 9,688, with 6,466 service at overseas missions. However, these top-lines do not include Institutional Support Contractors (ISCs), which in FY2018 (most recent available), numbered more than 1,600. USAID, Agency Financial Report Fiscal Year 2019, p. 3; USAID Congressional Staffing Report, FY2018.

A more detailed look at the USAID workforce in 2018 shows that, as at the State Department, Blacks/African Americans were overrepresented in the USAID Civil Service, and Whites overrepresented in the USAID Foreign Service, relative to the U.S. population that year. Hispanic/Latino employees were underrepresented in both categories, and Asian Americans were represented at about the same level as in the U.S. population (Figure 9).

The GAO data also showed a decrease in racial and ethnic diversity, but a slight increase in the proportion of women in USAID’s workforce, compared with the U.S. resident population between 2002 and 2018. Representation variance is notable among different ethnic or racial groups. For example, the agency’s proportions of Hispanic/Latino, Asian, and other racial or ethnic minority employees rose by 3, 3, and 1 percentage point(s) respectively, while the proportion of Blacks/African Americans fell by 5 percentage points in this period. When disaggregating between the Foreign Service and Civil Service workforce, USAID’s Foreign Service increased its share of both women and racial and ethnic minorities between 2002 and 2018, while the share of both women and ethnic and racial minorities within the Civil Service declined. Both trends brought the agency closer to reflecting the U.S. resident population (Figures 10 and 11). According to the GAO, the proportion of African American Civil Service employees at USAID fell by 10 percentage points in this period, while the proportion of African American employees in the Foreign Service increased by 1 percentage point during the same time period.\(^6\)

---

\(^6\) Ibid., pp.18-19.
GAO made several recommendations related to USAID’s Office of Civil Rights and Diversity (OCRD), which publishes the annual MD-715 Report describing EEO compliance at the agency, including efforts to manage and resolve EEO complaints. Recommendations included increasing capacity of the OCRD to respond to EEO complaints, analyzing workforce demographic data, completing MD-715 reports in a timely manner, and increasing agency leadership investment in OCRD activities. GAO was able to apply its analysis only to racial, ethnic, and gender diversity. Analyses on other diversity efforts, including disability status and gender identity, were not included due to data availability challenges.

**Agency Efforts to Increase Diversity**

USAID employs a number of mechanisms aimed at increasing workforce diversity, primarily within the agency’s Foreign Service (notably, there are no fellowship or recruitment programs aimed specifically at improving diversity in the Civil Service). These include the following:

---

62 USAID did not publicly release its FY2018 MD-715 report. Both FY2019 and FY2017 reports are available on the agency’s website, USAID, *Management Directive 715 Report - FY2019*, July 8, 2020. USAID MD-715 reports also provide demographic information on the Civil Service and Foreign Service and USAID’s temporary direct hire workforce but not on non-direct hire employees (e.g., Personal Services Contractors [PSC] and Institutional Support Contractors [ISC]).

63 GAO reports that it did not conduct analysis of the numbers and percentages of USAID employees with disabilities because USAID was involved in disability-related litigation during the audit period. Sexual orientation was not included because the National Finance Center data do not include that information.

64 Legal issues or legal challenges that may arise with respect to these mechanisms are beyond the scope of this report.
• **Donald Payne International Development Fellowship.** The Donald Payne International Development Fellowship was established by USAID in partnership with Howard University in 2012, with the intention of recruiting talent from historically underrepresented groups into the Foreign Service for careers in international development.\(^{65}\) From its establishment to 2016, the program awarded approximately five fellowships each year (the highest number was six in 2016). In 2017, the State Department Authorities Act (P.L. 114-323) directed the Secretary of State to “increase by 5 the number of fellows selected for the Donald M. Payne International Development Fellowship Program.” Since then, ten fellowships were awarded each year to students from universities and colleges across the country, providing up to $48,000 annually for a two-year graduate program in international affairs or a related subject. Following completion of the fellowship and USAID Foreign Service entry requirements, Payne Fellows become USAID Foreign Service Officers (FSOs). In 2021, the program expects to expand once more, offering fellowships to 15 students.\(^{66}\) USAID funds the program through its *Operating Expenses* account.

• **Development Diplomats in Residence.** Also focused on increasing diversity in USAID’s Foreign Service, the Development Diplomats in Residence program was established in 2016 and places senior Foreign Service Officers on college campuses to promote, educate, and provide information about a career in international development. Today there are two Development Diplomats in Residence focusing on institutions serving students from underrepresented groups both in the southeast region constituting Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Tennessee, and Louisiana and California, Nevada, and Hawaii.\(^{67}\)

• **Pathways Internship Program.** USAID’s Pathways Internships are paid positions for students at various education levels.\(^{68}\) While the program was not established with the explicit goal of increasing workforce diversity, according to USAID, program participants have been increasingly diverse (in FY2018, racial and ethnic minority representation was 69%), and the agency works closely with third-party organizations to extend its recruiting reach.\(^{69}\)

---


\(^{66}\) For more on the Donald Payne International Development Fellowship, see https://www.paynefellows.org/.

\(^{67}\) For more information on the Development Diplomats in Residence Program, see https://www.paynefellows.org/graduate-fellowship-program/ddir/.

\(^{68}\) The summer 2020 solicitation for Pathways Interns ranged from GS-4 (completion of two full academic years of post-high school study or associate’s degree) to GS-9 (completion of all requirements for a master’s degree or equivalent degree). Job description accessed at https://www.usajobs.gov/GetJob/ViewDetails/557240800 on September 18, 2020.

\(^{69}\) According to USAID’s Chief Human Capital Officer, the agency engages with the Congressional Black Caucus Institute, Congressional Hispanic Caucus Institute, Urban Alliance, Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities, and International Leadership Program for Asian/Pacific Islander students. House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, *The State Department and USAID FY 2020 Operations Budget*, 116th Cong., 1 sess., July 11, 2019.
Policy Issues

Multiple hiring mechanisms affect available data. Lack of comprehensive data makes progress toward increasing diversity at USAID impossible to measure on a broad scale. USAID employs more than 20 hiring mechanisms to build and maintain its workforce and collects demographic data on only a subset of those mechanisms. For example, data are collected and analyzed relating to USAID’s Direct Hire workforce, including Civil Service, Foreign Service, and Foreign Service Limited employees. However, data are not collected on contractors or on the agency’s Foreign Service National (FSN) employees. For FY2018, this means that USAID did not have demographic data available for approximately 70% of its workforce (Figure 12). While the FSN workforce may not be pertinent to the goal of reflecting the U.S. population abroad, other unreported workforce categories are relevant.

Agency efforts to increase diversity are small in number and scope. While touted for their efforts to increase the agency’s diversity, the Donald Payne International Development Fellowship, Development Diplomats in Residence, and Pathways Internship Programs are narrowly focused and have minimal impact on USAID’s overall diversity. The Payne Fellowship—the only of the three efforts that guarantees a position at the conclusion of the program—brings on 10 fellows each year who will become FSOs if they complete the program. Onboarding 10 new FSOs from ethnic minority groups may increase the diversity of the Foreign Service by about 1%, or 0.1% of the total USAID workforce, annually depending on agency growth. Both the Development Diplomats in Residence and Pathways Internship Programs aim to improve recruitment pipelines, but their effectiveness is difficult to measure. Further, the Payne Fellowship is the only effort that is directed by law, leaving the others subject to change potentially without congressional input.

Apart from its internal workforce activities, USAID works to incorporate diversity promotion and inclusion in a number of its foreign assistance activities. Perhaps the most documented of these efforts is the agency’s work to integrate gender and women’s empowerment into all of its overseas programming. According to USAID’s gender policy, released in 2020, “Our vision is of a prosperous and peaceful world in which women, girls, men, and boys enjoy equal economic, social, cultural, civil, and political rights and are equally empowered to secure better lives for themselves, their families, their communities, and their countries.”70 Operationally, USAID’s Automated Directive System (ADS) Chapter 205 governs how USAID and its partners put this into practice. For example

---

70 USAID, DRAFT: 2020 Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment Policy, August 19, 2020, p. 3.
ADS 205 requires Mission Orders specifically on gender, Country Development Cooperation Strategies that analyze and integrate gender considerations in project designs, and accountability measures for Implementing Partners to comply with USAID gender policy.\(^{71}\)

Other agency diversity and inclusion efforts in programming are housed primarily in the agency’s Center for Excellence on Democracy, Human Rights and Governance (DRG) and are largely not mandatory.\(^{72}\) DRG is meant to be an “information hub” for other agency offices that may be seeking help in incorporating DRG issues into their respective programs. The Human Rights division within DRG, in addition to other responsibilities, seeks to offer expertise and resources on how to advance disability-inclusive development, remain sensitive to the needs of indigenous communities, and protect LGBT individuals.\(^{73}\)

Suggested conflict between USAID’s messaging in overseas programs and workforce diversity efforts. While there is broad support for USAID’s activities that promote diversity and inclusion overseas, some have suggested that USAID’s internal challenges with diversity and inclusion and the current cultural debates surrounding equality in American society may compromise the agency’s success in the field (see text box above). In June 2020, more than 1,000 USAID staff signed a letter to then-acting Administrator John Barsa indicating their pride in USAID’s field work but deep concern that “USAID’s credibility and effectiveness abroad are undermined by systemic racism and injustice at home.” Further, the letter called on USAID to “improve hiring outreach, fix our broken talent pipeline, and ensure that incoming and current nonwhite staff have equal opportunities and are paid and promoted equitably to their colleagues.”\(^{74}\)

### U.S. Agency for Global Media

The U.S. Agency for Global Media (USAGM) is an independent agency with the mission “to inform, engage, and connect people around the world in support of freedom and democracy.” The agency carries out this work through a network of broadcasting platforms, employing approximately 3,700 full-time personnel as of FY2020. Of this total, approximately 1,700 are federal employees, working in Agency positions or for one of the two federal broadcasting entities, the Voice of America (VOA) and the Office of Cuba Broadcasting (OCB). Three USAGM-funded broadcasters, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (RFE/RL), Radio Free Asia (RFA), and the Middle East Broadcasting Networks (MBN), as well as the Open Technology Fund (OTF), employ approximately 2,000 nonfederal personnel in total. While the significant majority of federal employees are individuals who are U.S. citizens or residents, for FY2020 USAGM designated approximately 240 federal USAGM employees as “Foreign Nationals.”

U.S. international broadcasting is guided in part by statutory provisions that deal with diversity as a part of the overall mission of government-funded broadcasting to foreign publics. Section 303(b) of the United States International Broadcasting Act of 1994, as amended (Title III of P.L. 71\(^{71}\) USAID, ADS Chapter 205.1, p. 4.

\(^{72}\) USAID has, for example, a DRG-authored document on integrating inclusive development across the program cycle and in mission operations that notes that “inclusion is key to aid effectiveness” but that the guidance is not mandatory. USAID DCHA/DRG/HR, Suggested Approaches for Integrating Inclusive Development Across the Program Cycle and in Mission Operations, Additional Help for ADS 201, July 2018.

\(^{73}\) See, for example, USAID, Disability Inclusive Development 102, April 8, 2020; and USAID, Policy on Promoting the Rights of Indigenous Peoples, March 2020.

\(^{74}\) Dan De Luce and Abigail Williams, “USAID staff demand action from agency leaders over ‘systemic racism,’” \textit{NBC News}, June 11, 2020.
103-236; 22 U.S.C. s. 6202(b)) sets out the standards of U.S. international broadcasting, requiring broadcasts to include, among other things,

[(b)](2) a balanced and comprehensive projection of United States thought and institutions, reflecting the diversity of United States culture and society.[75]

Subsection (c)(2) of Section 303 impels VOA specifically to provide diverse views of the United States:

[(c)](2) VOA will represent America, not any single segment of American society, and will therefore present a balanced and comprehensive projection of significant American thought and institutions.

In executive branch regulation, Title 22, Part 530 of the Code of Federal Regulations requires USA GM to practice and enforce nondiscrimination “on the basis of handicap” in employment and participation in programs and activities of the agency. The regulations include requirements and procedures for enforcement of nondiscrimination and the consideration of complaints of discrimination based on an employee’s handicap. USAGM is also governed by certain provisions of the Department of State Foreign Affairs Manual for any Foreign Service personnel employed by the agency, which include the requirement that its personnel programs “be administered without discrimination on the basis of race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, national origin, age, disability, marital status, geographic or educational affiliation, or political affiliation.”[76]

Diversity Data

USAGM submits annual EEO reports to OPM. USAGM’s grantee broadcasters, RFE/RL, RFA, and MBN, as well as OTF, are nonfederal entities and do not report their diversity numbers to OPM.[77] The diversity numbers for USAGM in this report therefore reflect solely the makeup of the federal workforce, and not those of the agency’s grantees (Figure 13).

USAGM’s most recent publicly available annual EEO report includes data for FY2018 and reflects a total agency workforce minority participation percentage of 51.49%, which is significantly higher than some other agencies and higher than the U.S. civilian workforce overall. OPM data on USAGM diversity for FY2018 differ slightly, reporting 52.9% of the USAGM workforce as racial or ethnic minorities (Figure 14 and Figure 15). Data for 2018 show that relative to the U.S. population,

[75] Emphasis added.

[76] See 3 FAM 1212.2; see generally 3 FAM 1200.

[77] CRS has asked for detailed breakdowns of workforce composition from the grantee broadcasters. RFE/RL has stated that its workforce of 1,272 comprises 778 male personnel and 494 female personnel, for 38.8% female participation. The broadcaster stated that it does not keep record of the race or ethnicity of its workforce. Neither RFA nor MBN has been able to provide diversity numbers to CRS as of publication of this report.
Black and Asian Americans were highly represented at USAGM, while White and Hispanic Americans were underrepresented (Figure 16).

**Figure 14. USAGM’s Racial and Ethnic Diversity, 2002-2018**

% Deviation from the U.S. Resident Population
(0=U.S. Resident Population Percentage)

**Figure 15. USAGM’s Gender Diversity, 2002-2018**

% Deviation from the U.S. Resident Population
(0=U.S. Resident Population Percentage)


While USAGM has a relatively more diverse workforce in some racial or ethnic terms, it is less diverse in other workforce characteristics. EEOC data for FY2018 show the agency has failed to employ personnel with disabilities at the federal targeted rate of 2% of the overall workforce. Females made up 39.6% of the total workforce, and Hispanic/Latino employees made up 7.1%, both below the overall federal civilian workforce rates. While Black/African American personnel made up 22.9% of the total USAGM workforce for FY2018, there were no Black/African American employees in Senior Executive Service positions at USAGM. OPM data from that same year show similar but not identical representation of female (41.3%) and Hispanic/Latino (7.4%) employees.
Policies and Structures Affecting Diversity

In a policy statement on workforce diversity and inclusion released on December 31, 2019, then-USAGM Chief Executive Officer (CEO) Grant Turner stressed that the agency’s diversity “enables USAGM to provide consistently accurate and compelling journalism to millions of people around the world.” Turner exhorted all employees to reinforce this commitment to diversity in their everyday work.78

USAGM maintains structures and programs intended to increase and ensure diversity and inclusion in its workforce and operations. The agency’s EEO, Diversity & Inclusion Advisory Council is responsible for submitting the annual employment reports required by EEOC Management Directive 715 (MD-715). The Advisory Council is also tasked with informing management and employees of their responsibilities under applicable EEO standards; keeping the agency updated on changes to EEO and diversity and inclusion laws and regulations; identifying and providing recommendations to remove barriers to workforce EEO, diversity and inclusion; and monitoring agency efforts to improve compliance with applicable requirements.

USAGM’s Office of Civil Rights (OCR) is responsible for development and implementation of the EEO program, handles the Agency’s EEO complaint process, and informs USAGM managers of EEO requirements and procedures. OCR works with USAGM’s Human Resources Office on HR management initiatives to improve diversity, reasonable accommodation, and upward mobility for minority groups in the Agency. OCR is also tasked with ensuring that USAGM’s nonfederal grantees, Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty (RFE/RL), Radio Free Asia (RFA), the Middle East Broadcasting Networks (MBN), and the Open Technology Fund (OTF), comply with federal nondiscrimination requirements for recipients of federal grant funds. OCR also conducts outreach programs for staff to increase and maintain “harmonious and fair working conditions.”79

According to USAGM, all employees receive briefings and training on EEO policies, both at orientation upon employment and through regular agency communications. This includes training


for all managers and staff on USAGM’s EEO and diversity policies, “which prohibit unlawful
discrimination and harassment and promote diversity and inclusion in the workplace.”

**Issues Affecting Diversity**

**EEO compliance.** A December 2019 OIG report found that the USAGM CEO expressed support for EEO standards and that in June 2018 USAGM adopted “a zero-tolerance policy regarding all forms of harassment, harassing conduct, and discrimination.” USAGM generally met hiring requirements, which include EEO standards. The OIG found, however, that USAGM was failing to carry out some EEO-related training that concerned workplace harassment.

**Vetting of new hires and work visa expirations.** Soon after USAGM CEO Michael Pack assumed leadership of the agency in June 2020, reports surfaced that the agency would allow the work visas for approximately 100 foreign USAGM employees to expire, requiring the termination of their employment and their departure from the United States. According to USAGM officials and Mr. Pack himself, the decision was linked to alleged problems with USAGM’s suitability and security vetting for employees, problems that Mr. Pack has asserted had possibly allowed foreign intelligence agencies to gain influence through Agency personnel, endangering U.S. national security. (A previous July 2020 decision by the Office of Personnel Management stripped USAGM of autonomous authority to determine personnel suitability for sensitive positions.) A significant reduction of foreign employees might reduce the diverse makeup of the USAGM workforce. Changes to suitability and security standards in hiring could also have an adverse effect on workforce diversity, as many candidates with foreign backgrounds and contacts (among other things), even those who are U.S. citizens or permanent residents, might be considered hiring risks.

**Political priorities and diversity of reporting.** Recent actions by CEO Pack to replace the leadership of all of the USAGM-funded broadcasters, and to reportedly investigate the journalistic integrity of several employees, have raised concerns about the politicization of

---


82 Ibid.


84 In an August 2020 interview, CEO Pack stated that state-run broadcasters in several countries had been “penetrated” by foreign agents, stating, “It is a great place to put a foreign spy. I have to make sure that doesn’t happen—to stand up for the national security interests of Americans.” Tristan Justice, “NPR Manipulates Federalist Interview With VOA Executive On Behalf Of Government Employees Opposing Reform,” *The Federalist*, September 3, 2020, at https://thefederalist.com/2020/09/03/npr-manipulates-federalist-interview-with-voa-executive-on-behalf-of-government-employees-opposing-reform/. Critics of the decision not to renew visas stated that foreign USAGM employees are hired when U.S. citizens and permanent residents cannot fill vital broadcasting roles providing news and information to foreign publics. They argue that the visa decision itself could harm U.S. national security and interests, as well as place foreign journalists in danger as they return to repressive societies where the government would not look kindly on citizens who have been critical of such repression. They also assert that characterizations of foreign-born journalists as potential “spies” compromise the trust foreign publics have in USAGM-funded broadcasts, and give U.S. adversaries in authoritarian regimes fodder for attacks on USAGM broadcasters. See David Folkenflick, “Voice of America Journalists: New CEO Endangers Reporters, Harms U.S. Aims,” *National Public Radio*, August 31, 2020.

USAGM broadcasting. These actions may have implications for the diversity of political perspectives reflected in USAGM-supported broadcasts, particularly at VOA, which is tasked with “telling America’s story,” and explaining the policy positions and actions of the U.S. government to foreign audiences. VOA is required to produce reporting that reflects “the diversity of United States culture and society,” and some observers have expressed concern that USAGM broadcasters’ reporting will face pressure to favor conservative viewpoints or narrow its focus to promote certain U.S. government policy interests. On the other hand, some believe that the USAGM broadcaster reporting will become more ideologically diverse, arguing that U.S. international broadcasting currently has a decidedly liberal or progressive bias.

**Peace Corps**

The Peace Corps was created with a vision of promoting world peace and friendship through a cadre of trained volunteers to support community-based development projects in countries around the world. Representing the United States abroad, including its tradition of diversity, is an explicit part of the second of the Peace Corps Act’s three goals, “to help promote a better understanding of Americans on the part of peoples served.” Agency analysts have argued in the past that this mandate makes it especially important that the Peace Corps workforce, including the volunteer force, reflect the diversity of the American population.

The Peace Corps prioritized efforts to promote diversity in consecutive agency strategic plans, dating back to at least 2000. The FY2018-2022 Strategic Plan is the first in the 21st century not to include such a target.

---


88 §2 of the Peace Corps Act, P.L. 87-293, as amended.

89 A 2010 comprehensive agency assessment, for instance, argued that this goal of increasing understanding of Americans “is best achieved by a diverse cadre of Volunteers.” Peace Corps, *A Comprehensive Agency Assessment*, June 2010, p. 109.

90 CRS review of agency Performance and Accountability Reports, 2000 to 2020.
Diversity Data

**Figure 17. Peace Corp’s Racial and Ethnic Diversity, 2002-2018**

% Deviation from the U.S. Resident Population
(0=U.S. Resident Population Percentage)


Note: See “Definitions and Data” text box for an explanation of “minority” and “nonminority.”

Peace Corps volunteers, who serve overseas at the grassroots level for 27-month terms, are the backbone of the agency’s overseas programming. Over 7,000 volunteers are supported by a U.S. direct hire workforce of approximately 900 and a host country national staff of more than 2,800.91 Ethnic minorities made up about 15% of the volunteer force in 2008, rising steadily to over 30% by 2018. In this same period, the diversity of Peace Corps federal employees (non-volunteers) declined slightly in the years after FY2008 before rebounding in 2018.92 Since 2006, Peace Corps’ federal employee workforce has consistently had a smaller share of racial and ethnic minorities, and males, than the U.S. population or general labor force (Figure 17 and Figure 18).

Peace Corps senior staff includes a smaller proportion of ethnic or racial minorities than the volunteer force and the agency’s total workforce. In 2017, 35.5% of Peace Corps staff in grades GS-1 to GS-11 were ethnic or racial minorities, compared with 28.6% of staff in grades 14-15 and 14.3% at the Senior Executive level. Women composed 42.9% of the Senior Executive level workforce, compared with 59% of the staff workforce total (Figure 19 and Figure 20).93
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92 Peace Corps, Congressional Budget Justification FY2021, February 2020, p. 73. The Peace Corps reported an increase in applicants of minority racial and ethnic groups from 21% in FY2007 to 36% in FY2017. While that data is no longer regularly reported, figures from the volunteer force have remained stable since FY2017.

In 2018, Peace Corps volunteers and staff identifying as Asian closely reflected the U.S. population, while Black/African Americans were overrepresented relative to the general population in the staff ranks and underrepresented in the volunteer force. Hispanic/Latinos were underrepresented in both workforce groups relative to their portion of the U.S. resident population. (Figure 21). The volunteer force was more diverse than the employee workforce with 37% self-identifying as ethnic or racial minorities, higher than the agency average of 31.6%. 94 The volunteer force and federal employee workforce at Peace Corps had a higher proportion of women than the U.S. workforce. Women formed a majority of both the overseas volunteer force (64.0%) and federal staff (58.4%) in 2018.

Volunteer service has long attracted an especially young recruitment pool, with 89% of volunteers younger than 30 in FY2019. The agency worked to achieve greater age balance in the volunteer force throughout the 2000s, but ultimately determined that the short, two-year term of volunteers’ service would inherently limit recruitment among an older-age cohort, the members of which may be more established in their careers. Peace Corps staff more closely align with the U.S. workforce, with 46.6% of U.S. direct hires aged 45 and older, compared with 44.0% of the U.S. civilian workforce.

Beyond the demographics of the Peace Corps workforce, the agency has also historically tracked staff perceptions as to whether the workplace is open and inclusive. The FY2014-FY2018 performance plan consistently fell short of its targets among volunteers, host country nationals, and U.S. employees for these targets. In FY2017, the last year of reporting on that plan, 82% of U.S. employees, 68% of volunteers, and 91% of host country nationals reported that the agency “is inclusive of diverse people,” missing the 90% target across these groups. In FY2019, perceptions of inclusivity appear to have worsened across each group—68.5% of federal employees and 85% of host country nationals agreeing that managers and supervisors “work well with employees of different backgrounds,” and 60% of volunteers agreeing that “the organizational culture of the Peace Corps is inclusive of diverse backgrounds.”

Policy Issues

One contextual factor affecting the Peace Corps is the so-called “Five Year Rule,” which limits most Peace Corps staff to a five-year contract. The intent of the rule, which dates to shortly after
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95 Peace Corps, Congressional Budget Justification: Fiscal Year 2021. February 2020, p. 73.
96 For further information, see “Volunteer Expertise and Training” in CRS Report RS21168, The Peace Corps: Overview and Issues, by Nick M. Brown.
99 Ibid.
Peace Corps’ creation in 1961, is to continually bring in fresh perspectives to the agency. In practice, such turnover may hinder diversity and inclusion recruitment programs. On the one hand, the agency may see the effects of new hiring policies relatively quickly, given that staff turnover is relatively high. On the other hand, the agency’s applicant pool may particularly depend on the diversity policies of places they hire from, because the Peace Corps does not cultivate a long-term workforce. The agency thus may struggle to hire racial or ethnic minorities at the senior level if agencies it hires from have failed to cultivate diverse senior staff themselves.

The nature of Peace Corps jobs, and volunteer assignments in particular, may also be a factor affecting diversity. As mentioned, the agency has tried with mixed success to recruit older volunteers, but the agency found that the two-year assignments are most appealing to people early in their careers and those without young children at home. The remote nature of many assignments may also limit the participation of people with physical disabilities or certain health conditions. Furthermore, Peace Corps formulates volunteer stipends to match local living conditions, which are almost invariably below the U.S. minimum wage. That may limit efforts to promote diversity by discouraging those with substantial financial commitments from joining. Families who rely on a recent college graduate’s income may be a constraint on that graduate serving overseas. Peace Corps has created several initiatives to balance these pressures. It has touted Peace Corps Response, a short-term program designed for more experienced candidates, as a vehicle for engaging older volunteers. It has also sought to establish a “strong, long-term, ongoing collaborative relationship” with a historically black college or university (HBCU), Howard University, and has run marketing campaigns targeted at HBCU audiences, featuring HBCU alumni who are returned volunteers. Various student loan deferment options are meant to mitigate financial hardship for young volunteers, but such programs are unlikely to be adequate for all prospective volunteers.

Other Selected Agencies

Other U.S. agencies, such as the examples below, implement foreign policy and may be in a position to promote U.S. policy and values with regard to diversity through their workforce composition or may undermine it through inattention to such matters.

- The **Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC)** funds and oversees implementation of development compacts led by partner countries, deploying a small number of U.S. direct-hire staff abroad. MCC appears to maintain a relatively diverse workforce across all salary tiers: 38.1% of employees identify as racial or ethnic minorities, with 37.5% of those making more than $100,000/year identifying as such.\(^{103}\)

- The **Overseas Private Investment Corporation**, which has recently become the **U.S. International Development Finance Corporation (DFC)**, supports international projects but maintains a very small workforce presence overseas. DFC’s workforce is diverse compared with some of its counterpart agencies, with
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101 A 1986 study of the attitudes toward Peace Corps among Black students and parents found that both tended to see no economic benefit to joining the Peace Corps and perceived Peace Corps volunteers as traditionally coming from upper-middle class white families. See “Peace Corps: Meeting the Challenges of the 1990s,” GAO/NSIAD-90-122. May 1990, at https://www.gao.gov/assets/150/149047.pdf.


38.5% identifying as racial or ethnic minorities. 104 DFC data suggest a considerable compensation disparity, however: 26.6% of staff making more than $100,000/year are racial or ethnic minorities, compared with 77.8% making less than that. 105

**Issues for Congress**

As Congress considers ongoing involvement in how the foreign affairs agencies pursue diversity in their workforces, it may focus its efforts on a number of challenges and lessons learned that have been identified through previous agency efforts and congressional oversight activity.

**Data Challenges**

A persistent challenge to diversity and inclusion efforts is the lack of available, consistent, and complete data. GAO audits of the Department of State and USAID both found that inconsistent data analysis and reporting hindered workforce planning efforts. 106 The two primary sources of diversity data across the federal workforce, the EEOC and OPM, gather data using different reporting mechanisms, leading to different employee counts, and neither source provides complete data for all of the agencies covered in this report. To aid future oversight efforts, Congress may wish to ascertain the extent to which foreign affairs agencies are complying with current reporting requirements, congressional directives, and agency policies on diversity. As part of that discussion, Congress may consider whether data on contractors and other staff should be part of agency reporting on workforce diversity.

Congress may also consider addressing obstacles to data collection. At the most basic level, demographic identification is not mandatory—individuals opt in to providing demographic data, whether race, ethnicity, disability status, etc. If enough employees choose not to share their demographic information or are not prompted to share additional contextual information that may prove useful, data are sufficiently incomplete that analyses are not helpful to agency planning efforts. In some cases, agencies are working to address such challenges. For example, the State Department overhauled its exit survey process effective May 1, 2020, amid longstanding concerns that it lacked the capacity to capture systemic factors prompting personnel from underrepresented groups to leave the department. 107 Some Members of Congress have supported legislative proposals for the State Department to conduct exit interviews with department employees to capture data for this purpose. For example, Section 403 of H.R. 3352, (116th Congress), which passed the House of Representatives and was received in the Senate in September 2019, would have required the State Department to offer optional exit interviews to State Department employees leaving the workforce.
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104 Ibid.


107 U.S. Department of State, Bureau of Global Talent Management, “Changes to the Department’s Centralized Exit Survey System,” notice transmitted to State Department employees via e-mail, April 2020.
Staffing and Leadership of Diversity and Inclusion Programs

Staffing levels within the agency offices that manage hiring and diversity efforts have reportedly had a negative effect on agencies’ ability to analyze available data and inform workforce planning efforts. USAID cited understaffing and/or high staff turnover in OCRD as hindering the agency’s ability to meet its MD-715 report requirements and effectively process EEO complaints while staffing challenges in HCTM slowed agency hiring. In addition, the State Department informed Congress that in January 2019 only one staffer within the Global Talent Management (GTM) Bureau was focused on diversity and inclusion efforts—as of September 2020, the number of personnel working on these issues had increased to four. Maintaining staff in those offices may play a role in the success of diversity and inclusion efforts.

In addition to increased staffing levels, backing from senior staff is regularly cited as necessary for success in improving diversity, equity, and inclusion. While foreign affairs agencies’ leadership have repeatedly stated their support for these efforts, some in Congress have questioned their commitment to action. For example, in a recent hearing on the Department of State’s Diversity and Inclusion efforts, there was debate over whether or not the department should make unconscious bias trainings mandatory. The department representative noted that unconscious bias training experts urged them to keep the training optional, suggesting that a mandatory requirement would be viewed as less valuable. Members expressed some skepticism of this justification, including one who noted that not making the training mandatory conveyed “a certain lack of seriousness.”

Recruitment and Retention Concerns

Members of Congress and other observers continue to emphasize the need to ensure that recruiting efforts attract applicants from underrepresented groups. For example, in testimony before Congress in June 2020, retired Ambassador Gina Abercrombie-Winstanley remarked that the Rangel and Pickering Fellowship Programs have become the near-exclusive entry point into the Foreign Service for minority officers, and that more must be done to ensure such officers are also able to enter the Foreign Service through the regular intake process. In this vein, Director General Perez informed Congress in September 2020 that the State Department was reassessing the Foreign Service application process to determine whether the department could improve it to bring in greater numbers of highly qualified female and minority candidates.

There is also a growing understanding that recruitment is just one aspect of increasing diversity. Both executive branch officials from foreign affairs agencies and Members of Congress have asserted that in order to ensure representation throughout agencies’ mid- and senior-level ranks,
they must invest in staff retention and inclusion efforts. Congress has approached this issue from several angles. For example, several Members have expressed concerns that State Department “assignment restrictions” have a negative impact on retention. These prohibit selected employees from serving in certain countries, or working on programs where such countries are a primary focus. This is due to an employee’s potential vulnerability to targeting and harassment by foreign intelligence services and to lessen perceived foreign influence and/or foreign preference security concerns.113 The State Department’s Asian American Foreign Affairs Association Employee Affinity Group (EAG) and Members of Congress have expressed concern that assignment restrictions may unfairly and disproportionately affect Asian-American employees, making it more difficult for them to advance their careers and increasing the likelihood that they will leave the department. Members of Congress have added that the discriminatory use of assignment restrictions may also deprive the State Department of cultural expertise, language skills, and other benefits that would improve implementation of U.S. foreign policy in East Asia. Thus far, GTM has engaged on this issue with the Bureau of Diplomatic Security (DS), which is responsible for implementing assignment restrictions, and DS has pledged to offer more transparency on this matter.114

**Foreign Relations Complications**

In the foreign policy arena, workforce diversity may have implications for bilateral relationships, and staff biographies may challenge locals’ sensibilities. In 2016, for example, the Obama Administration faced criticism overseas after appointing an openly gay American, James Brewster, as ambassador to the Dominican Republic. Local religious groups disparaged the pick, saying the appointment signaled hostility to Christian values.115 Ethnic heritage may also create tensions. U.S. Ambassador to Korea Harry Harris stated that he has faced criticism in Korea due to his Japanese heritage, as some Koreans have compared him to Japanese colonial officials who directed Japan’s occupation of the country for part of the 20th century.116

In addition to the personal biographies foreign affairs personnel bring to their roles, staff may be expected to modulate their public images to account for fundamentally different views of inclusion in the countries where they serve. Balancing this tension may include calculations about staff effectiveness or even safety and security, particularly among agencies with large presences outside comparatively cosmopolitan capital cities. Perhaps no agency is more sensitive to this issue than the Peace Corps, whose country offices communicate these challenges to volunteers quite explicitly. Peace Corps Uganda notes that “whistles and verbal harassment based on race or gender” may be common, and Peace Corps Ukraine volunteers warn that racial epithets and games involving Blackface are not uncommon.117 Peace Corps Morocco indicates that open
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identification as a homosexual may thwart community integration efforts, as may open expressions of Jewish faith.\footnote{Peace Corps Morocco, \textit{Diversity and Inclusion}, at https://www.peacecorps.gov/morocco/preparing-to-volunteer/diversity-and-inclusion/} Peace Corps country programs also assert that volunteers should seek moments to enhance cross-cultural understanding, although they may be sanguine about the extent of such moments’ impact. Peace Corps Uganda notes that verbal harassment may decline with effective integration, although they also note that gender equality is “generally considered irrelevant in Ugandan culture.”\footnote{Peace Corps Uganda, \textit{Diversity and Inclusion}, at https://www.peacecorps.gov/uganda/preparing-to-volunteer/diversity-and-inclusion/} Peace Corps Morocco suggests that female volunteers have the opportunity to demonstrate new paradigms for female leadership, even if they “should consider keeping a low social profile.”\footnote{Peace Corps Morocco, \textit{Diversity and Inclusion}, at https://www.peacecorps.gov/morocco/preparing-to-volunteer/diversity-and-inclusion/} Peace Corps Ukraine volunteers are similarly told that volunteers may turn moments of discomfort into teaching opportunities for host country nationals unfamiliar with descendants of non-European cultures.\footnote{Peace Corps Ukraine, \textit{Diversity and Inclusion}, at https://www.peacecorps.gov/ukraine/preparing-to-volunteer/diversity-and-inclusion/}

With these concerns in mind, Congress may investigate how agencies are balancing local cultural considerations against diversity and inclusion goals, and Members may evaluate the efficacy of agencies seeking to advance inclusion priorities, in particular whether it may be perceived as interfering in a country’s domestic political affairs. Congress may also weigh whether appointments that elicit negative reaction among certain local groups may nevertheless advance democratic values such as tolerance and inclusivity. Such appointments may even accord with national government leaders’ aims, even as some local groups express disapproval.

\footnote{121 Peace Corps Ukraine, \textit{Diversity and Inclusion}, at https://www.peacecorps.gov/ukraine/preparing-to-volunteer/diversity-and-inclusion/}.  

Appendix A. Data Sources

This report drew from several data sources, including the following:

**Government Accountability Office (GAO).** Data compiled in GAO’s two reports on the U.S. Department of State and USAID are used in this report for analysis of these agencies in their respective sections. GAO reporting includes the Department of State’s Foreign Service, which generally is not included in annual, publicly accessible reporting on federal workforce data.

**Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC).** EEOC data are used in this report for statistical analysis of the U.S. Peace Corps, the U.S. Agency for Global Media (USAGM)/Broadcasting Board of Governors, and certain comparisons between agencies and the federal workforce.

**Office of Personnel Management (OPM).** Data compiled by OPM are used in this report for the purposes of comparisons to the relevant federal workforce and civilian labor force via OPM’s Federal Equal Opportunity Recruitment Program (FEORP) annual reports.

**U.S. Census Bureau.** This report employs comparisons between foreign affairs agencies and the U.S. population. Demographic statistics for U.S. resident population are derived from inter-census data published by the U.S. Census Bureau.\(^\text{122}\)

**Agency Reports.** Reports written by foreign affairs agencies assessing their priorities in promoting workforce diversity—and their success in implementing those priorities—are included within their respective sections.
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Appendix B. Glossary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAD</td>
<td>American Academy of Diplomacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOS</td>
<td>U.S. Department of State</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAG</td>
<td>Employee Affinity Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEOC</td>
<td>Equal Employment Opportunity Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAM</td>
<td>Foreign Affairs Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GAO</td>
<td>Government Accountability Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GTM</td>
<td>U.S. State Department Office of Global Talent Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCTM</td>
<td>USAID Office of Human Capital and Talent Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LGBT</td>
<td>Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBN</td>
<td>Middle East Broadcasting Network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD-715</td>
<td>Management Directive 715 (annual agency reports to the EEOC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCRD</td>
<td>USAID Office of Civil Rights and Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPM</td>
<td>Office of Personnel Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTF</td>
<td>Open Technology Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFA</td>
<td>Radio Free Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFE/RL</td>
<td>Radio Free Europe/Radio Liberty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S/OCR</td>
<td>U.S. State Department Office of Civil Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAGM</td>
<td>U.S. Agency for Global Media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>U.S. Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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