PRESENTATION ON PROGRESS OF CITYWIDE POLICY INITIATIVE TO ELIMINATE BARRIERS TO EMPLOYMENT FOR PEOPLE WITH CRIMINAL HISTORIES

BEFORE PORTLAND CITY COUNCIL MARCH 11, 2015





| Location | | Employers: Private Vendors | | Public | Background checks only for some positions | Background check only after conditional offer or finalists selected | EEOC criteria |
|----------|----------------------------|-------------------------------|----|--------|--|---|------------------|
| ARI | ZONA | | | | | | |
| 1. | Tucson | | | х | х | | |
| 2. | CALIFORNIA (State law) | | | x | | | |
| 3. | Alameda County | | | х | | | |
| 4. | Berkeley | | | х | х | | x |
| 5. | Carson | | | х | | | |
| 6. | Compton | | X | х | | | x |
| 7. | East Palo Alto | | | х | | | |
| 8. | Oakland | | | х | х | х | x |
| 9. | Pasadena | | | х | | | |
| 10. | Richmond | | X | х | Х | | |
| 11. | San Francisco | X1 | X1 | х | | Х | x |
| 12. | Santa Clara County | | | Х | | | |
| 13. | COLORADO (State law) | | | x | | | × |
| 14. | CONNECTICUT (State law) | | | × | | | × |
| 15. | Bridgeport | | | х | | | x |
| 16. | Hartford | | X | х | x | х | x |
| 17. | New Haven | | × | х | | x | x |
| 18. | Norwich | | | х | | х | |

| Location | Private | Employers: Vendors | Public | Background checks only for some positions | Background check only after conditional offer or finalists selected | EEOC criteria |
|----------------------------|---------|-----------------------|--------|--|---|------------------|
| 19. DELAWARE | | | х | | | х |
| (State law) | | | | | | |
| 20. New Castle County | | | Х | | | |
| 21. Wilmington | | | х | | Х | |
| FLORIDA | | | | | | |
| 22. Clearwater | | | Х | | | х |
| 23. Jacksonville | | | х | | Х | х |
| 24. Pompano Beach | | | х | | | |
| 25. St. Petersburg | | | х | | | |
| 26. Tampa | | | х | | Х | |
| 27. Tallahassee | | | Х | | | х |
| 28. GEORGIA (State policy) | | | х | | | |
| 29. Atlanta | | | х | | | |
| 30. Fulton County | | | х | х | | х |
| 31. Macon-Bibb County | | | х | | | |
| 32. HAWAII (State law) | Х | х | х | | Х | x |
| 33. ILLINOIS (State law) | Х | х | х | | | |
| 34. Chicago | Х | x | х | | х | × |

| | | Employers: | | Background | Background check only after | EEOC criteria |
|----------------------------------|---------|------------|--------|--------------------------------------|---|------------------|
| Location | Private | Vendors | Public | checks only for some positions | conditional offer or finalists selected | |
| INDIANA | | | | | | |
| 35. Indianapolis | | x | Х | | | x |
| KANSAS | | | | | | |
| 36. Kansas City | | | Х | | | × |
| KENTUCKY | | | | | | |
| 37. Louisville | | x | Х | | | x |
| LOUISIANA | | | | | | |
| 38. New Orleans | | | х | x | | |
| 39. MARYLAND | | | Х | | | |
| (State law) | | | | | | |
| 40. Baltimore | × | × | х | X | X | x |
| 41. Montgomery County | × | × | х | | | |
| 42. Prince George's County | x | x | Х | | | x |
| 43. MASSACHUSETTS (State law) | × | × | × | | | |
| 44. Boston | | × | х | х | | |
| 45. Cambridge | | X | х | | | x |
| 46. Worcester | | x | х | х | | × |

| | | Employers: | | Background checks only | Background check only after | EEOC criteria |
|-------------------------------|---------|------------|--------|---------------------------|---|------------------|
| Location | Private | Vendors | Public | for some positions | conditional offer or finalists selected | |
| MICHIGAN | | | | | | |
| 47. Ann Arbor | | | x | | х | x |
| 48. Detroit | | х | × | | | |
| 49. East Lansing | | | × | | | |
| 50. Genesee County | | | × | | Х | |
| 51. Kalamazoo | | | × | | | |
| 52. Muskegon County | | | х | | | |
| 53. MINNESOTA (State law) | × | × | × | | × | X ² |
| 54. Minneapolis | | | х | x | | X |
| 55. St. Paul | | | х | x | | x |
| MISSOURI | | | | | | |
| 56. Columbia | × | × | × | | х | |
| 57. Kansas City | | | × | | х | × |
| 58. St. Louis | | | × | х | | |
| 59. NEBRASKA | | | × | | | |
| (State law) | | | | | | |
| 60. NEW JERSEY | × | × | X | | | |
| (State law) | | | | | | |
| 61. Atlantic City | | X | x | | X | x |
| 62. Newark | × | x | Х | x | х | x |
| 63. NEW MEXICO (State law) | | | × | | | × |

| | | Employers: | | Background | Background check only after | EEOC criteria |
|-----------------------|---------|------------|--------|--------------------------------------|---|------------------|
| Location | Private | Vendors | Public | checks only for some positions | conditional offer or finalists selected | |
| NEW YORK | | | | | | |
| 64. Buffalo | × | × | × | | х | |
| 65. New York | | X³ | × | | | |
| 66. Rochester | × | x | × | | х | |
| 67. Syracuse | | × | × | | Х | × |
| 68. Ulster County | | | × | | | |
| 69. Yonkers | | | × | | | |
| NORTH CAROLINA | | | | | | |
| 70. Carrboro | | | × | | | × |
| 71. Charlotte | | | × | | | |
| 72. Cumberland County | | | | Х | | |
| 73. Durham City | | | | х | | x |
| 74. Durham County | | | | х | | × |
| 75. Spring Lake | | | | х | | |
| оню | | | | | | |
| 76. Akron | | | × | | | x |
| 77. Canton | | | × | | Х | × |
| 78. Cincinnati | | | × | | | × |
| 79. Cleveland | | | × | | | |
| 80. Cuyahoga County | | | × | | х | × |
| 81. Dayton | | | × | | | × |
| 82. Hamilton County | | | × | | | |
| 83. Massillon | | | × | | | × |
| 84. Summit County | | | × | х | | × |

| | | Employers: | | Background | Background check only after | EEOC criteria |
|---------------------------------|---------|------------|--------|--------------------------------------|---|------------------|
| Location | Private | Vendors | Public | checks only for some positions | conditional offer or finalists selected | |
| OREGON | | | | | | |
| 86. Multnomah County | | | Х | | | Х |
| 87. Portland | | | х | | | |
| PENNSYLVANIA | | | | | | |
| 88. Allegheny County | | | Х | х | Х | Х |
| 89. Lancaster | | | Х | | Х | Х |
| 90. Philadelphia | X | Х | Х | | Х | |
| 91. Pittsburgh | | Х | Х | | Х | |
| 92. RHODE ISLAND (State law) | х | х | х | | | |
| 93. Providence | | | х | | | |
| TENNESSEE | | | | | | |
| 94. Hamilton County | | | | | | |
| 95. Memphis | | | Х | | | Х |

| Location | Private | Employers: Vendors | Public | Background checks only for some positions | Background check only after conditional offer or finalists selected | EEOC criteria |
|-----------------------|---------|-----------------------|--------|--|---|------------------|
| TEXAS | | | | | | |
| 96. Austin | | | × | x | | |
| 97. Travis County | | | × | X | х | × |
| VIRGINIA | | | | | | |
| 98. Alexandria | | | × | | × | |
| 99. Arlington County | | | × | | | |
| 100. Charlottesville | | | × | | | |
| 101.Danville | | | × | | × | × |
| 102.Fairfax County | | | × | | × | |
| 103.Fredericksburg | | | × | | × | × |
| 104.Newport News | | | × | | | x |
| 105.Norfolk | | | × | | | × |
| 106.Petersburg | | | × | | | |
| 107.Portsmouth | | | × | | | |
| 108.Richmond | | | × | | | |
| 109.Roanoke | | | × | | | |
| 110.Virginia Beach | | | × | | × | x |
| WASHINGTON | | | | | | |
| 111.Seattle | x | × | × | X | | |
| 112.Spokane | | | × | | | |
| 113. Washington D.C. | x | × | × | | × | × |
| WISCONSIN | | | | | | |
| 114. Dane County | | | × | | | |
| 115. Milwaukee County | | | × | | | |

NELP (National Employment Law Project) | BAN THE BOX – FAIR CHANCE GUIDE

January 2015

SUMMARY OF MUNICIPAL ORDINANCES

| City | San Francisco, CA | Seattle, WA | Buffalo, NY | Rochester, NY | Philadelphia, PA | Columbia, MO | Washington DC | Baltimore, MD | PROPOSED Portland, OR |
|-----------------|-----------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------------|
| Pop. (2013) | 837,422 | | | 210,358 | 1.553 million | | | | 609,456 |
| Effective Date | 8/13/2014 | 11/1/2013 | 1/1/2014 | 11/18/2014 | 7/12/2011 | 12/1/2014 | 12/17/2014 | 8/13/2014 | |
| Min. Employees | 20 | 1 | 15 | 4 | 10 | 1 | 11 | 10 | 6 |
| When in the | After first interview | After | Not before first | After "good | May ask after first | Conditional Offer | Conditional Offer | Conditional Offer | Conditional Offer |
| process is | or upon conditional | applications are | interview. | faith interview". | interview. May | | | | |
| employer | offer. | sorted for | | | discuss voluntarily | | | | |
| allowed to | | qualified | | | disclosed | | | | |
| review criminal | | candidates. | | | convictions. May | | | | |
| history | | | | | obtain report upon | | | | |
| | | | | | conditional offer. | | | | |
| Administrative | Office of Labor | Seattle Office of | Commission on | None | Mayor's Office of | Human Rights | Commission on | Community | TBD |
| Agency | Standards | Civil Rights | Citizens' Rights | | Labor & Standards; | Commission | Human Rights | Relations | |
| | Enforcement; | (exclusive) | and Community | | Philadelphia | (Exclusive) | (Exclusive) | Commission | |
| | Appeal allowed | | Relations | | Commission of | | | | |
| | | | | | Human Rights | | | | |
| | | | | | (Exclusive) | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Penalties | \$50-\$100 | \$700-\$1000 | \$500-\$1000 | \$500-\$1000 | \$2000 Per | Misdemeanor | \$1000-\$5000 | Misdemeanor | up to \$1000 |
| | | | | | Violation | \$1000/30 days | | \$500/90 Days | |
| Private Right | Yes | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | Yes | Yes |
| Title | Fair Chance | Use of Criminal | Fair | Fair | Fair Criminal | Employment | Fair Criminal | Fair Criminal | TBD |
| | Ordinance | History in | Employment | Employment | Record Screening | Opportunities for | Record Screening | Record Screening | |
| | | Employment | Screening | Screening | Standards | Qualified | Amendment Act of | Practices | |
| | | Decisions | | | | Applicants | 2014 | | |

HIGHLIGHTS OF PROPOSED POLICY TO REMOVE BARRIERS FOR EMPLOYMENT FOR PEOPLE WITH CRIMINAL HISTORIES

ADVERTISEMENT & APPLICATION

Employers would be encouraged to remove the "box" on their employment applications, whether they be in paper form or online.

While this proposed policy would not impose a ban on the question of whether a person has a criminal history, in assessing whether an employer violated the policy, the presence of the "box" could be evidence that criminal history was improperly considered before a conditional offer of employment was extended.

EMPLOYER COULD ONLY CONSIDER THE CRIMINAL HISTORY OF A PERSON AFTER MAKING CONDITIONAL OFFER OF EMPLOYMENT

"Conditional Offer" means any offer of Employment that is conditioned solely on:

- the results of an employer's inquiry into or gathering of information about a person's arrest or conviction history; and/or
- some other contingency expressly communicated to the applicant at the time of the offer;
- Example: drug test skills test

INDIVIDUALIZED ASESSMENT

After extending a conditional offer of employment, an employer could inquire into a person's criminal history, either by asking them or obtaining a criminal history report. An employer would then be required to make an **individualized assessment** to determine whether a specific offense has a **direct relationship** to a person's ability to **perform the duties or responsibilities of the job** they are seeking.

EEOC ANALYSIS

To accomplish this, the EEOC recommends in its 2012 guidance paper relating to the disparate impact of the use of criminal histories of protected classes that an employer utilize the factors identified in the 1975 Eighth Circuit decision, *Green v. Missouri Pacific Railroad*, 523 F.2d 1290 (8th Cir. 1975). Those factors are:

- The nature and gravity of the offense or conduct
- The time that has passed since the offense, conduct and/or completion of the sentence
- The nature of the job held or sought

WHAT SHOULD <u>NOT</u> BE CONSIDERED BY THE EMPLOYER

- An arrest not leading to a conviction, except where a crime is unresolved or where charges are pending against a person
- Convictions that have been judicially voided or expunged
- Charges that have been resolved through the completion of a diversion or deferral of judgment program

EXCEPTIONS

The proposed policy would not apply where a federal, state or local law or regulation requires or authorizes the consideration of a person's criminal history. Such situations include:

- Employment with law enforcement or in the criminal justice system
- Private security employment, where a license is required by the Oregon Department of Safety Standards and Training
- Employees who have direct access to or provide services for children, the elderly, persons with disabilities, persons with a mental illness, or individuals with alcohol or drug dependence or substance abuse disorders
- Employees required to be licensed, registered, certified or otherwise authorized to practice a profession or trade in this state and individuals applying for licensure, registration, certification or authorization to practice a profession or trade in this state.
- Positions designated by the employer as part of a federal, state or local government program designed to encourage the employment of those with criminal histories

PROCESS IF EMPLOYER TAKES AN ADVERSE EMPLOYMENT DECISION

If after making an individualized assessment to determine whether a specific offense has a direct relationship to a person's ability to perform the duties or responsibilities of the job they are seeking, an employer decided to decline to hire, not promote or discharge a person, or to revoke a person's Conditional Offer of Employment, the employer would have to:

- Inform the person of the adverse employment decision and indicate what portions of the criminal history check influenced the decision
- Give the person a copy of the criminal history report with information on the source of the report
- Provide Written Notice of Rights with timeline for opportunity to request reconsideration (2 business days)
- Inform the person of enforcement options

RECONSIDERATION

If the person requests reconsideration in a timely manner, employer would then have 2 business days to reconsider the Adverse Employment Decision.

Employer would to conduct an individualized assessment of all relevant evidence offered by the person, including, but not limited to:

- The facts or circumstances surrounding the offense or conduct
- The number of offenses for which the person was convicted
- The person's age at the time of conviction, or release from prison
- That the person performed the same type of work, post-conviction, with the same or a different employer, with no known incidents of criminal conduct
- The length and consistency of employment history before and after the offense or conduct
- The person's successful participation in rehabilitation efforts, such as education, training or substance abuse treatment
- Employment or character references and any other information regarding the person's fitness for the particular position
- Whether the person is bonded under a federal, state, or local bonding program.

Unless the employer reaches a different decision on reconsideration, the Adverse Employment Decision would become final 4 business days after the initial Notice of Adverse Employment Decision.

ENFORCEMENT

Action by The City Attorney

If the City Attorney determines that a violation of the policy occurred, she could initiate a Code violation proceeding after giving the employer notice of and an opportunity to explain the allegations.

Private Right of Action

A person claiming to be aggrieved under this policy would have a cause of action in any court of competent jurisdiction as provided in ORS 659A.885 (Civil Action).

PUBLIC EDUCATION AND OUTREACH

It is strongly encouraged that The City develop and implement an outreach program to inform employers and members of the public about the proposed ordinance and how it will affect their hiring practices and rights.