

**White Paper Discussion and Strategic Plan to Implement the
2012 Model Employer Resolution**

**Submitted to Bureau of Human Resources
City of Portland**

By

Michael A. Szporluk

MAS Consulting

August 5, 2016

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	4
Introduction	6
Methodology, Sample Population, and Limitations	8
Part 1: The City’s Values	9
Seven Key Assumptions	10
1. Disability is a normal part of the human condition.....	10
2. Able-bodied privilege needs to be unpacked	10
3. A model employer proactively addresses inequities.....	10
4. A model employer strives to meet a standard above what’s legally required	11
5. Requests for reasonable accommodation are legitimate.....	11
6. BHR needs to be “decider” in reasonable accommodation	11
7. An inconsistent approach to reasonable accommodation could make the City more liable	11
Objectives of the Strategic Plan	12
Objective I. Demonstrate Organizational Commitment and Leadership.....	12
A. Awareness of Elected Officials and Bureau Directors increased	13
B. Improved data on disability	14
C. Equity plans make use of intersectional lens	14
D. Support for innovation and inclusion of persons with developmental disabilities	14
Objective II. Facilitate Community Access and Partnerships	15
A. Full access to programs and services	15
B. Persons with disabilities are included in leadership academies	16
C. New opportunities for persons with disabilities	16
Objective III. Improve Outreach and Recruitment	16
A. Outreach leads to increase in new hires	17
B. Information on employment is accessible.....	18
C. Recruitment and tracking of applications is improved.....	18
D. Applications from persons with disabilities are given due consideration.....	18
E. Support with onboarding	18
Objective IV. Create a Supportive Environment	19
A. Information and communication is inclusive.....	19
B. Reasonable Accommodation is provided in a timely manner.....	19
C. Employees with disabilities have opportunities	23
Part II: Recommended Actions to Meet Objectives	25
Bureau of Human Resources	25
Actions to meet objective I - Organizational Commitment and Leadership	25
Actions to meet objective II - Community Access and Partnerships.....	28
Actions to meet objective III - Outreach and Recruitment.....	28
Actions to meet objective IV - Create a Supportive Environment	31
Mayor and City Commissioners	33
Actions to meet objective I – Organizational Commitment and Leadership.....	33
Actions to meet objective II – Community Access and Partnerships.....	34
Office of Equity and Human Rights	34
Actions to meet objective I – Organizational Commitment and Leadership.....	35

Actions to meet objective II – Community Access and Partnerships	36
Parks and Recreation Bureau	36
Office of Neighborhood Involvement.....	36
Actions to meet objective II – Community Access and Partnerships.....	36
Actions to meet objective IV – Create a Supportive Environment.....	37
Other specific bureaus, offices and programs.....	37
Measures for all bureaus	38
Part III: Integrated monitoring plan for strategic plan	39
Appendix 1: Bureaus targeted for key informant interviews.....	47
Appendix 2: 2016 MAS Survey: Findings.....	48

“Persons with disabilities are members of our community, our society, and they deserve a fair shake, they deserve a job and career. Other bureaus or divisions could also make simple modifications to make this happen.”¹

Executive Summary

Nearly twenty percent of Portlanders are persons with disabilities, yet statistics maintained by the City show that just 2.01% of the City’s workforce self-identify as persons with disabilities.² The City recognizes that a representative workforce benefits the City, and is committed to being an Employer of Choice. Resources are needed to close the employment gap for persons with disabilities, and to provide a supportive workplace for employees with disabilities.

There are several reasons to believe that the City’s estimate of 2.01% under-reports the real percentage of employees with disabilities, who may not disclose their disability status due to stigma and fear that it will compromise their opportunities. Information about disability is taken at time of hire, and the City does not regularly or periodically ask employees if there has been a change in their disability status.

The City can and should change some policies and practices to provide a more supportive environment for persons with disabilities. The May 2012 Model Employer Resolution, which committed the City to develop a strategic plan to hire job-seekers with disabilities and provide support for employees with disabilities, passed council unanimously. In the past four years limited progress has been made, thus a new approach is needed to realize the promise of the Model Employer Resolution.

This strategic plan has identified four main objectives to enable the City to become a model employer in practice: (1) Organizational Commitment and Leadership; (2) Community Access and Partnerships; (3) Outreach and Recruitment; and (4) More Representative Workforce. The rationale for each objective is described and is followed by sets of corresponding actions. 1.5 FTE is requested to facilitate implementation of this strategic plan. 1 FTE would be for the position of Accommodation Coordinator; and .5 FTE for targeted outreach.

The primary owner of this strategic plan is the Bureau of Human Resources (BHR). BHR worked together with the Portland Commission on Disability (PCOD) under the Office of Equity and Human Rights (OEHR) to draft and propose the Model Employer Resolution, and BHR commissioned this strategic plan. OEHR, which hosts PCOD and whose mandate includes addressing equity for persons with disabilities, also has a significant role to play. Other bureaus have undertaken efforts to attract employees with disabilities and to provide more support to them. Thus, Office of Neighborhood Involvement (ONI), Bureau of Environmental Services (BES), and Parks and Recreation (Parks) are also identified as key partners for this work.

¹ Notes from interview with supervisor at the City who has had two employees with disabilities on their team for twenty years, 2016.

² City data is taken from OEHR Demographic Dashboard (March 2016). 2012 US Census data reports that nearly 1 in five adults in the US report having a disability. Data specific to Portland suggests it is also in the range between 15 to 20%. See Szporluk, Michael, “Disparities in Access and Opportunity for Persons with Disabilities in Portland”, Coalition for a Livable Future, January 2014.

This plan comprises three parts. Part one provides background information, an overview of findings and presents a brief outline of the proposed strategic plan. Part two provides a more detailed explanation, organized by bureau, of the actions and tasks that could be assigned to different bureaus within the City. Part three provides the same information as in part two, but in table format and is organized by objective. Part three also includes information on indicators and targets for each of the proposed actions. There is some overlapping information, especially in parts two and three, but it is important to present the information, both as a written description by bureau as well as by a table snapshot, where the bureaus can see how their work is connected to the work of other bureaus. Appendices present a list of the bureaus that were the focus of this plan, a copy of the questions and main findings of the MAS Survey, and a spotlight on the importance of mental health.

Definition of disability

This plan uses the ADA definition of disability. The ADA, as amended in 2009, provides three prongs that are included in the understanding of the term disability: “(A) a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities of such individual; (B) a record of such an impairment; or (C) being regarded as having such an impairment.”³

It is acknowledged that this definition is broad and thus may pose some difficulties for managers and supervisors, who try to determine whether one of their employees is a person with a disability. As discussed in more detail below, the breadth of the definition is one of several reasons why it is important for BHR (rather than direct supervisors) to take a more prominent role in handling and managing requests for reasonable accommodation.

³ Americans with Disabilities Act (2009), Section 4, Disability Defined and Rules of Construction.

Introduction

The May 2012 Model Employer Resolution (Model Employer Resolution) committed the City to assess the “City’s current employment of and capacity to employ persons with disabilities” and to “review the city’s present employment policies and practices...to determine where they may need revision or new policies and practices are needed.”⁴ That assessment was seen as a first step toward the development of a strategic plan to promote employment of persons with disabilities. While no funds were allocated for its implementation, the Model Employer Resolution noted that there would be an evaluation of the need for a dedicated staff person to facilitate implementation of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Title I obligations.⁵

The past four years has seen incremental progress only. According to the “Demographic Dashboard” of the Office of Equity and Human Rights (OEHR) as of March 2016 the City employees 90 individuals with disabilities.⁶ Data from the SAP, the City’s repository for employee information shows only 2.01% of the City’s total workforce identifying as a person with a disability.. The Bureau of Human Resources (BHR) new hire data from 2011 to 2016 shows that 9 individuals with disabilities and 20 disabled vets were hired (out of a total of 1481 new hires).⁷ This is equivalent to .6% and 1.3% of new hires, respectively. While this underestimates⁸ the true number of persons with disabilities employed by the City, it is far below the Federal target of 7% and even further below the estimated 20% of the population who are persons with disabilities.

In part due to the limited progress made during the past four years, this plan proposes the allocation of funds to cover the cost of 1.5 FTE. One FTE would focus on ensuring persons with disabilities are accommodated (the mechanism to achieve this would be modeled on the successful establishment of the mechanism to coordinate FMLA). One .5 FTE would be focus on outreach and recruitment of persons with disabilities.

This plan notes the recognition of the need to allocate resources to address substantive inequalities:

“The obligation in the case of such a vulnerable and disadvantaged group is to take positive action to reduce structural disadvantages and to give appropriate preferential treatment to people with disabilities in order to achieve the objectives of full participation and equality within society for all persons with disabilities. This almost invariably means

⁴ Model Employer Resolution (2012), page 3. [36925].

⁵ ADA Title I protects employees and applicants with disabilities from discrimination in all employment practices.

⁶ OEHR Demographic dashboard. accessed from

https://www.portlandoregon.gov/oehr/Workforce_Demographics/eoswf.cfm on 19 May 2016.

⁷ Does not include employees we are not federally required to report on - casual/seasonal employees, elected officials (City Council) and their staffing. Estimates made at the time of hire are most under-report the true number of employees with disabilities due to several reasons: people are afraid to disclose (especially not before their probation period ends), people may acquire disabilities during their employment tenure.

⁸ Reasons include, but are not limited to, the correlation between aging and disability status, and the large percentage of older persons who work for the City, the lack of demographic updates to record changes in disability status, stigma associated with disclosure.

that additional resources will need to be made available for this purpose and that a wide range of specially tailored measures will be required.”⁹

The BHR Survey

In the fall of 2014 BHR sent an anonymous survey on disability (BHR Survey) via survey monkey to City employees, and received 964 responses, of which 149 persons (15.5%) self-identified as persons with disabilities. While a response bias over-estimated the number of persons with disabilities,¹⁰ there is a significant gap between those who disclosed their disability at the time of hire, and those who disclosed through the BHR Survey.

Slightly over half of the persons with disabilities indicated their primary disability as physical in nature, and forty persons in the BHR Survey indicated “mental health” as a primary or secondary disability. This is just over a quarter (26.8%) of persons who self-identified. Given the strong sense of stigma, legitimate fear of disclosure, and the fact that persons who experience mental health crises are not usually visibly identified as such, the City needs to pay particular attention to educating employees about common accommodation requests for such persons, and make concerted efforts to accommodate them.

The BHR Survey findings revealed that employees with disabilities had statistically different impressions than their non-disabled peers about several key questions from the survey (*top row for each question presents results for non-disabled persons; second row presents results for persons with disabilities*).

Table 1: Differences in Perceptions on Working Conditions (BHR Survey)

BHR Survey Question Number	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Z-test
23: My bureau is supportive of including workers with disabilities	741	2.40	.901	Significant at the 99% level
	137	2.89	1.29	
26: City employees are respected by co-workers	741	2.18	.81	Significant at the 99% level
	136	2.78	.95	
27: City employees with disabilities are welcomed and supported by management.	742	2.49	.97	Significant at the 99% level
	137	3.28	1.07	
28: The City provides training on disability awareness	741	2.82	.99	Significant at the 99% level
	137	3.28	1.04	

These results indicate a deep divide in how non-disabled persons and persons with disabilities perceive the extent to which the City offers a welcoming environment. Thus, while the City has

⁹ Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1994), *General Comment No. 5, Persons with disabilities*, UN Doc E/1995/22, paragraph 9.

¹⁰ Reasons for inflated estimates of employees with disabilities include: persons with disabilities are more likely than non-disabled to respond to a survey on disability, the survey was electronic (and thus did not reach most employees who don't work in offices).

in place to ensure accommodation is in place when requested, it appears that persons with disabilities do not feel welcomed or supported. As discussed in more detail later, persons with disabilities don't feel able to disclose their disability, and feel their accommodation requests will be denied.

Being a model employer

While the City made the commitment to be a model employer back in 2012, it is important to outline in brief what being a model employer means. A model employer recognizes that persons with disabilities are an important part of the community, that persons with disabilities experience unemployment and underemployment at significantly higher rates than non-disabled persons, that persons with disabilities are good and reliable employees, and that persons with disabilities are often in vulnerable situations given any number of factors, including but not limited to higher levels of poverty, lower levels of education, discrimination in employment, physical and other environmental barriers, attitudinal barriers, the high costs of health care, the damage of lowered expectations of their ability, intersecting aspects of their identity (race, ethnicity, LGBTQ status, gender, citizenship status, etc.), and lower levels of self-esteem and confidence. Given this context, a model employer commits to supporting persons with disabilities in all aspects of the application process and commits to ensuring employees with disabilities have the support they need and are entitled to perform their essential job functions. A model employer recognizes the value in having a workforce that is more representative of the communities it serves, that employing persons with disabilities reduces their reliance on expensive public programs, and that employees with disabilities can contribute to the development and implementation of creative and innovative programs and policies that benefit the whole community.

Methodology, Sample Population, and Limitations

In 2016 BHR hired MAS Consulting to undertake an assessment of conditions within the City and to draft this white paper and strategic plan. The first phase of this work consisted of a desk review and a review of the findings of the 2014 BHR survey, new hire data from 2011-2016 and the bureaus' Equal Employment Opportunity Affirmative Action Plans (EEO AAPs). During this phase interview guides and a short survey (MAS Survey) were developed to assess employees' views on employment of persons with disabilities and to elicit their suggestions on the prioritization of actions for this strategic plan.

A second phase consisted of selecting bureaus to focus on¹¹ and setting up and holding key informant interviews with Commissioners, the Mayor's office, twelve Bureau Directors, and some of their staff. A third stage has been to contact other jurisdictions to identify good practices that could serve as models for Portland, and to draft this strategic plan for feedback from internal stakeholders.

¹¹ Bureaus were selected on the basis of agreed criteria with BHR. List appears as appendix 1.

The MAS Survey respondents were balanced in terms of gender and there was a proportional number of persons with disabilities (nine out of forty-three). However, respondents were not representative in terms of age, with no one between the ages of 18-24 and only five respondents between the ages of 25-34. The sample skewed toward older population given the emphasis on meeting with Bureau Directors and Commissioners. A limitation of the survey, thus, is that insufficient numbers of younger persons were interviewed or completed the survey.

Although persons interviewed expressed strong views about the need to improve the worker's compensation process, this was seen as largely outside the scope of the plan (especially given the tight timeline). The issue of contracting procedures and the question of expanding minority contracts to be inclusive of organizations and companies of persons with disabilities was also raised, but seen as outside the scope for this consultancy.

Part 1: The City's Values

Equity is one of the City's four key priorities.¹² For the City equity is

*[W]hen everyone has access to the opportunities necessary to satisfy their essential needs, advance their well-being and achieve their full potential.*¹³

The Portland Plan specifically commits the City to increase focus on addressing disability inequities. Actions include awareness raising, implementation of the ADA Transition Plan, collecting data on disparities, and applying “lessons learned from the racial/ethnic focus and adapt tools to address the most critical disparities facing Portlanders with disabilities.”¹⁴ This includes a “guiding policy” to reduce disparities in economic self-sufficiency amongst persons with disabilities¹⁵ and a commitment to “[r]ecruit, train and appoint minority members, including people with disabilities to city advisory boards to ensure accurate representation of the city's diverse population.”¹⁶ Desired outcomes of the equity focus are engagement by under-represented communities in policy decisions, and a “future” that is “not limited by your race, gender, sexual orientation, disability, age, income, where you were born or where you live.”¹⁷

The Model Employer Resolution outlined the business case for hiring and supporting persons with disabilities, many of whom have been historically marginalized and denied access to opportunities and resources on an equal basis with others.¹⁸ The Model Employer Resolution passed Council unanimously in 2012. Forty-one of 43 respondents to the MAS Survey agreed that it is important for the City to employ more persons with disabilities.¹⁹ The Model Employer

¹² Portland Plan (April 2012), page 3.

¹³ Portland Plan Summary (April 2012), page 4.

¹⁴ Portland Plan (April 2012), page 22.

¹⁵ Portland Plan (April 2012), page 68.

¹⁶ Portland Plan (April 2012), page 20.

¹⁷ Portland Plan Summary (2012), page 4.

¹⁸ Model Employer Resolution (2012), pages 9-11. [36925].

¹⁹ Two said they were not sure. One of those indicated: I believe we have many people here with disabilities but do not feel safe being open about it. If people feel safe, we could draw a more diverse work force.” The other wrote: “I

Resolution fits within the larger frame of the Employer of Choice initiative, which recognizes the importance of organizational commitment, employee development and a supportive workplace.

Strategic Plan Goal

The City is a model employer of persons with disabilities.

Strategic Plan Vision

This strategic plan shares the vision of the Comprehensive Plan: “Portland is a prosperous, healthy, equitable and resilient city where everyone has access to opportunity and is engaged in shaping decisions that affect their lives.”²⁰

Seven Key Assumptions

1. Disability is a normal part of the human condition

Persons with disabilities have been, are, and will be part of every community. In Portland, given the demographics of aging and the aging workforce, the number of persons with disabilities will increase significantly over the next twenty years. The largest barriers to participation and equal opportunity are not the individual’s impairments, rather they are institutional, environmental and attitudinal barriers created by society.²¹ Since society disables persons with disabilities, the answer to their exclusion is to remove barriers and to find ways to include persons with disabilities in a meaningful way in all aspects of the City’s work.

2. Able-bodied privilege needs to be unpacked

In 1989 Peggy McIntosh, a professor at Wellesley College, wrote a short yet very influential essay, titled “White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack.”²² In that essay she enumerates twenty-six examples of how whites, unlike African Americans, are able to count on certain conditions to be in place in their everyday life.²³ A very similar dynamic exists (though the specifics will differ) between non-disabled persons and persons with disabilities. The end result is that efforts needed to ensure equal access and opportunities for persons with disabilities are misconstrued as “special treatment” and thus remain dependent on the “benevolence” of non-disabled persons, who can take it away when budgets are tight.

3. A model employer proactively addresses inequities

With respect to disability, twin-track approaches have been used by branches of the United Nations, and donors active in supporting international development. A twin track approach works simultaneously on integrating disability into existing mechanisms and processes while

can't really answer yes or no because we truly have no idea how many we currently employ. There are many who choose not to self-identify and quite frankly there are probably many more who do not know they qualify.”

²⁰ 2035 Comprehensive Plan Update: recommended draft, August 2015, accessed from

www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/pdxcompplan, p 1-6

²¹ See page 12 for explanation of such barriers.

²² McIntosh’s article is available on many websites. The author of this strategic plan accessed it from <http://nationalseedproject.org/white-privilege-unpacking-the-invisible-knapsack> on 12 June 2016.

²³ For example, statement four reads: “I can go shopping alone most of the time, pretty well assured that I will not be followed or harassed.” Several persons have posted able-ism privilege lists. Though it is not comprehensive, see http://www.sap.mit.edu/content/pdf/able_bodied_privilege.pdf for an example of such a list.

also setting in motion stand-alone actions to provide support solely for persons with disabilities. As an example of the first track, racial minorities with disabilities and women with disabilities, respectively, should be included in equity plans and leadership academies on race and gender. A new (racially and gender diverse) leadership academy specifically for persons with disabilities is an example of the second track. Both approaches are needed to address inequity.

4. A model employer strives to meet a standard above what's legally required

Even though one of the principal goals of the ADA was to “provide more jobs for those with disabilities so as to better integrate them into the workplace and the economy”²⁴, implementing the ADA should be the baseline, not the target. The United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD), which entered into force in May 2008 and which the United States has signed, provides the standards that governmental units and others should aim to achieve. The CRPD, importantly, shifts away from the traditional and medical focus on diagnoses and functional limitations. It introduces a social and human rights framework for understanding disability, and as a result focuses attention on the obligations of the State to ensure persons with disabilities can access opportunities and resources on an equal basis with others.

5. Requests for reasonable accommodation are legitimate

The CRPD signals a move from the medical model of disability. Rather than require someone to prove the medical nature of their disability or question the validity of requests for reasonable accommodation, the City should presume there are legitimate reasons for all requests. While this does not guarantee that all requests will be reasonable, the City's initial response should not question the rationale for the request, but instead look at options and solutions. Bureaus could instead ask “what specific modifications would improve your work experience?”

The “reasonableness” test performed by the City concerns the potential solutions (*as opposed to the medical nature of the impairment or the functional limitation described*). If the agreed solution does not enhance the employee's ability to carry out their essential functions, then the City can discontinue that solution (*whether it is a flexible schedule, an assistive device, or any other accommodation measure*).

6. BHR needs to be “decider” in reasonable accommodation

Currently employees submit requests for reasonable accommodation to their supervisors. The BHR survey and interviews with City employees have shown that many supervisors may not be sufficiently familiar with the ADA or the array of accommodation options, may be uncomfortable discussing accommodation, and thus may delay or reject legitimate requests, even before notifying HR business partners of the request. It makes sense, therefore, for BHR to take the lead in processing, tracking and deciding on requests for accommodation.

7. An inconsistent approach to reasonable accommodation could make the City more liable

Inconsistencies have been noted in at least three ways: 1) with respect to the type of request (*some requests appear to be more acceptable than others*); 2) the position of the requester (*there is anecdotal evidence that leads one to believe that higher level managers have more flexibility with respect to their schedules and other accommodation requests*); and 3) there is significant

²⁴ Selmi, Michael, “The Stigma of Disabilities and the Americans with Disabilities Act” in *Disability and Aging Discrimination: Perspectives in Law and Psychology*, ed. Wiener, Richard L and Steven L. Willborn, (Springer, 2016), p.124

variation in outcomes depending on the division or bureau where an individual requestor happens to work. These sorts of inconsistencies, with respect to process and application of the ADA may make the City more vulnerable to litigation.

Objectives of the Strategic Plan

Four main objectives serve as pillars for this strategic plan:

- I. Demonstrate Organizational Commitment and Leadership
- II. Facilitate Community Access and Partnerships
- III. Improve Outreach and Recruitment
- IV. Create a Supportive Environment

This plan outlines in brief each of these objectives, and in the subsequent section provides recommended actions for each of the main stakeholders to achieve the objectives. The proposed objectives have been shaped by the BHR Survey, key informant interviews, and MAS Survey.

MAS Survey participants were asked open ended questions about reasons why someone might not disclose and to propose actions that the City could undertake to implement the resolution. Thirty-eight persons provided feedback on why one might not disclose their disability. Twenty wrote about “fear” or “being afraid”, eleven wrote of not wanting to be “treated” differently, and ten wrote of “stigma.” Thirty-three persons wrote comments on steps that could be taken to increase number of employees with disabilities. The four most frequent responses centered around training for senior management, improving outreach to organizations, improving the hiring process, and making the environment safe for persons to disclose (part of this includes improving how reasonable accommodation is handled). Three less frequent responses referred to the need to raise capacity of applicants with disabilities, job training programs, and the value of diversity. All of these observations have helped to inform the structure of this strategic plan.²⁵

One surprising finding was that a significant majority (28 of 43; or 65%) of persons who completed the survey have “family or close friends” who are persons with disabilities. This lends credence to the belief that there are more persons with disabilities in the community than usually recognized.

Objective I. Demonstrate Organizational Commitment and Leadership

Respondents to the MAS survey were asked to rank the most important actions for advancing the Model Employer Resolution (see Appendix 2 for a copy of the survey with findings).

Box 1: MAS Survey respondents ranking of the most important actions to advance the Model Employer Resolution (1 = most important; 8 = least important)

1. Leadership commitment from senior management

²⁵ Word clouds were created for each of these questions and can be found on pages 50 and 51 of this document.

2. Identification of specific goals to guide implementation
3. Targeted career development opportunities inclusive of persons with disabilities
4. Training for staff at all levels
5. Centralized funding and processing for reasonable accommodations
6. Flexible work environment
7. Better coordination between and across bureaus
8. Regular surveying workforce on disability

The two top-ranked actions inform the formation of this first objective. To ensure there is organizational commitment and leadership, it is necessary for Elected Officials and Bureau Directors to communicate to the workforce the disparities in employment that persons with disabilities experience, and to take measures to address the gaps through an array of measures targeting recruitment, hiring, retention and promotion.

A demonstration of organizational commitment and leadership is predicated on raising awareness amongst senior management that the logical extension of the City's values and branding as an Employer of Choice requires a significant shift in how persons with disabilities in the workforce are viewed and supported. As one respondent to the MAS Survey wrote:

*"I think there is an abominable lack of knowledge/understanding of who persons with disabilities are and what they are capable of. One of the first steps to open the way for change is to ensure that all senior management is educated on the realities of people with disabilities...[to help] them understand the deeper reasons for addressing issues and the fundamental truths about those who have disabilities. Until we remove the ignorance and stereotypes, no real change can happen. It has to start with a change of mindset and heart. It is a huge undertaking."*²⁶

A. Awareness of Elected Officials and Bureau Directors increased

The 2016 interviews found that many employees are neither familiar with the definition of disability as per the ADA, nor are they familiar with the breadth of services and modifications that fall within the scope of reasonable accommodation.²⁷ One element to enable senior leadership to value inclusion of persons with disabilities may be through helping them to recognize that disability status is not the only identity marker. Disabled persons are women, persons of color, immigrants, refugees, LGBTQ, etc. Given the way discrimination works, the majority of persons with disabilities, by virtue of their other identity markers, face multiple discrimination and deeper exclusion.

²⁶ Response to MAS survey question four regarding steps to increase employment of persons with disabilities.

²⁷ US Department of Justice provides the following guidance: "Reasonable accommodations may include, but are not limited to (a) making existing facilities readily accessible to individuals with disabilities; (b) job restructuring, modification of work schedules or place of work, extended leave, telecommuting, reassignment to a vacant position; and (c) acquisition or modification of equipment or devices, including computer software and hardware, appropriate adjustments or modifications of examinations, training materials or policies, the provision of qualified readers and/or interpreters and other similar accommodations." Accessed from <https://www.justice.gov/jmd/eeos/manual-and-procedures-providing-reasonable-accommodation> on 18 May 2016, page 2.

In conjunction with educating senior leadership in the City, it would be ideal if Bureau Directors and Elected Officials disclosed their disabilities (or their experience having friends or family members who self-identify) to begin to normalize disability. It is important for employees with disabilities to have role models, and to have mentors. This will also help to change the uninformed perception - *held by non-disabled persons* – that persons with disabilities cannot be productive employees. Knowing that senior leadership includes persons with disabilities will also make it safer for employees at mid and entry-levels to disclose their status.

Finally, it is important for the City to be transparent to the broader disability community about the content of this strategic plan, and transparency requires consideration of mechanisms whereby the community can hold the City accountable.

B. Improved data on disability

While much of the work on improving data will fall to BHR (and is described later), the City would benefit from several straightforward measures that could be instituted by leadership. In particular, brief demographic surveys could be administered every three-four years. These surveys should cover information on gender, disability, race, etc. Thus, they would not be solely focused on disability, but they should include questions on disability given the fact that employees acquire disability during the course of employment.

C. Equity plans make use of intersectional lens

OEHR's racial equity plans are restrictive and thus do not take into account the diversity that exists within every race and ethnicity. For this reason, it is important, while still leading with race, for equity plans to use an intersectional lens to better understand how layers of identity create or inhibit opportunities and access to resources and employment.

D. Support for innovation and inclusion of persons with developmental disabilities

Some innovations have been successful at the bureau level and should be considered for replication (see section on BES's GRUMPs, described on page 38, as one example). Other innovations are in the works, and also deserve attention and support from leadership. First, Commissioner Fish has initiated conversations with Project Search to create an internship program for persons with developmental disabilities; and second, OHSU has begun a job-customization program (described in more detail on page 26).

Persons interviewed during the development of this strategic plan have advised that if an internship program is set in place, there should be a longer-term aim to transition persons who complete the internship program to full time employment. It has been noted that since it may take a person with a developmental disability a longer time to learn the skills, the best way to ensure the skills are learned and built upon is by having a pathway to full time employment.

While the cities of Baltimore, Chicago, Denver, Los Angeles, New York, Philadelphia and Seattle were contacted, it became apparent that none of these cities have considered or implemented anything to support their employment of persons with disabilities to the extent of this plan. In fact, only the City of Seattle was identified as having some good practices. They

have an Accommodations Coordinator (discussed in more detail below) and a program targeting persons with developmental disabilities.

The City of Seattle has an innovative program that identifies, hires and supports persons with developmental or intellectual disabilities. The City of Seattle currently employs 102 people with developmental disabilities within seventeen City departments.

One aspect of their supported employment program is educating bureaus (called “departments” in Seattle’s terminology) on the possibility of customizing jobs specifically for persons with developmental or intellectual disabilities. Jobs are customized by bundling a variety of entry-level duties into positions that match candidates’ skills and the business needs of the workplace. This strategy has resulted in a more diverse workforce and a more cost-effective division of labor, allowing other employees to maximize their time and skills by reducing time spent on entry-level aspects of their jobs. For example, the City of Seattle has designated the job title “*Office/Maintenance Aide*” for employees with developmental disabilities. This title intentionally has no job specifications associated with it, in order to allow for maximum customization of each position.

A second aspect is developing relationships with job coaching agencies that can then recommend candidates who may be good fits for particular jobs. Job coaches provide training and coaching “support” as needed for the employee with a disability. Job coaches are dispatched from local community agencies that serve the employment-related needs of people with developmental disabilities. Coaches are a valuable resource for the entire workplace, and are available at no cost to any employer who hires a person with a developmental disability. The City of Seattle has found that local job coaching agencies were better partners than the larger national ones.

Finally, it is worth noting that funding for the supported employment program came initially from a grant from the State of Washington and was subsequently supported by King County for several years, until the City of Seattle took responsibility for covering the costs of one FTE to oversee the program. The City of Seattle produced a FAQ document on how to set up a supported employment program. That document has been shared with BHR.

Objective II. Facilitate Community Access and Partnerships

Community access and partnerships are foundational toward improving outreach and recruitment of job-seekers with disabilities.

A. Full access to programs and services

Since persons with disabilities in the community first interact with the City by attending events or taking part in services or programs, it is important for the City to ensure that persons with disabilities can participate on an equal basis with others (the failure to ensure participation provides a strong and negative message to community members with disabilities that the City does not provide a welcoming environment for persons with disabilities).

Building partnerships with community service and advocacy organizations goes hand in hand with increased attention to measures to be undertaken to facilitate better community access. In other words, by establishing partnerships with community organizations that provide services for persons with disabilities and organizations that advocate on behalf of persons with disabilities, the City can learn more about what can and should be done to facilitate access.

B. Persons with disabilities are included in leadership academies

ONI is the lead for the development of a leadership academy for persons with disabilities. At the same time, leadership academies on race and gender should also be inclusive of persons of color with disabilities and women with disabilities, respectively. This twin-track approach follows directly international development good practices (described above as the third assumption on pages 10-11).

C. New opportunities for persons with disabilities

Given the breadth of work done by the City, it is not possible at this stage to identify specific partners for all of the bureaus. That effort will have to be done at the bureau level with the support of PCOD and the .5 FTE for outreach and recruitment (mentioned below). The City can encourage its partners to be more inclusive of persons with disabilities, and thereby help facilitate skill development for persons with disabilities (that in turn will make them more competitive).

The City should explore partnerships with the Office of Developmental Disabilities Services and with mental health programs in the city to identify clients of those programs who may be interested in pursuing employment opportunities at the City.

Objective III. Improve Outreach and Recruitment

The CRPD notes that jurisdictions have a general obligation “[T]o provide accessible information to persons with disabilities about mobility aids, devices and assistive technologies, including new technologies, as well as other forms of assistance, support services and facilities.”²⁸ This obligation is extremely important, both during the outreach and recruitment phases of the employment process, but also once someone is hired.

Barriers for persons with disabilities

Persons with disabilities face numerous barriers – and these barriers need to be recognized for the City to begin to address them. The accepted practice of placing responsibility on persons with disabilities to disclose their disability and to request reasonable accommodation needs to be questioned in light of the low number who disclose, the barriers that make it more difficult for persons to disclose disability, and difficulties with the process of requesting and obtaining reasonable accommodation.

²⁸ CRPD, Article 4 (1) (h).

The MAS Survey found that City employees recognize persons with disabilities face various barriers. Respondents explained the difference in employment rates as follows:

95% believe “persons with disabilities face barriers to employment that non-disabled persons do not face.”

61% believe “a perception that persons with disabilities are not able to perform tasks as well as non-disabled persons”;

61% believe “persons with disabilities do not have sufficient information about job opportunities”;

55% believe “a perception that persons with disabilities do not possess qualifications”; and

21% believe “a perception that persons with disabilities don’t work as hard as non-disabled persons.”

Almost all respondents recognize that persons with disabilities face additional barriers. These barriers can be attitudinal, institutional, or environmental in nature. The attitudinal barriers include the perceptions mentioned above. One employee with a disability noted,

Non-disabled persons have lowered expectations about the capacity of persons with disabilities. As a result, persons with disabilities may not get hired (even though they can do the job in question). I’ve never met anyone blind, I’ve never met anyone with a significant speech impediment, or someone who is completely Deaf at the City.²⁹

Institutional barriers “include many laws, policies, strategies or practices that discriminate against people with disabilities.”³⁰ Environmental barriers inhibit access for persons with disabilities. This can include physical barriers, inaccessible forms of communication, or other barriers that restrict participation of persons with disabilities.

A. Outreach leads to increase in new hires

The targeted outreach program within BHR has not prioritized identifying persons with disabilities interested in positions at the City. Over the past five years the targeted outreach program, which focuses on race, has enabled two persons with disabilities to join the workforce. Outreach to vocational schools, high schools, community organizations, and the military (vets) could be pursued with a specific focus on targeting persons with disabilities. Targeted outreach follows very closely from the objective of ensuring access and building partnerships with community organizations and aligns with the third top priority as identified in the MAS Survey. Through forging those ties the City will be able to identify potential applicants through more targeted outreach and to facilitate their access to training opportunities and experiences to enable them to become qualified for a wider range of positions. Specific opportunities and potential partner organizations are described in more detail in part II of this strategic plan.

²⁹ Notes from informant interview, 2016. That individual also expressed the hope that the City would hire persons whose disabilities are more pronounced or severe to help normalize disability within the work environment.

³⁰ <http://www.gsdrc.org/topic-guides/disability-inclusion/barriers-to-disability-inclusion/>, accessed 10 June 2016.

B. Information on employment is accessible

The City needs to make sure that all information on employment opportunities is fully accessible. This includes all public facing digital content, as well as raising awareness throughout the bureaus on information requirements for persons with different kinds of disabilities (for example, persons with intellectual disabilities, mental health users or persons on the autism spectrum).

C. Recruitment and tracking of applications is improved

Once the City builds more relationships with organizations that serve or advocate on behalf of the community of persons with disabilities, and once targeted outreach identify persons with disabilities who can add value to the City, the City then should make an effort the recruit them for jobs that open up. The OMF CAO indicated that a third of the workforce would be eligible to retire within the next three years.³¹ While undoubtedly not all those eligible for retirement will retire, this still presents an opportunity to make a more concerted effort to ensure that persons with disabilities are recruited once positions are open.

D. Applications from persons with disabilities are given due consideration

It is important to provide trainings to Human Resources Business Partners (HRBPs), Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) and hiring managers on the importance of hiring persons with disabilities, and to raise awareness on disability etiquette, fulfilling reasonable accommodation requests made during application process.

If the .5 FTE for targeted outreach is approved, then BHR will be able to start building relationships with organizations and will be able to identify persons that may be vetted and tracked when suitable positions open up.

The Council and BHR will be able to assess the impact of the Charles Jordan Standard, and would be in a position to consider whether to expand that standard for all positions.

BHR can continue its review of class specifications and job descriptions to ensure that the new classification system is sensitive to what constitutes essential job functions, and to address language that creates unintended barriers.

E. Support with onboarding

BHR can ensure that bureaus' new hire checklists contain a provision for ADA assessments as the default standard (which individuals can opt out of if they so choose). BHR in partnership with bureaus can also create a mechanism to ensure that accommodations are in place prior to the new hire's first day of work. Some of the agencies that are potential partners, for example, provide job coaches to assist with onboarding.

³¹ Interview with Fred Miller, 25 April 2016

Objective IV. Create a Supportive Environment

Creating a safer environment will encourage more people to disclose their disability status and will increase retention rates of employees with disabilities. This can be done by ensuring access to information, providing reasonable accommodation in a timely manner, and by providing opportunities to learn skills/training.

A. Information and communication is inclusive

Employees with disabilities may not have access to information on an equal basis with others. Employees who are Deaf or are hard of hearing may not have access to information that is presented orally. Persons who are blind or have low vision may not have access to information that is presented in hard copy or orally (power point presentations, for example, often contain text, photos, or graphs that are not fully explained). Persons with cognitive impairments may not have access to alternative formats of key documents. In terms of the profile of City employees with disabilities, the BHR Survey revealed significant imbalances by type of impairment.³²

Table 2: Population of employees with disabilities (BHR Survey)

Disability type	Primary disability	Secondary disability	Sub-total
“Physical disability”	76	10	86
“Mental health”	26	14	40
“Deaf or hard of hearing”	18	0	18
Other	15	4	19
“Developmental” and “cognitive disability”	8	9	17
“Blind or vision related”	1	3	4
No detail provided on nature of disability	5	0	5
Total	149		

When gathering data on the types of impairments people have, it is important to pair that with a question about the support needs, if any, that individual has. It is impossible to tell, from the BHR Survey whether the persons who indicated “Deaf or hard of hearing”, for example, need an amplified phone, an assistive listening device, sign language interpreters or some other type of accommodation. Given the lack of information about corresponding accommodations, it is difficult to identify the most appropriate types of investments to ensure all employees have access to information and can communicate effectively with their peers. To be a Model Employer the City should ensure it proactively commits to provide information in alternative formats for their employees, as needed. The City also should be proactive in ensuring employees know about assistance that is available to them (Preferred Worker Program, Employer at Injury Program, etc.)

B. Reasonable Accommodation is provided in a timely manner

³² It was not mandatory to provide “secondary disability”, and in fact many indicated they had no secondary disability. The secondary disability column does not count persons who indicated their secondary disability was the same as their primary disability (since that would be double counting).

“No one considers their own needs as special. The City should not either.”³³

The CRPD notes the requirement of jurisdictions to provide reasonable accommodation:

“In order to promote equality and eliminate discrimination, States Parties shall take all appropriate steps to ensure that reasonable accommodation is provided.”³⁴

Persons with disabilities fear disclosing their disability, believe they are unlikely to get the reasonable accommodation they request, and experience delays and difficulties even when their request is approved. The current system, where bureaus do not track the numbers of requests or the amount of funds expended, allows Bureaus to be inconsistent in their application of the ADA. The result is a lose-lose situation. Persons with disabilities may not be getting the accommodation to which they are entitled, and the City is vulnerable to lawsuits.

The Amendments Act to the ADA entered into force in 2008. The Equal Employment Opportunities Commission explains the impact as follows: “to make it easier for an individual seeking protection under the ADA to establish that he or she has a disability within the meaning of the ADA.”³⁵ It broadens coverage for individuals seeking accommodation and “generally shall not require extensive analysis.”³⁶

One person in Portland who works on reasonable accommodation explained:

*The point of the ADA amendments in 2008 was that employers are not supposed to dig into the trenches to examine medical histories, but rather to provide accommodation as and when needed.*³⁷

The BHR Survey data on disability revealed some interesting findings with respect to reasonable accommodation. Of the 149 persons with disabilities who self-disclosed, 52 individuals (roughly 1/3 of those who disclosed) indicated they’d requested reasonable accommodation. Thirty-three individuals indicated they’d received full or partial accommodation, indicated requesters received accommodation at a rate of approximately 64%.

Table 3: Requests and approvals by bureau (BHR Survey)³⁸

Bureau	Number of requests	Number approved	Approval percentage
BDS	5	4	80%
BES	5	4	80%
City Hall	1	1	100%

³³ Notes from key informant interview, 2016.

³⁴ CRPD, Article 5 (3).

³⁵ https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/statutes/adaaa_info.cfm

³⁶ https://www.eeoc.gov/laws/statutes/adaaa_info.cfm

³⁷ Notes from key informant interview, 2016.

³⁸ While the small sample sizes prohibit reliable statistical analysis, substantial differences in the approval rate are evident.

Fire	2	1	50%
OMF	8	8	100%
Other small bureaus	6	3	50%
Parks	1	1	100%
PBOT	11	6	54%
Police	4	2	50%
Water	9	3	33%
Totals	52	33	63.5%

The BHR Survey respondents also indicated reasons for not making requests.

Table 4: Why don't people make requests for accommodation? (BHR Survey)

Reason why accommodation not requested	Count
I did not want to disclose	37
I feared request would be denied	30
I did not know I could ask	21
I did not know what I needed	20
I did not need a request	12
Cost	7
I feared further harassment	1
<i>Total</i>	128 ³⁹

Several things jump out: first, over half (67) of the responses reflect a culture of fear and self-censoring, while nearly a third of respondents (41) expressed a gap in knowledge about the process or about options to address their functional limitations. Second, better communication and more expertise within BHR could overcome the knowledge gap. Once BHR is able to ensure more consistency in considering requests, more responsiveness in terms of processing, and higher rates of approving requests, employees should be less reluctant to make requests.

Anecdotal data shows that the process is slow and unsatisfactory. One interviewee, Frank⁴⁰, stated directly that he is retiring because his reasonable accommodation request (for flexible hours to enable him to schedule doctor's appointments) was denied. Another, Mary, stated that it took at least three months to request and get dictation software. Mary mentioned that she was required to do much of the legwork in terms of identifying the appropriate software, and that the software was installed a full month after it was ordered. She estimated her work capacity was at 50% - 75% during this time. The cost of the accommodation, at 500 dollars, was significantly less than the cost of her lowered productivity during that time. A third interviewee, Sally, mentioned that her request wasn't processed for several weeks despite several follow up calls to BTS, and it was only set in motion once Sally's supervisor complained and stated explicitly that the failure to respond constituted a violation of the ADA.

³⁹ Numbers don't add to 149 because some people identified more than one answer, and some skipped this question.

⁴⁰ All names are pseudonyms to ensure confidentiality.

Interviewees repeatedly mentioned inconsistencies in processing reasonable accommodation requests. Some types of requests appear to be handled more easily and readily than others. The 2016 interviews revealed that non-disabled persons are able to make some types of requests (sit stand desks, dual monitors) without delving deeply into their medical histories, as one example.⁴¹ This appears to be the case for many ergonomic related requests, which are quite common and are seen as preventative measures. It should not be easier for non-disabled persons to make these types of requests than for disabled persons. Two HRBPs mentioned that in their view persons with disabilities are less likely to request accommodation due to these hurdles (looking at medical history) than non-disabled persons. This means that persons with disabilities, who have legitimate claims and need support to perform the essential functions of the jobs, are placed at a disadvantage.

In the key informant interviews it has been posited that management/supervisors may have a skeptical attitude towards persons who don't want to or aren't able to work eight hours a day. More flexibility in terms of working hours is likely to make the City more attractive for persons with disabilities. A related barrier is that mid-entry level positions may have less flexible schedules. Since persons with disabilities are more likely to enter the workforce at these levels, this disproportionately affects them. Physical adjustments to facilitate capacity to carry out essential job functions are seen as less contentious or more acceptable than requests by persons with disabilities to work less or more flexible hours (for reasons of reasonable accommodation). While it is recognized there are operational barriers with certain jobs to accommodate flexible hours that is not the case for all city jobs. It may take more time for managers and supervisors to become more accustomed to and accept the legitimacy of such requests.

Two common myths about reasonable accommodation concern the large number of people with disabilities who need accommodation, and the high cost of accommodation. These myths may explain why managers/supervisors approve fewer accommodation requests. It is important to dispel the myths. First, the majority of workers with disabilities actually do not need accommodations.⁴² Second, the majority of accommodations are not costly. One study reports, "56% of accommodations cost less than \$600, with many costing nothing at all. Employers also report that accommodations paid for employees WITH disabilities typically cost only \$320 more than what they would have paid for an employee WITHOUT a disability who was in the same position."⁴³ The City of Portland's Budget office also confirmed: "reasonable accommodation requests, while not tracked specifically as such, have not presented a significant financial impact over the last several years."⁴⁴ Supervisors have been perceived to deny legitimate requests to ensure persons with disabilities cannot perform their essential job functions (which then gives the grounds for their dismissal).

Clearly, there is room for improvement. The Federal Government's Job Accommodation Network (a very valuable resource for guidance on accommodation) advises employers to view

⁴¹ One employee in the Mayor's office mentioned this explicitly, and other non-disabled persons indicated they'd had direct first-hand experience with this, or had seen others get certain accommodation without going through the interactive process.

⁴² http://www.oregon.gov/DHS/EMPLOYMENT/EMPLOYMENT-FIRST/Documents/5_myths_and_facts.pdf

⁴³ http://www.oregon.gov/DHS/EMPLOYMENT/EMPLOYMENT-FIRST/Documents/5_myths_and_facts.pdf

⁴⁴ Email communication from 8 June 2016. (on file with the author).

the definition of disability broadly, and recommends that employers “err on the side of caution and process the accommodation request. Accommodations are not typically costly and the benefits usually far outweigh the costs.”⁴⁵

MAS Consulting recommends funding the position of an Accommodations Coordinator to change the culture of fear and self-censorship around issues of reasonable accommodation. The Accommodations Coordinator will make employees aware that accommodation can be requested at any time, ensure that the request process is easy to understand, that requests are processed in a timely manner and that an appeals mechanism is in place (through the Accommodations Coordinator). The CRPD states clearly that the denial of reasonable accommodation (unless it would cause an undue burden) constitutes discrimination on the basis of disability.⁴⁶

The City of Seattle has had a centralized Accommodations Coordinator focusing on Title I issues since 1991. That person works with point persons in each Bureau, each of whom is responsible for fielding accommodations requests from within their bureaus. The Accommodations Coordinator focuses on capacity building and providing technical support when the bureau point people need additional assistance. In Seattle employees make requests to the bureau point people in the first instance, and those point persons serve as intermediaries between the person with the disability who makes the request and their supervisor. The Seattle Accommodations Coordinator advised that if the City of Portland approves this strategic plan, then the Accommodations Coordinator should have a similar capacity building role for bureau point people.

C. Employees with disabilities have opportunities

It is important for employees with disabilities to receive support in the form of training opportunities and career advancement. The CRPD obliges jurisdictions to “[p]romote employment opportunities and career advancement for persons with disabilities in the labour market, as well as assistance in finding, obtaining, maintaining and returning to employment.”⁴⁷ The CRPD further obliges jurisdictions to “[e]nable persons with disabilities to have effective access to general technical and vocational guidance programmes, placement services and vocational and continuing training.”⁴⁸

The MAS survey respondents identified “targeted career development opportunities” as the third most important actions, so it would be important for City to support job-seekers with disabilities and employees with disabilities by providing opportunities for advancement.

As part of the “Employer of Choice” initiative, the City is currently taking stock of different programs (which vary significantly from bureau to bureau) that are designed to “attract, develop and retain” a diverse workforce. This objectives and activities of this strategic plan fit

⁴⁵ <https://askjan.org/corner/vol05iss04.htm> (emphasis in the original).

⁴⁶ Making the workplace more accessible through ADA Transition Plan is a Title II issue. The obligation to act to identify and remove barriers is not dependent on any individual’s claim. Improvements in accessibility affect all users. Reasonable accommodation is a Title I issue. Failing to provide reasonable accommodation is discriminatory. The Department of Justice has suggested that large entities should have been setting aside funds to cover reasonable accommodation, and thus implied the cost of accommodation cannot be used to declare an accommodation a burden.

⁴⁷ CRPD, Article 27 (1) (e)

⁴⁸ CRPD, Article 27 (1) (d)

seamlessly with that initiative, and it would be important for the Employer of Choice initiative to collect and track data on employees with disabilities, and to ensure that they have opportunities through mainstreaming activities as well as through stand-alone activities explicitly for them.

Part II: Recommended Actions to Meet Objectives

This part outlines the main responsibilities of each bureau. In contrast, part three presents actions by objective (in table format). Presenting the information both ways will ensure clarity about the roles and responsibilities of each bureau specifically, and also clarify how the work is integrated.

Bureau of Human Resources

Given its history with the Model Employer Resolution, and the administrative focus of this plan, BHR is the lead for implementing this strategic plan, but other bureaus need to play a significant supporting role. BHR should take the lead in implementing all the objectives, with the exception of Objective Two. It is recognized meeting all of the objectives in this plan will require additional resources.

Actions to meet objective I - Organizational Commitment and Leadership

A. Awareness of Elected Officials and Bureau Directors Increased

1. Form a task force or working group to guide implementation of the plan

The “employer of choice” initiative has benefited from a cross-bureau working group that has helped to form and guide the work of that initiative. A similar type of working group would be useful to support the implementation of this strategic plan. Representatives should include policy level staff from OEHR, ONI, Parks, BTS, BES and ideally the office of one of the Commissioners and /or the Mayor’s office.

2. Ensure Elected Officials and Bureau Directors are aware of the Model Employer Resolution and this strategic plan

Two City Commissioners specifically mentioned that one way to make the Model Employer Resolution a priority would be “to increase awareness about the abysmal rate of employment.”⁴⁹ Thus, BHR should ensure the new Mayor and new Commissioners and Bureau Directors are informed about the Model Employer Resolution and this strategic plan through inclusion of information in their orientation binders; and that current Bureau Directors are informed of their commitments to implement the Model Employer Resolution through this strategic plan.

3. Present the business case for hiring persons with disabilities

Draft (as a brief brochure) and disseminate to Bureau Directors and hiring managers “a business case” for hiring persons with disabilities. This would emphasize the benefits of a more diverse workforce, including more closely representing the city as a whole; and also would recognize that as the workforce ages there will be more employees who acquire disabilities and may need accommodation to continue their level of productivity;

4. Introduce disability specific content into the bias awareness trainings of BHR;

⁴⁹ Notes from key informant interviews with two Commissioners, 2016

The Portland Commission on Disability (PCOD) and an Employees with Disabilities Affinity Group (EDAG, once it is established) can be enlisted to provide feedback to BHR on inclusion of disability in the bias awareness and cultural competency training. In addition, it should be possible to communicate with non-management employees about disability and reasonable accommodation. This could be done as part of the onboarding curriculum, for example.

5. Develop/revise and provide trainings on disability and reasonable accommodation

These trainings on reasonable accommodation should be provided to senior management and staff within BHR, and ideally should be co-facilitated by person with a disability.

B. Improved data on disability

In 2015 the United Nation’s Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) concluded, and were supplanted by the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs; also called “the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development”). While the MDGs did not contain any references to persons with disabilities, the SDGs have identified persons with disabilities as an important target, both directly as well as indirectly as a subset of the broader category of persons in vulnerable situations. SDG 8 considers the issue of economic development, employment, and “decent work for all.” Target 8.5 indicates the aim to “achieve full and productive employment and decent work” for all, including persons with disabilities. As an indicator, governments are to report on the unemployment rate, disaggregated for persons with and without disabilities.

In March 2014 new regulations to Section 503 of the Rehabilitation Act became effective. The regulations establish a 7% workforce composition target for all contractors with the Federal government. The regulations also require contractors “document and update annually several quantitative comparisons for the number of IWDs who apply for jobs and the number of IWDs they hire.”⁵⁰

1. To improve accountability of the City to this regulation demographic surveys should be prepared and disseminated – every two or three years (rolled in with existing surveys, not as a stand-alone survey), asking employees, inter alia, if they’d like to self-disclose. Those who disclose voluntarily could also be asked about accommodation requirements. The initial survey could be considered a benchmark for the City. It would also provide an opportunity for an additional conversation about reasonable accommodation. Surveys in subsequent years would then be able to track progress towards a more representative workforce, and would enable employees to disclose any updates to their disability status in a relatively stigma-free manner.

2. EEO AAPs could reference and identify actions to be taken to support individuals with disabilities and other individuals who may be under-represented. Plans should not just reiterate boilerplate language (that is simply a recitation of what is legally required). While the EEO AAPs track under-utilization for persons of color and women, there is no tracking of under-utilization for persons with disabilities. Such tracking should be instituted, if possible, while recognizing that individuals with disabilities are also part of City’s other diverse communities.

C. Equity plans make use of intersectional lens

⁵⁰ <https://www.dol.gov/ofccp/regs/compliance/section503.htm>

OEHR, should consider broadening of the Equity Plans to be inclusive of and address all forms of oppression (i.e. not just race or disability). Interviews with at least five Bureau Directors, several members of different equity committees, and equity managers revealed that there is significant interest in broadening the scope of the equity plans that bureaus are preparing currently.⁵¹ As one Bureau Director mentioned, “we look at race and gender for under-utilization, there is no reason we shouldn’t do that for people with disabilities as well.”⁵² One member of an Equity Committee stated they wanted to broaden the plan to look at all issues. We know we need to do more.”⁵³

An intersectional lens adds to, rather than diminishes the power of leading with race. Incidence of disabilities is more prevalent in some communities of color, including African Americans. Disabled persons of color face more challenges and barriers than whites with disabilities, and thus the City needs to reach and create opportunities for those individuals. “Leading with race” should not exclude other forms of oppression (gender, sexual orientation, transgender, and persons with disabilities).

D. Support for innovation and inclusion of persons with developmental disabilities

1. Explore customized opportunities following example of OHSU and/or City of Seattle

Over the past year Oregon Health and Sciences University (OHSU) affirmed their commitment to promote employment of persons with disabilities and undertook several major actions to realize that commitment. They formed a “Community Advisory Council for Recruiting and Retaining Persons with Disabilities” (Advisory Council) to answer to two central questions: “1) how can we make the workplace more accessible? and 2) how can we increase the number of persons employed by [OHSU]?” The Advisory Council guided a visioning and prioritization process. At the top of their list was the exploration of opportunities for persons with disabilities. They started by engaging hiring managers, talking with them to imagine how positions could be altered and job duties could be bundled together and customized specifically for persons with disabilities. They developed “job-carving”, which is an analysis of work duties performed in a given job and identifying specific tasks that could be performed by a person with a disability on a part-time basis. OHSU also worked with AFSCME to earn seniority in such positions, placing these employees in a more competitive position for job bidding. As their pilot, they created six positions, and are currently in the process of interviewing persons with disabilities, and training job coaches (paid for by Vocational Rehabilitation) to support each new hire.

OHSU has shared their experiences with the BHR director and BHR staff, and initial discussions have been held with the Parks Bureau to customize positions through a similar process. BHR, the Parks Bureau Equity Committee, and the Parks Bureau Employee Disability Task Force will be able to seek guidance from OHSU on possibilities for job customization, partnerships with

⁵¹ Notes from key informant interviews, 2016. Bureaus have expressed an interest in looking at sexual orientation, disability, gender (including transgender), and immigrant/refugee status in addition to race/ethnicity. This interest can and should be supported, while bureaus continue to lead with race.

⁵² Notes from key informant interview with Bureau Director, 2016.

⁵³ Notes from key informant interview with Bureau Equity Committee member, 2016.

organizations to hire persons with disabilities, and training for job coaches and mentoring for newly hired employees with disabilities.

The City of Seattle's Supported Employment Program (described above on pages 14-15) can also be used as a resource for support / inspiration.

Actions to meet objective II - Community Access and Partnerships

ONI is identified as the lead for including persons with disabilities in the leadership academies. The City needs to explore partnerships with the community, perhaps lead by OEHR and PCOD.

Actions to meet objective III - Outreach and Recruitment

A. Outreach leads to increase in new hires

It is important to create a new Targeted Outreach position (.5 FTE) to be responsible (through intersectional lens) for targeted outreach for persons with disabilities.

The HR Senior Analyst responsible for the Targeted Outreach program has facilitated the recruitment and hiring of 82 persons of color since 2011.⁵⁴ Though persons with disabilities are under-utilized, they are not particularly prioritized as part of targeted outreach, in part due to a lack of resources. Targeted Outreach is a time intensive undertaking. Since the hiring rate has not increased since the Model Employer Resolution was adopted, the creation of an additional .5 FTE position within the Targeted Outreach program in BHR to include a focus on persons with disabilities is recommended.

Addition of this position would allow BHR to begin to focus on specific tracking of persons with disabilities through the recruitment process. A baseline could be established from data from 2015-2016, looking at the following information:

- The number of individuals with disabilities and protected vets who applied for jobs
- The number of applicants for all jobs (total)
- The number of job openings / jobs filled (total)
- The number of individuals with disabilities and protected vets hired
- The number of applicants hired (total)

The targeted outreach position would also enable BHR to gather information on State Agencies, including Oregon Commission of the Blind (OCB), Office of Developmental Disabilities Services (which has funds and targets to assist persons with disabilities to gain employment), Oregon Department of Human Services (Employment First Program), Oregon Vocational Rehabilitation, Oregon Health Authority (for mental health users), Work Systems, and

⁵⁴ Notes from interview with Diane Avery, 24 March 2016.

Worksource Oregon⁵⁵, and to share that information with Bureaus to use in their recruitment efforts.

Finally the targeted outreach position would be a resource to provide to Bureaus the websites/contacts for agencies and organizations that host job fairs that target applicants with disabilities;

B. Information on employment is accessible

1. Bureaus, in collaboration with ONI and OEHR, ensure that public facing digital content is fully accessible for persons with all kinds of disabilities;⁵⁶
2. Bureaus, in collaboration with ONI and OEHR, work to develop a deeper understanding of Title II requirements specifically for persons with mental health histories and persons with intellectual or developmental disabilities;
3. Bureaus ensure that all videos are captioned.

C. Recruitment and tracking of applications is improved

1. In collaboration with all bureaus, include a statement in vacancy announcements that commits to making available any application materials in alternative formats (Braille, large print, or accessible digital formats) per any individual applicant's request.
2. The Diversity Outreach and Employment Resources (DOER) program area in BHR include a question in their checklist that asks applicants if they need reasonable accommodation and the type of accommodation they prefer. DOER would coordinate with the Accommodation Coordinator to ensure the accommodation is provided in advance of next stage of application (*for example, a sign language interpreter to be available at the interview stage*).
3. DOER and / or Bureau Subject Matter Experts to track (in aggregate) the number of applicants who disclose voluntarily they are persons with disabilities at the time of application to establish a baseline (*this will help determine if the barrier to employment is the lack of applications from persons with disabilities or if it is due to barriers at other stages in the hiring process, or if it is more common for people to disclose at later stages*). When gathering the voluntary information on persons who disclose, it is important to note whether the individuals have also disclosed any reasonable accommodation they may need to fulfill job functions;
- 4.. A standard practice DOER and Bureau Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) to track applicants not only by race **or** gender but by race **and** gender.⁵⁷ As part of this more intersectional tracking, BHR could begin to track by disability as well. For example:

⁵⁵ See <http://www.worksystems.org/> ; <http://www.worksourceoregon.org/> and <http://www.oregonworkready.com/>

⁵⁶ The website: <https://www.w3.org/WAI/intro/wcag> contains technical guidelines on website content accessibility and should be consulted and followed by all bureaus.

⁵⁷ While this can be done, bureaus appear to not realize the possibility of obtaining this level of data. So, it may be a question of making sure bureaus know this, and making this information available as a standard practice.

	Female	Male	Trans
White	10 (1)	20 (0)	
African-American	15 (0)	10 (1)	1 (1)
Etc...			

BHR could place in parentheses the number of applicants from within that category who are persons with disabilities.

D. Applications from persons with disabilities are given due consideration

1. BHR in conjunction with PCOD and OHSU to give targeted trainings to HRBPs, SMEs, and hiring managers on the importance of hiring persons with disabilities.
2. The targeted outreach position could begin to vet persons with disabilities and keep database for potential job openings (similar to the current focused outreach position that assists persons of color). When suitable / appropriate positions are open, proactively contact those who have been vetted and meet the experiences / requirements of the job to encourage them to apply;
3. Once the Charles Jordan standard has been in force for a year, assess the number of persons with disabilities who have applied and been interviewed for director level positions.
4. Once the Charles Jordan standard has been in force for a year, review the legal implications and consider proposing an amendment to the Model Employer Resolution (or a new resolution) that would expand the Charles Jordan standard for all positions (not just director positions);
5. Support ongoing effort by BHR to review classification specifications to ensure the duties noted as essential meet that definition and that unnecessary duties and qualifications that create barriers are removed. Remove boiler plate text on “physical and mental demands” from classification specification.
6. For interview panels encourage representation of persons with disabilities (not only when interviewing people with disabilities, rather when interviewing all new hires). Ideally these should be employees to avoid the appearance of tokenism.

E. Support with onboarding

1. HRBPs to ensure that disability components are added to new hire checklists. Consider making an ADA assessment automatically part of the onboarding unless the employee opts out of the assessment (to identify supports);
2. Bureaus create a mechanism to ensure that any / all requested accommodations are in place whenever possible before the new hire’s first day of work, and that during first day of work the

new hire has time to go over the accommodations with the relevant bureau point person to adjust accommodations, as needed.

Actions to meet objective IV - Create a Supportive Environment

A. Information and communication is inclusive

1. BHR to host fairs that highlight innovations and reasonable accommodation options;
2. BHR, together with Bureau Liaisons (this refers to the bureau employees responsible for Title I), can make information about the process more readily available, including information about types of accommodation available. This could include profiling some individuals who have requested and received accommodation, documenting how the accommodation has helped them to carry out the essential functions of their jobs. This could serve to inform and inspire others to make similar requests, and could be shared as brief brochures to raise awareness amongst employees with similar impairments about the options that exist.⁵⁸
- 3.. Ensure employees with disabilities know about complementary programs:
 - a. Bureau Liaisons ensure that employees receive updates about the Employer Assistance Programs;
 - b. BHR Accommodations Coordinator and FMLA Program Coordinator to discuss the below topics with BIBS staff who assist bureaus with paperwork, if requested, for the Preferred Worker Program (PWP) and Employer-at-Injury Program (EAIP):
 1. The BHR Accommodations Coordinator could assist bureaus in reaching out to the State of Oregon's PWP personnel to develop a process whereby PWP eligible persons across the state are given notice of job vacancies with the City.
 2. The BHR Accommodations Coordinator could identify the assistance programs that may be best for different employees in need of support to carry out their essential job functions;
 3. The BHR Accommodations Coordinator could develop strategies for optimizing use of those programs by employees with disabilities and new hires, and make suggestions for reducing the paperwork burden (which is perceived by some to be a barrier);
 4. The BHR Accommodations Coordinator could work with bureau point persons to create a database to track the inventory of accommodation equipment/assistive devices in use by City Employees (to gain knowledge about what accommodations work best and also enable re-assignment once a staff member using accommodations separates from the City);
 5. The BHR Accommodations Coordinator could keep a centralized city-wide list of employees hired through the PWP. Risk Management can assist

⁵⁸ Notes from key informant interview with Bureau Director, 2016

bureaus in recovering all funds due under the program and pursue recovery of funds paid out on a claim for any preferred worker who suffers an injury/occupational disease within the first three years.

B. Reasonable accommodation is provided in a timely manner

1. Create a new position of Accommodations Coordinator, similar to position of FMLA Coordinator within BHR (if funding approved for one FTE).

The Accommodations Coordinator would have several main tasks: a) training HR Business Partners and Bureau liaisons on reasonable accommodation best practices; b) ensuring BHR tracks all requests [*per mechanism described below*], that procedures are followed consistently and that data on reasonable accommodation is compiled and reviewed; c) ensuring that accommodations are effectively implemented and that support on their use, if needed, is provided; d) maintaining information on the inventory of available accommodation related materials in the City (for example, making sure that materials no longer in use are returned to central repositories); e) researching and testing any new technologies that may be assist persons with disabilities to carry out the essential functions of their jobs.

Centralizing the intake process would enable BHR and City Elected Officials to hold Bureaus accountable.

2. Centralizing request process for reasonable accommodation

A new mechanism could be introduced, whereby employees initiate requests for accommodation with BHR in the first instance, with the option of notifying their supervisor. Supervisors would no longer be the primary decision-maker with regard to reasonable accommodation requests. Instead, decisions would be made jointly by the Accommodations Coordinator, in consultation with the supervisor in question, the HRBPs and bureau director. This would enable BHR to track requests, compile data and monitor the timeliness of responses. Tracking would include the types of support requested, what is approved, timeliness of response, documentation of denials, to what extent denials lead to ADA and other EEO complaints, and the development of standards (what requests can be approved without medical documentation). This approach would follow the successful centralization of FMLA, which was implemented in 2007. Once a decision is made about the reasonableness of the request, then the supervisor and employee would discuss and agree on the specifics.

The Accommodations Coordinator would serve as an independent reviewer, and thus would be empowered to consider any appeals, and could over-turn the denial of reasonable accommodation. This would reduce the City's liability (from potential lawsuits) and ensure consistency in accommodation of employees with disabilities..

Consider PCOD and EDAG reviewing BHR training on reasonable accommodation. While the two central points of the training are to describe the request process and to assure requesters that "the City accommodates", the BHR Survey and informant interviews show a gap between the City's intent and the City's practice. Revisions to the training should align with guidance from the CRPD and the Department of Justice (*where approval is the rule, not the exception, and the emphasis is on providing solutions to mitigate against functional limitations rather than*

examining medical histories), introduce the above new mechanism, and emphasize the availability of solutions. It would be important to clarify the duties of the employer, explain the obligations of the employer to follow the interactive process even if the request appears to not be reasonable or if there is no accommodation available to enable the person to perform the essential functions. The training should clarify when and how the City’s ADA forms are to be used or not.

3. *Guidance to other bureaus*

BHR to provide guidance to bureaus with respect to reasonable accommodation/process through training and regular communications;

4. *Single requests for ongoing accommodation support*

Bureau Liaisons to ensure that persons who have ongoing reasonable accommodation needs, are required only once to submit a formal request.

5. *Alternative formats*

Bureau Liaisons to proactively make available materials in alternative formats (Braille, large print, or accessible digital formats) for employees who are blind or have low vision. Many websites already provide guidance and resources on technological supports. For example, Portland Community College offers the following: <http://www.pcc.edu/resources/instructional-support/access/>

6. *Exit interviews*

Encourage consistent use of exit interviews, with questions on disability and reasonable accommodation included.

C. Employees with disabilities have opportunities

BHR can play a role in promoting employment opportunities and career advancement for current City employees through the “Employee Development and Learning” sphere of the Employer of Choice initiative. Much of this work, though, will need to be bureau specific, and will depend on the specific needs, skills and plans of employees with disabilities.

Mayor and City Commissioners

Actions to meet objective I – Organizational Commitment and Leadership

A. Awareness of Commissioners and Bureau Directors is increased

1. *Communicate the importance of this strategic plan to the Bureau Directors under their purview*

Commissioners to communicate to Bureau Directors about how and why disability employment is a priority (this could include drafting and disseminating a brief on the business case for hiring persons with disabilities, sharing data on low rate of employment of persons with disabilities);

2. Hold bureaus accountable for employment of all under-represented populations and to report on provision of reasonable accommodation

Commissioners to require bureaus to report on employment of all under-utilized groups (including, but not limited to race, gender, and persons with disabilities) and accommodation requests and actions. The BHR survey revealed significant variation in bureaus' approval rates of requests for accommodation. Some bureaus approved all requests, whereas the approval rating for the worst performing bureau was 33%.

Support for innovation

1. With Commissioner Fish support pilot collaboration with Project Search

Commissioner Fish has met with Project Search several times to discuss the possibility of creating an internship program for persons with developmental disabilities. The .5 FTE Outreach Coordinator (if approved) in BHR could assist in this effort and share findings once it has been set up. The City of Seattle's Supported Employment program (operated out of their Department of Human Resources) and State of Oregon agencies can provide guidance to Commissioner Fish's office and BHR on steps to operationalize a program for persons with developmental disabilities.

Actions to meet objective II – Community Access and Partnerships

A. Full access to programs and services

1. Empower the ADA Title II Coordinator to monitor more closely and in conjunction with bureau liaisons, implementation of the ADA Transition Plans to ensure that actions are taken in compliance with the ADA. Commissioners to hold bureaus to account for missing deadlines or non-implementation of ADA Transition Plans.
- 2.. Commissioners to ask Bureau Directors to report on Title II requests and funds spent to enable community members with disability to participate on an equal basis with others.

Office of Equity and Human Rights

The Office of Equity and Human Rights provides education and technical support to City staff and elected officials, leading to recognition and removal of systemic barriers to fair and just distribution of resources, access and opportunity, starting with issues of race and disability.⁵⁹

Equity is realized when identity – such as race, ethnicity, gender, age, disability, or sexual orientation – has no detrimental effect on the distribution of resources, opportunities, and outcomes for group members in a society.⁶⁰

⁵⁹ OEHR Mission Statement..

⁶⁰ Racial equity user manual, page 3

OEHR’s mission and definition of equity make it clear that equity is a much broader concept than just racial equity or disability equity. International human rights law, through their core treaties and through the work of treaty bodies, have embraced the principle of the indivisibility and inter-connectedness of all human rights, and the importance of non-discrimination across all identity markers. Persons of color and persons with disabilities certainly experience different outcomes based on other identity markers, including (but not limited to) gender, LGBTQ status, and migrant status.

OEHR’s role for the Model Employer Resolution is defined through the Portland Plan and its role with the Portland Commission on Disability. The Portland Plan tasks OEHR with tracking and sharing, with the City’s partners and the general public, information on disparities experienced by persons with disabilities (and other marginalized groups). Further, the Portland Plan advises OEHR to invite “self-identified communities to provide information and sources unique to them. Explore building metrics related to well-being and equity.”

PCOD, which operates under OEHR, and BHR brought the Model Employer Resolution to Council. The Model Employer Resolution obliges the City to work “in partnership with the Commission, to developing, implementing and evaluating a strategic plan for increasing the City's employment of persons with disabilities.”⁶¹

In annual reports to Council OEHR recognized the Model Employer Resolution as a “significant change” and noted its “influence” and “collaboration” with BHR that enabled it to be adopted by Council.⁶² OEHR further noted as an achievement that it “continues work on the resolution making the City a Model Employer of People with Disability.”⁶³ It is very important for OEHR to be a partner to BHR in implementing this strategic plan.

Actions to meet objective I – Organizational Commitment and Leadership

A. Awareness of Commissioners and Bureau Directors is increased

- 1.. OEHR, as the bureau responsible for supporting different employee affinity groups, should facilitate the creation of an Employees with Disabilities Affinity Group (EDAG);
2. OEHR Program Coordinator, in collaboration with BHR,PCOD, ONI, and employee disability affinity group, to develop a training for senior management on disability, and the importance of an intersectional lens through which to consider equity.

B. Improved Data on Disability

⁶¹ Model Employer Resolution, page 8

⁶² OEHR Annual Report 2012-2013, page 2

⁶³ OEHR Annual Report 2012-2013, page 8

3. OEHR should devise a strategy and plan for tracking data on disparities for persons with disabilities and other marginalized groups as per the Portland Plan, and to report on developments to Portland Plan partners and the general public.

C. Equity plans make Use of intersectional lens

As mentioned earlier, OEHR could operationalize a broader frame for its racial equity plans based on its definition of equity and its mission. Broadening the scope of those plans would not be limited to inclusion of persons with disabilities, rather it would introduce an intersectional lens that acknowledges the multiple identity markers we all have, and would work to identify and address the ways in which persons experience discrimination.

Actions to meet objective II – Community Access and Partnerships

A. Full Access to Programs and Services

1. Ensure that organizations and community groups know the process for making ADA Title II accommodation requests specific to any individual; Standardize form for community members to request an accommodation to attend event or take part in a City program or service;
2. Establish a mechanism to track the funds each bureau earmarks to cover costs of all ADA Title II requests (for accommodation to enable community participation). Since this would enable oversight, this would reduce the likelihood that reasonable accommodation requests are denied.

Parks and Recreation Bureau

The Parks bureau has drafted an “Affirmation of Equity” statement, has an Accessibility Advisory Committee, an Equity Manager and Equity Committee, and employees in Parks have begun to convene, in collaboration with BHR, an Employee Disability Task Force to consider steps that can be taken to recruit and bring on board more persons with disabilities. Parks bureau has also signaled an interest in OHSU’s job customization process, as described above [Objective 1, component D. 1]. Parks and Recreation could also benefit from guidance from the City of Seattle’s Supported Employment program.

If BHR and the Parks Bureau engage in a pilot program to develop and implement a job customization program, this could be complemented by a review, within the Parks Bureau only, of the return to work programs (Preferred Worker Program and Employer at Injury Program) that are part of Worker’s Compensation. Data shows that they generate positive outcomes for both workers and employers, and thus it is important for the City to ensure that these programs are utilized by all employees who might benefit from them.

Office of Neighborhood Involvement

Actions to meet objective II – Community Access and Partnerships

A. Full access to programs and services

1. Coordinate with ADA Title II Coordinator to ensure that organizations of persons with disabilities and the organizations that serve them are aware of events that are organized, that venues are fully accessible, and the availability of accessible information about technologies and other forms of assistance, including digital content;

B. Persons with disabilities included in leadership academies

2. ONI should take the lead on a leadership academy for persons with disabilities. This could be done in collaboration with different independent living resource centers, the Oregon Council on Developmental Disabilities, Oregon Commission for the Blind, Disability Rights Oregon and other organizations;

C. New opportunities for persons with disabilities

1. Encourage existing partnerships, such as the one that OGR has with New Leadership Oregon (which focuses on training women on politics), to be inclusive of persons with disabilities who are part of their target audience.

2. Apprenticeship program with ONI for PSU and / or PCC students with disabilities.

Actions to meet objective IV – Create a Supportive Environment

B. Reasonable accommodation is processed in a timely manner

1. ONI to train and have on call a team of persons who would be available to provide mental health peer support or accompaniment. This could start as anonymous call line for persons who need mental health support, with the ability to have a peer support person to accompany individuals as needed. This would be led by the ONI Mental Health Specialist.

Other specific bureaus, offices and programs

New Portland Program

The New Portlander Program should include representational percentage of persons with disabilities in their work (both as staff and as persons who participate in their programs).

Bureau of Technology Services

1. A new process is being put in place for handling exception requests at BTS. The form for making requests will be revised to include a question on ADA, which will then trigger expedited processing within BTS, and can be used to improve reporting.
2. BTS has expressed an interest in proactively identifying software that may be commonly requested due to ADA related needs, and to no longer require those to be processed as exception requests (i.e. to test their compatibility and to then place them in the standards catalogue). This would then no longer require anyone to declare that the request is for ADA related reasons.

New opportunities for persons with disabilities

Encourage existing partnerships with organizations to be inclusive of persons with disabilities. Specific opportunities will vary significantly from bureau to bureau, but should include consideration of (paid) internships, apprenticeships, job training, and partnerships with community organizations.

Outreach leads to an increase in new hires

The gap of between the number of persons with disabilities (of all races and genders) in the community and the number of employees with disabilities who work for the City is significantly greater than gaps according to race or gender. While BHR is the main bureau for driving change through raising awareness on this gap and initiating other actions per this strategic plan, it is important for Bureau Directors to recognize this gap.

Reasonable accommodation is provided in a timely manner

Larger bureaus may want to consider following the example of BES and create a mechanism for pooling and supporting requests for reasonable accommodation. BES calls this mechanism the Group Resource User Management Persons (GRUMPs). GRUMPs has been in place for over ten years and is used to facilitate communication between BES employees (who have particular administrative needs) and the Technical Business Consultants (TBCs) employed by BTS. It is broader with respect to the number of people who can use the mechanism (it does not have to be medically necessary), while it is narrower with respect to breadth of requests, which are limited to monitors, computers, software, and other technical equipment.

Bureaus should be open to multiple options including teleworking and flexible hours where appropriate for the work to be performed.

Measures for all bureaus

Newly hired employees with disabilities (and those returning from injury) could be supported through a number of different programs, including through job coaches (agencies such as Oregon Commission of Blind make this option available), job shadowing, training and skill development opportunities, one-on-one mentoring, developmental assignments, and tuition reimbursement.

Part III: Integrated monitoring plan for strategic plan

Objective #1: Demonstrate Organizational Commitment and Leadership				Annual Timelines (six monthly)										Targets or indicators
				Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5		
Results	Key Activities	Persons Responsible		1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	
A. Awareness of Commissioners and Bureau Directors Increased	Form a task force or team with representatives of each of key bureaus to guide implementation	BHR – Action A1												Team convened, defines scope of work, and meets on regular basis to review progress
	Provide information in new orientation binders on model resolution and this strategic plan	BHR – Action A2												Placement in binders is made standard practice
	Develop and present the business case for hiring persons with disabilities (include information about the rate of employment for persons with disabilities)	BHR – Action A3												Document is drafted, disseminated, and updated on regular basis
	Revise Bias Training to be inclusive of disability	BHR – Action A4												Training is revised; BHR tracks # of persons who attend trainings
	Revise training on reasonable accommodation provided to senior management	BHR and OEHR – Action A5												Training is revised; BHR tracks # of persons who attend trainings
	Communicate importance of this plan to Bureau Directors and hold bureaus to account for all under-utilized populations	Commissioners – Action A6												Bureaus establish baseline, from which point tracking can begin
	Require Bureau Directors to report on reasonable accommodation data	Commissioners – Action A7												Targets used by Federal government are adopted by bureaus

EXHIBIT A

Objective #2: Facilitate Community Access and Partnerships				Annual Timelines (six monthly)										Targets or indicators
				Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5		
Results	Key Activities	Persons Responsible	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2		
A	Persons with disabilities have full access to all programs and services of the City	ADA Title II Coordinator streamlines and standardizes request and tracking processes, coordinates with ADA liaisons	OEHR Action A1										Process standardized; # requests tracked	
		ADA Title II Coordinator and bureau liaisons track and report on number of requests for accommodation, funds spent	OEHR Action A2										Bureau liaisons track and report on # accommodation requests; # fulfilled	
		Monitor implementation of ADA Transition Plans to ensure bureaus meet deadlines	Commissioners Action A3											Bureaus report on ADA transition plan implementation
		Commissioners to require Bureau Directors to report on Title II requests and funds spent to accommodate those requests	Commissioners Action A4											Bureaus report on Title II requests and funds expended
B	Persons with disabilities are included in all leadership academies	Race and gender leadership academies have a proportional representation of persons with disabilities	ONI and OEHR Action B1										Percentage of persons with disabilities who participate in academies	
		A new leadership academy is established for persons with disabilities	ONI Action B2										# of persons with disabilities who participate in academy	
C	New opportunities for persons with disabilities	Encourage Bureaus' existing partnerships to be inclusive of persons with disabilities	All Bureaus Action C1										# of partners that change policies to be inclusive	
		Apprenticeship program established for students with disabilities (PSU and/or PCC) to be interns within the City	ONI Action C2										# students who become apprentices	

Objective #3: Improve Outreach and Recruitment				Annual Timelines (six monthly)										Targets or indicators
				Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5		
Results	Key Activities	Persons Responsible	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2		
A	Outreach has led to increase in hires of persons with disabilities	Add .5 FTE Targeted Outreach position to commence targeted outreach to attract applicants with disabilities	BHR Targeted Outreach Action A1										. 5 FTE funding for position; # of applicants with disabilities	
		Gather information on State agencies (Vocational Rehabilitation, Oregon Commission of Blind, etc)	BHR Targeted Outreach Action A2										# of bureaus who partner with one of select State agencies	
		Provide information to bureaus on websites and contacts for agencies and organizations that host fairs	BHR Targeted Outreach Action A3											# of bureaus who include disability specific organizations in outreach;
B	Information on employment opportunities is fully accessible	All public facing digital content is accessible	All Bureaus Action B1										Requiring accessible digital content becomes standard practice	
		Develop deeper understanding of information requirements for persons with intellectual disabilities, mental health users, persons with autism	BHR, OEHR and ONI, EDAG Action B2										# of employees disaggregated by impairment type; guidance on info requirements drafted for these subsets of population	
		Ensure all videos providing information on employment are captioned	All Bureaus Action B3											Requiring captioning becomes standard practice

EXHIBIT A

C	Recruitment and tracking is improved	Include a statement in vacancy announcements that commits to making available any application materials in alternative formats	BHR and Bureau Hiring Managers Action C1															Statement drafted	
		Add questions about reasonable accommodation for applicants and type of accommodation preferred	BHR/DOER Action C2																Questions added to recruitment guidance
		Coordinator with Accommodations Coordinator and Bureau Liaison to ensure accommodation provided at all stages of recruitment process	BHR/ DOER Action C3																Mechanism for coordination added as standard practice
		Track number of applicants who disclose voluntarily at time of application and time of hire to establish baseline for each;	BHR/ DOER and Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) Action C4																# of applicants who disclose; # of applicants who reach each stage of application process
		Introduce as standard practice intersectional tracking of applicants (i.e not just race or gender, but race, gender, disability status and LGBTQ)	BHR/ DOER and SMEs Action C5																Intersectional tracking introduced as standard practice; establish a baseline City-wide and by bureau
D	Applications from persons with disabilities given due consideration	Trainings provided to HRBP, SMEs and hiring managers on the importance of hiring persons with disabilities	BHR, PCOD and OHSU Action D1															# of trainings; # participants attending training	
		Persons with disabilities vetted and database created for potential job openings of interest	BHR/ DOER Action D2															# persons with disabilities on vetted roster	
		Assess impact of Charles Jordan Standard (CJS) on persons with disabilities for director positions	BHR Action D3															Review establishes # of persons with disabilities hired through appts;	

EXHIBIT A

		Review legal implications and consider expanding CJS for all positions	BHR and City Attorney Action D4												Assessment made to ascertain success of CJS and need for expansion
		Support ongoing efforts of Class Specification review	BHR / Class Compensation Action D5												Class Comp staff review and revise language that creates barriers for applicants with disabilities
		Ensure employees with disabilities represented on interview panels (for sample of all jobs, not just those focusing on disability)	BHR – Bureau Hiring Managers Action D6												# of employees with disabilities on interview panels
E	New hires with disabilities receive support they need (onboarding)	Disability questions added to new hire checklists, and ADA assessments automatically offered (with option to opt out if assessment not needed)	BHR Accommodations Coordinator Action E1												Disability questions added to new hire checklists
		Mechanism in place to ensure accommodations in place prior to new hire's first day of work	Accommodations Coordinator and bureau hiring managers Action E2												Mechanism created; number of new hires who have accommodations in place by first day;
		Information about employee assistance programs, PWP, EIAP, etc. are made available	BHR /Benefits Action E3												BHR ensures new hires receive information

Objective #4: Create a Supportive Environment				Annual Timelines (six monthly)										Targets or indicators	
				Year 1		Year 2		Year 3		Year 4		Year 5			
	Results	Key Activities	Persons Responsible	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2		
A	Information and Communication is inclusive	Host fairs that highlight innovations and reasonable accommodation options	BHR Action A1											# of fairs that include sessions on reasonable accommodations	
		Showcase examples of accommodations that have been provided to illustrate positive impact towards completing job functions	BHR and Bureau Liaisons Action A2												Create and disseminate document on accommodations available
		Ensure knowledge and use of PWP and EAIP programs. This includes regular updates about employee assistance programs, etc.	BHR/ Benefits and all bureaus Action A4												Regular updates on programs provided
B	Reasonable Accommodation is processed in a timely manner	Create new position for Accommodations Coordinator	BHR Action B1											Funding for 1 FTE provided	
		Establish mechanism (similar FMLA mechanism) to centralize accommodation tracking, processing and delivery	BHR Accommodations coordinator Action B2											Mechanism in place; tracking begins;	
		Regular communication to bureaus on what can be provided as reasonable accommodation	BHR Accommodations Coordinator Action B3											Regular updates provided	

EXHIBIT A

		Train and have on call a team of mental health specialists to provide peer support (and hotline)	ONI Action B4															Team in place to provide mental health support; # of employees who use mechanism
		Set guidance that persons with disabilities only required once to submit formal request for ongoing reasonable accommodations	BHR and all bureaus Action B6															Guidance adopted
		Materials are proactively made available in alternative formats for any/all employees who may need them	All bureaus Action B7															Employees receive information in accessible formats
		Exit interviews encouraged, with questions on reasonable accommodation included	BHR and all bureaus Action B8															# of exit interviews; # who comment on reasonable accommodation; content of comments reviewed
		Consider “GRUMPs” model as potential good practice for replication	BES and all bureaus Action B10															GRUMPS model shared with other bureaus; # of bureaus who establish similar model;
C	Employees with disabilities have opportunities	Link to employer of choice program	BHR and all bureaus															Employees with disabilities provided equal opportunities through employer of choice program

Appendix 1: Bureaus targeted for key informant interviews

- Bureau of Emergency Management
- Bureau of Environmental Services
- Bureau of Human Resources
- Bureau of Internal Business Services
- Bureau of Transportation
- Bureau of Technology Services
- Housing Bureau
- Office of Equity and Human Rights
- Office of Management and Finance – Chief Administrative Officer
- Office of Neighborhood Involvement
- Office of Government Relations
- Parks and Recreation

MAS Consulting met Bureau Directors and with select staff from these bureaus. Their names are kept anonymous and their full statements remain confidential.

Appendix 2: 2016 MAS Survey: Findings

(n= 43)

I. Confidential Demographic information

Please identify the bureau (and division if applicable) you work for:

BES: 5

BHR: 8

BIBS: 4

BTS: 2

Mayor's Office and Commissioners: 7

OEHR: 4

OGR: 1

OMF-CAO: 1

ONI: 4

Parks: 2

PBEM: 1

PBOT: 2

PHB: 2

Sex: 22 female 20 male 1 transgender 0 prefer not to answer

Age: 0 18 to 24 5 25 to 34 17 35 to 49 20 50 to 65 1 66 and over

Disability status: 34 not disabled 9 person with disability 0 prefer not to answer

Please list your job classification here: _____

Do you have any family members or close friends who self-identify as persons with disabilities?

28 yes 13 no 2 prefer not to answer

II. Survey Questions

1. Do you know anyone (aside from yourself if you self-identify) employed by the City of Portland who self-identifies as a person with a disability and has self-disclosed?

10 Yes (I know one person)

28 Yes (I know more than one person)

3 No.

1 I don't know (*note: someone added this field in*)

2. Do you know anyone (aside from yourself if you self-identify) employed by the City of Portland who self-identifies as a person with a disability, but has not disclosed his or her disability?

4 Yes (I know one person)

9 Yes (I know more than one person)

27 No.

2 I don't know (*note: two people added this field in*)

1 (no response)

3. What are some reasons why someone might not disclose their disability? (open-ended)

Compiled separately – see word cloud on page 51 for summary of responses

The most frequent words and phrases include: Fear, want, stigma, treated differently, and job.

4. Is it important to increase the percentage of persons with disabilities employed at the City?

41 Yes (if yes, use space below to suggest steps to do this)

0 No (if no, use space below to explain why not)

1 Not sure (*note: this field was added*)

1 (no response)

Compiled separately – see word cloud on page 52 for summary of responses

The most frequent words and phrases include: outreach, accommodation, hiring, training, safe space, open, and management

5. What percentage of employees in your bureau do you think are persons with disabilities?

10 0 to 1.9%

9 2 to 3.9%

5 4 to 5.9%

4 6 to 7.9%

8 8% or higher

7 don't know

6. What percentage of the population (i.e. from 18 to 65 years old) are persons with disabilities who could work?⁶⁴

0 0 to 4.9%

5 5 to 9.9%

6 10 to 14.9%

5 15 to 19.9%

12 20% or higher

14 don't know

1 (no response)

7. If your answers (to above questions 5 and 6) indicate a greater percentage of adults with disabilities in the general population than the percentage employed within your bureau or the city at large, what do you think accounts for that difference in percentages? (Check as many as apply).⁶⁵

21 There is a perception that persons with disabilities do not possess the qualifications to do the work

⁶⁴ On average, persons estimated the estimated percentage of persons who could work (question 6) was 11.1% higher than estimates for their specific bureau.

⁶⁵ n=38 for this question.

- 8 There is a perception that persons with disabilities do not work as hard as non-disabled employees
- 23 There is a perception that persons with disabilities are not able to perform tasks as well as non-disabled employees
- 23 Persons with disabilities do not have sufficient information about job opportunities
- 36 Persons with disabilities face barriers to employment that non-disabled persons do not face

8. Which of the following actions would best help the City to implement the model employer resolution? Rank 1 through 8, with 1 as the most important, 2 as the next most important, etc. and 8 as the least important.⁶⁶

Action	Average score	Median score	Average deviation
Leadership commitment from senior management	6.56	7	1.46
Identification of specific goals to guide implementation	5.83	6	1.40
Targeted career development opportunities inclusive of persons with disabilities	5.27	5	1.48
Training for staff at all levels	4.83	5	1.66
Centralized funding and processing for reasonable accommodations	4.12	4	2.13
Flexible work environment	3.90	4	1.76
Better coordination between and across bureaus	2.85	3	1.38
Regular surveying workforce on disability	2.63	2	1.22

Average score: the mean

Median score: the middle number in a given sequence of numbers

Average deviation: a measure of dispersion, computed by taking the arithmetic mean of the absolute values of the deviations of the functional values from some central value⁶⁷ (*in this case from the mean*).⁶⁸

⁶⁶ **Note** – to ease computations and analysis, I inverted the results. As a result, the most important action (i.e. 1) was scored as an eight, the second most important action (i.e.2) was scored as seven, etc. Thus, when looking at the results below the higher the number signifies the action was deemed more important.

⁶⁷ Definitions taken from dictionary.com – accessed 9 June 2016.

⁶⁸ Lower average deviations signal that there was more agreement with respect to the importance of a specific action. Higher average deviations signal that there were more extreme views (either higher or lower) than the mean. Thus, the action for which there was the most significant disagreement was the issue of centralized funding for reasonable accommodation. The action for which there was most significant agreement was regular surveying of the workforce.

