

**SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS  
EMPLOYMENTSTANDARD DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE  
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 20, 2016  
SECOND FLOOR BOARDROOM  
401 YORK AVENUE, NORQUAY BUILDING**

**In Attendance:**

Jim Baker (Chairperson), Yvonne Peters, Glen Coutts, Heather Korol, Maureen Morrison, , Alison Moist, Jesse Turner, Kim Lanyon, John Wyndels (DIO)

**Regrets:**

Jamie Horyski

It was determined to work through the entire side-by-side document before re-visiting where things were left at the end of the last meeting. We picked up the discussion with Notice to Successful Applicants.

There is agreement with the provision, although there are different suggested wording to be used, such as “reasonable accommodation” rather than accommodation. In the next section, Informing Employees of Supports, it was questioned why the language used was not consistent. For example, committee members ask why Ontario uses supports instead of accommodation. Again, there is general support for the section, although re-writing is suggested. It is also suggested the title of the section be re-named. There is general agreement with the next section, Accessible Formats and Communication Supports, although re-wording and re-phrasing of the provisions is noted.

The language used in Documented Individual Accommodation Plans is problematic and considered by some as paternalistic. It is suggested we avoid phrases like “manner in which” or “means by which”. The importance of a review was noted. This is needed due to workplace changes, a change in the disability or change in staff. Consider something along the lines of “review as needed upon request by employee”. There was also discussion surround the idea of when to bring bargaining agent of representative. Does a union representative need to be there from the start? What if the accommodation differs from union agreement?

The next meeting is February 9. The discussion will pick up where left off today.