

**SUMMARY OF DISCUSSIONS  
EMPLOYMENT STANDARD DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE  
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 2016  
SECOND FLOOR BOARDROOM  
401 YORK AVENUE, NORQUAY BUILDING**

**In Attendance:**

Jim Baker (Chairperson), Yvonne Peters, Jesse Turner, Maureen Morrison, Alison Moist, Jamie Horyski, Kim Lanyon, John Wyndels (DIO)

**Regrets:**

Glenn Coutts, Heather Korol

Starting at the beginning of the side-by-side, the committee continued its review of the proposed accessibility standard of employment. A definitions section will be added as a first section to define all terms that require further clarification. At this point, the terms to be defined are alternate formats, communication supports and reasonable accommodations. Others may be included.

One of the provisions within the customer service standard is that an organization's action must be consistent with the purposes and principles of the Act and the Manitoba Human Rights Code, including the obligation to make reasonable accommodation. This will be added to the Scope and Interpretation section of the proposed standard. As stated in previous summaries, the envisioned schedule will follow the customer service standard, with government and its departments having one year to come into compliance, the public sector, including municipalities two years, and the private and non-profits three years to come into compliance after the standard is established as a regulation.

There is substantial agreement among committee members over the next six sections, although no agreed upon language. Language will be drafted for these sections for the next committee meeting. The committee would like wording that focuses on reasonable accommodation and removes everything but the non-essential use disability.

The differential threshold for Documented Individual Accommodation Plans and the Return to Work sections is currently 20 employees or more. This is consistent with the customer service standard. The differential threshold in the Ontario standard is 50 employees or more. If Manitoba was to consider moving to 50 instead of 20, this would significantly lessen the number of organizations that would have to document these practices. No decisions has been made on the number of employees that would serve as a differential threshold in the two sections where it is recognized.

There is growing agreement to amalgamating the final three sections into one section under the title "Employee Retention". Members questioned picking out three employment processes, when others, such as career development, are not included. Language will be drafted for review at the next committee meeting.

The next committee meeting will be Monday, March 7.