



Center for Assistive Technology and
Environmental Access (CATEA)
Georgia Institute for Technology
490 10th Street · Atlanta, GA 30318
<http://www.workrerc.org>

WORKPLACE ACCOMMODATIONS POLICY HIGHLIGHTS 1.2

April 2003

RERC on Workplace Accommodations

The primary objectives of the Rehabilitation Engineering Research Center on Workplace Accommodation, a federal program funded by The National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR), U.S. Department of Education, are to identify, design, develop, and promote new assistive devices and universally-designed technologies that will enable all individuals, and particularly those with disabilities, to achieve the greatest degree of independence and integration in the workplace. To accomplish its mission, the RERC engages in a comprehensive program of research, development, training, and information dissemination.

Overview

In this second issue of the Workplace Accommodations Policy Highlights, we continue the review of the legal foundations of workplace accommodation policies and the Supreme Court's decisions addressing the relation between the declaration of a person as disabled and the person's right to ask for a reasonable accommodation. In addition, two important concepts are examined: universal design and assistive technologies.

Legislative/ Regulatory Basis

Workforce Investment Act of 1998. The Workforce Investment Act of 1998 (WIA) became effective July 1, 2000. It has three titles (I, III, & VI) of importance for workplace accommodation policies. Titles I and III establish a national workforce preparation and employment system (America's Workforce Network) to meet the needs of businesses, job seekers and those who want to further their careers. Customers, with and without disabilities, have easy access to information and a variety of job training, education and employment services through the One-Stop Career Centers System. People with disabilities have access to services provided by disability-specific organizations through the One-Stop Career Centers. The One-Stop Career Centers offer three kinds of services: core services (orientation about available services, job search processes, and eligibility for intensive and training services), intensive services (comprehensive assessment of skill levels and service needs, development of individual employment plans, and individual counseling and career planning), and training employment-related services. **(Basic information and the location of One-Stop Centers may be accessed by calling the toll-free telephone help line at 877-US2-JOBS (877-872-5627). TTY users may dial 877-TTY-JOBS (877-887-5627), and Internet users can gain access through America's Service Locator at [<http://www.servicelocator.org>])**

Title VI of the WIA reauthorizes Rehabilitation Act programs through Fiscal Year 2003, and contains a number of provisions linking these programs to the workforce development systems. The workforce development systems referred to in Title VI of the WIA are the infrastructure and strategic plans created by the states and local communities "to improve the quality of the workforce, reduce dependency to welfare, and enhance the productivity and competitiveness of the Nation" (Title VI is also known as the Rehabilitation Act Amendment of 1998). In general, Title VI of the WIA has three key guiding principles: Streamlining services to co-locate, coordinate and integrate activities and information to achieve a coherent and accessible information system; empowering individuals through the advice, guidance and support available on the One-Stop Career Centers System; and Universal Access to guarantee that all individuals have

access to core employment-related services that will define their future eligibility for more advanced services.

[<http://www.dol.gov/odep/pubs/ek01/act.htm>]

[<http://www.doleta.gov/usworkforce/wialaw.pdf>]

The Assistive Technology Act of 1998. The Assistive Technology Act (AT Act), passed on November 13, 1998, replaced the Technology-Related Assistance for Individuals with Disabilities Act of 1988, as amended. "The AT Act of 1998 reaffirms the Federal role of promoting access to AT devices and services for individuals with disabilities... There are changes in the delivery of AT devices and services that include the increased prevalence of managed care entities as payers for these devices and services; an increased focus on universal design; the increased importance of AT in employment, as more individuals with disabilities move from public assistance to work through training and on-the-job accommodations; the role and impact that new technologies have on how individuals with disabilities will learn about, access, and participate in programs or services that will affect their lives; and the increased role that telecommunications play in education, employment, health care, and social activities." (*Federal Register*, July 9, 1999)

[<http://www.matr.org/PDFs/Handouts/Assistive%20Technology%20Act.pdf>]

The AT Act has three purposes. The first purpose of the AT Act is to provide financial assistance to States to undertake activities that assist each State in maintaining and strengthening a permanent comprehensive statewide program of technology-related assistance, for individuals with disabilities of all ages. The second purpose of the AT Act is to identify federal policies that facilitate payment for assistive technology devices and assistive technology services, to identify those federal policies that impede such payment, and to eliminate inappropriate barriers to such payment. The third purpose of the AT Act is to enhance the ability of the Federal Government to provide States with financial assistance that supports understanding of and access to assistive technology devices and assistive technology services.

The AT Act makes use of two definitions that are important for workplace accommodation policies. The first, 'Assistive technology device', means "any item, piece of equipment, or product system, whether acquired commercially, modified, or customized, that is used to increase, maintain, or improve functional capabilities of individuals with disabilities." The second, 'universal design', means "a concept or philosophy for designing and delivering products and services that are usable by people with the widest possible range of functional capabilities, which include products and services that are directly usable (without requiring assistive technologies) and products and services that are made usable with assistive technologies."

[<http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/29/ch31.html>]

Enforcement Activities

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) sues a McDonald's Restaurant for disability bias against an employee with facial disfigurement. On March 7, 2003, the EEOC filed an employment discrimination lawsuit under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA) and the Civil Rights Act of 1991 against R.P.H. Management, Inc., doing business as McDonald's restaurant in Northport, Alabama. Samantha Robichaud, who has a cosmetic disfigurement known as Sturge Weber Syndrome, argued that "McDonald's discriminated against her when it denied her the opportunity for promotion to a management position and constructively discharged her." The U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Alabama now has the job to decide the case.

[<http://www.eeoc.gov/press/3-7-03.html>]

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) settles disability discrimination suit against aerospace giant Honeywell for \$100,000. On November 22, 2002, the EEOC announced that Sherry Layne's case for disability discrimination had been resolved. The EEOC alleged Honeywell discriminated against Sherry Layne, a disability-rights activist who is hearing and visually impaired, by withdrawing an accommodation for her disability, involuntarily transferring her, failing to accommodate her disability, and discriminating against her because she sought an accommodation of her disability. The final decision was that "in addition to paying Ms. Layne \$100,000, Honeywell also agreed to the entry of a Consent Decree under which it is enjoined from engaging in any employment practice that discriminates on the basis of disability at its Union Hills, Arizona, facility including failing to engage in good faith to accommodate an employee's disability. Honeywell is also enjoined from retaliating against any employee who seeks to exercise his/her rights under the ADA. Additionally, Honeywell agreed to other curative relief including providing training at its Union Hills facility for employees involved in the decision making process for providing accommodations to employees with disabilities." [<http://www.eeoc.gov/press/11-21-02.html>]

Judicial Activities

Bias Suit by 900 Deaf Workers Underway. The San Francisco Federal Court has to decide a discrimination lawsuit filed by 900 deaf workers at United Parcel Service (U.P.S). The workers claimed that the company excluded them from numerous job categories and generally limited them to bottom-rung positions. The workers lawyers said that they would seek to provide evidence that the company often does not provide deaf workers with simple accommodations such as interpreters during safety training and other meetings. On the other side of the controversy, U.P.S. officials say that their company has always been committed to hiring, promoting and providing accommodations for people with disabilities, and that they have been accused unfairly of discrimination. If the court rules in favor of plaintiffs, this case will represent an important precedent concerning accommodation requirements for deaf employees, especially with respect to employers' promotion policies. In addition, the court ruling in favor of the plaintiffs will set an important precedent for equal treatment in the workplace for people with disabilities no matter what type of disability they have. (Greenhouse, Steven. "Trial Begins in Bias Suit by Deaf U.P.S. Worker." *The New York Times*, April 9, 2003)

Supreme Court Opens the Pandora Box for Small Employers Under the ADA Regulations. On April 22, 2003, the Supreme Court clarified the conditions under which small companies are exempt from ADA requirements. In a 7-2 decision, the Supreme Court decision ruled against Deborah Wells, a disabled woman who contended a small company's partners and shareholders should be counted as employees. Ms. Wells claimed she was demoted and then fired because of her disability, a debilitating tissue order. When Ms. Wells argued that her employer, Clackamas Gastroenterology Associates, violated the ADA regulations, they claimed that they are too small to be covered by ADA regulations since a group of doctors who are not employers owns them. "Justice John Paul Stevens said the court was persuaded by the standards used by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. The EEOC says someone is not an employee if, for example, the person cannot be fired or is liable if a company loses money ...The doctors at Clackamas Gastroenterology Associates appear to fall into that category because they apparently control the operation of their clinic, they share the profits, and they are personally liable for malpractice claims. The case was sent to a lower court for more considerations." (Holland, Gina. "Court Rules for Clinic in Disability Case" *The Associated Press*, April 22, 2003. [washingtonpost.com](http://www.washingtonpost.com)). This case introduces a restriction affecting workers with disabilities since it allows organizations such as law firms, medical practices and accounting offices to claim an exemption from the ADA's

practices and accounting offices to claim an exemption from the ADA's requirements. [<http://www.lawmemo.com/emp/docs/us/wells.htm>]

School Bd. Of Nassau County v. Arline, 480 U.S. 273 (1987). This case examined whether the medical condition of Gene Arline, an elementary school teacher in Nassau County, Florida from 1966 until 1979, is covered by Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act and, if so, whether she is "otherwise qualified" to teach elementary school or if a reasonable accommodation is possible. Gene Arline was afflicted with tuberculosis, a contagious disease. After she was denied relief in state administrative proceedings, she sued in Federal District Court, alleging a violation of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act. The District Court held that she was not a "handicapped person" under the Act, but that, even assuming she were, she was not "qualified" to teach elementary school. The Supreme Court found that Arline is a handicapped individual and so covered by section 504. Accordingly, the Court remanded the case "for further findings as to whether the risks of infection precluded Mrs. Arline from being otherwise qualified for her job and, if so, whether it was possible to make some reasonable accommodation for her in that teaching position."

In general, the Supreme Court held that a person afflicted with tuberculosis may be a handicapped individual within the meaning of section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, and ruled that Courts must determine specific facts related to the plaintiff's disability prior to determining whether any reasonable accommodation can be made by the employer under the established standards for that inquiry. In this context, the decision upheld that "in order to determine whether a person handicapped by contagious disease is "otherwise qualified" under 504, the district court must conduct an individualized inquiry and make appropriate findings of fact, based on reasonable medical judgments given the state of medical knowledge, about (a) the nature of the risk (e. g., how the disease is transmitted), (b) the duration of the risk (how long is the carrier infectious), (c) the severity of the risk (what is the potential harm to third parties), and (d) the probabilities the disease will be transmitted and will cause varying degrees of harm. In making these findings, courts normally should defer to the reasonable medical judgments of public health officials."

[<http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/scripts/getcase.pl?navby=case&court=US&vol=480&page=273>]

Toyota Motor Mfg., Kentucky, Inc. v. Williams, 534 U.S. 184, 122 S.Ct. 681 (2002). In this case, the Supreme Court held that "when addressing the major life activity of performing manual tasks, the central inquiry must be whether the claimant is unable to perform the variety of tasks central to most people's daily lives, not whether the claimant is unable to perform the tasks associated with her specific job." Ella Williams sued Toyota Motor Mfg., Kentucky, Inc. for violation of the ADA and the Kentucky Civil Rights Act by failing to reasonably accommodate her disability and by terminating her employment. She claimed to be disabled because of her carpal tunnel syndrome and other related impairments "limited her in (1) manual tasks; (2) housework; (3) gardening; (4) playing with her children; (5) lifting; and (6) working, all of which, she argued, constituted major life activities under the Act." William's accommodation request was to allow her to return to doing only her original two jobs in the Quality Control Inspection Operations (QCIO), a unit of the manufacturing plant in which she could still perform without difficulty. The District Court found that the respondent had not been disabled, as defined by the ADA, at the time of petitioner's alleged refusal to accommodate her, and that she had therefore not been covered by the ADA's protections or by the Kentucky Civil Rights Act, which is construed consistently with the ADA. Then, the Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit reversed the District Court's ruling on whether the respondent was disabled at the time she sought an

accommodation, but affirmed the District Court's rulings on wrongful termination claims. Finally, the Supreme Court held that "the Sixth Circuit did not apply the proper standard in determining that the respondent was disabled under the ADA because it analyzed only a limited class of manual tasks and failed to ask whether respondent's impairments prevented or restricted her from performing tasks that are of central importance to most people's daily lives."

[<http://caselaw.lp.findlaw.com/cgi-bin/getcase.pl?court=US&navby=case&vol=000&invol=00-1089>]

Organizations of Interest

Equal Access to Software and Information (EASI). EASI provides online training on accessible information technology for persons with disabilities. EASI's mission is to serve as a resource by providing information and guidance in the area of access-to-information technologies for individuals with disabilities. EASI provides distance-learning opportunities with online training courses and consulting services. EASI's publications and the Information Technology and Disabilities (ITD) e-journal provide information about developments and advancements within the adaptive computer technology field and disseminate that information to colleges, universities, K-12 schools, libraries and into the workplace.

[<http://www.rit.edu/~easi/>]

National Center on Workforce and Disability/Adult (NCWD). The Center provides training, technical assistance, policy analysis, and information to improve access for everyone in the workforce development systems. Public and private organizations, as well as community and states governments have to create workforce development systems in order to elaborate plans oriented to promote and develop competitive workforces in the states according to the Workforce Investment Act of 1998. The NCWD is based at the Institute for Community Inclusion [<http://www.communityinclusion.org/>] at the University of Massachusetts, Boston. It is funded through the U.S. Department of Labor's Office of Disability Employment Policy (ODEP).

[http://www.onestops.info/website.php?page=about_us]

National Organization on Disability (NOD). The mission of the NOD is to expand the participation and contribution of the United States' 54 million men, women and children with disabilities in all aspects of life. The NOD has two core programs. The first core program is the Community Partnership Program (CPP) that promotes replication of model local disability programs through its growing network of more than a thousand towns, cities and counties committed to the mainstreaming of people with disabilities. The second core program is the National Partnership Program (NPP), which assists 40 major non-disability organizations and associations in carrying out national grassroots disability action programs.

[<http://www.nod.org/>]

Rehabilitation Engineering and Assistive Technology Society of North America (RESNA). RESNA, an interdisciplinary association of people with a common interest in technology and issues affecting the lives of people with disabilities, was founded in 1979 with the goal of using technology to enhance the opportunities for people with disabilities to achieve their life and employment aspirations. The following are the Key RESNA programs: The Annual Conference, the program to disseminate information through different publications (the journal *Assistive Technology* and other RESNA Publications), a Credentialing Program for assistive technology service providers, and other programs for professional development opportunities. In addition, RESNA participates in special interest groups and professional specialty groups to support them and to maintain cooperative relationships.

[<http://www.resna.org>]

**Other Activities
& Items of
Interest**

“Assistive Technology Helps Disabled Live Full Lives”. A recent article in *The Sacramento Bee* noted that while the problem of severe unemployment among people with disabilities has not yet been overcome, assistive technology has changed the situation and opened a world full of opportunities for people with disabilities. However, there are two important barriers in the use of this technology. First, employers do not have information about either the kinds of assistive technologies that are available or how assistive technologies can empower a workforce. Second, people with disabilities face the barrier of attitudes and misconceptions imposed by employers and co-workers. If employers do not believe that employees with disabilities are able to do their job, no matter what technology is available they will be relegated to non-demanding positions or excluded from the workforce. Education, as a shared responsibility between employers and employees, is the key to reducing unemployment within the community of people with disabilities. (*The Sacramento Bee*, Jan 10, 2003.)
[\[http://www.sacbee.com\]](http://www.sacbee.com)

“Case Challenges Employees' Waiving Right to Sue”. This article describes the history of Donald Lagatree who is suing the law firm, Luce, Forward, Hamilton & Scripps because it withdrew its job offer when he refused to sign a compulsory arbitration agreement. The case is important because it addresses one of the most pressing questions in employment law today: Can employers force workers to waive their right to bring employment-related civil rights suits and instead to accept arbitration? About 8 percent of U.S workers are bound by arbitration agreements, and the number is climbing because employers view arbitration as less expensive and cumbersome than going to court. Lawyers who represent employees say many aspects of arbitration are not as fair as court trials. Cliff Palefsky, Mr. Lagatree's lawyer, said the trend toward compulsory arbitration was worrisome. "Civil rights laws have no meaning if you don't have the right to go to court to enforce them." On the other side, Mr. Bird for Luce, Forward, Hamilton & Scripps, said that "the firm had neither retaliated nor discriminated against Mr. Lagatree. An employee's refusal to sign an arbitration agreement and an employer's refusal to hire that person, he said, are merely the basic give and take of hiring negotiations." In this context, the EEOC has urged the Ninth Circuit Court to articulate a new legal theory to protect an employee's refusal to sign a compulsory arbitration agreement. The final decision in this case will affect the relationship of employers and employees relationship in the hiring process, and it will clarify how employees, including people with disabilities, may protect their right to seek redress in court in employment related cases. (Greenhouse, Steven. "Case Challenges Employees' Waiving Right to Sue." *The New York Times*, May 5, 2003).

Electronically Accessible Work Stations and Kiosks. Riverside County, California, has deployed 40 ADA-compliant information kiosks in high profile, strategic locations. Text on the touch-screens is presented in a simple way, using graphics designs, to accommodate people who have difficulty reading English. A help button activates a video of a person explaining the information specific to that screen. A phone handset enables customers to access companies and organizations listed on a screen without having to dial numbers. Customers can use the phone handset to schedule appointments, or register for classes with a local training provider or community college. These, and other examples of accessible workstations and kiosks, are on the One-Stop Career Centers' report about different ways to design universally accessible workstations and kiosks.

[\[http://www.onestops.info/article.php?article_id=94&subcat_id=25\]](http://www.onestops.info/article.php?article_id=94&subcat_id=25)

"Is Universal Web Design Achievable?" John M. Williams. February 19, 2003. News on NOD. Org. John M. Williams defines 'universal design' as "an approach to the design of all products and environments to be as usable as possible by as many people as possible regardless of age, ability, or situation." In this article, Williams uses the story of Joseph McGuffin to show the importance of universal designs to integrate people with disabilities into their workplaces. Joseph McGuffin is a New York City lawyer with a significant visual impairment. He uses, in his daily work activities, a screen reader, voice recognition software, and an onscreen keyboard to help him access the web. When McGuffin asked his employers for web accessibility in order to improve his performance at his job, he received his employer's support to ensure he had the hardware, software, and training needed to provide him and his co-workers universal access to the web. However, Williams argues that the actions of McGuffin's employer are the exception to the rule. For most people with disabilities, universal web accessibility is just a concept rather than a reality. Accessible web design, as an example of universal design, employs five basic principles: perceivability, operability, navigability, understandability, and robustness. While perceivability is achieved by having web content in formats that can be understood by any user, flexibility guarantees that the interface elements in the content are usable by all. A website that it is easily navigable facilitates content orientation, and understandability will be achieved if the content and controls are presented logically. Robustness will maximize the ability of the website's content to work with current and future accessibility technologies. These principles will guarantee access to all, but especially to people with disabilities.

[\[http://www.nod.org/content.cfm?id=1319\]](http://www.nod.org/content.cfm?id=1319)

RESNA 26th International Conference on Technology & Disability: Research, Design, Practice, & Policy. On June 19-23, 2003, RESNA will hold its Annual Conference in Atlanta, GA. This three-day conference focuses on three tracks: practice and service delivery, research and development, and public policy. The following are just some of the courses' titles of the conference: *Speech Recognition from Alpha to Zulu: Exploring the Tough Questions; Constructing an Accessible Web Experience: Equity and Enhancement Through Design; ADAPTABLE: A Creative, Practical and Inclusive Approach to Workplace Accommodation Planning; Practical Ergonomics for Computer Use and Disability; Positioning and Vision for AT Access: Foundations for Successful Computer, Communication & Switch Use Outcomes.*

[\[http://www.resna.org/conferences/index.html\]](http://www.resna.org/conferences/index.html)

"Transit authority to scale back level of disabled service". The Valley Transportation Authority (VTA) in San Jose, California has run one of the nation's premier paratransit operations, extending services to the elderly and disabled that far exceed the federal mandates under the ADA. The VTA sends cars and vans to the top of Mount Hamilton and deep into the Santa Cruz Mountains, driving miles beyond ADA requirements. VTA van drivers do not just pick individuals up at the curb, they go into homes and help them into the vans. They do not just drop the patients outside doctor's offices, they escort them inside. Now the operation is in danger. The agency is facing annual deficits because operation costs have increased and demand for services offered by the VTA has decreased. As a result, VTA board members are planning changes such as restricting services to the curb-to-curb service mandated by the ADA. These changes will affect the riders and their quality of life. (Richards, Gary "Transit authority to scale back level of disabled service" *San Jose Mercury News/Tribune Business News*, March 31, 2003.)

[\[http://nl.newsbank.com/nl-search/we/Archives?p_action=list&p_topdoc=111\]](http://nl.newsbank.com/nl-search/we/Archives?p_action=list&p_topdoc=111)

**Journals/
Research/
Resources**

Information Technology and Disabilities (ITD) Journal. ITD is an electronic journal oriented to the practical and theoretical issues surrounding the development and effective use of new and emerging technologies by computer users with disabilities. Founded by EASI, ITD features articles for educators, librarians, academic computing staff, job accommodations/human relations professionals, and others interested in new technology and its effective use by people with disabilities. [<http://www.rit.edu/~easi/itd.htm>]

Journal of Disability Policy Studies. *The Journal of Disability Policy Studies* is a quarterly publication that seeks quality scholarship dealing with ethical, policy and legal issues that affect the lives of persons with disabilities. The purpose of each publication is to decipher complex legislation, to understand the problems and concerns driving current public policy, and to unravel the tangled philosophies surrounding controversial ethical issues. [<http://www.proedinc.com/jdps.html>]

“Case Studies on the Implementation of the Workforce Investment Act: Focus on Accessibility”. On April 1, 2003, the Institute for Community Inclusion released a brief to highlight various innovative strategies States have used to make their One-Stops Careers Centers better able to support job seekers with disabilities. This brief reports some States’ responses to the Workforce Investment Act (WIA) requirement that One-Stop Career Centers’ services be accessible for individuals with disabilities. The study concludes, “no prototype exists for the best way to implement this new workforce system. Local cultures vary, and the key to successful implementation is not national standardization but flexibility. The many changes brought forth by WIA create opportunities and challenges. To ensure success, it is important for partners to consider a wide range of possibilities in addressing these issues.” [http://www.onestops.info/article.php?article_id=186&subcat_id=27]

“Low-Tech and High Tech Access to Computers”. This article presents universal design and assistive technology strategies to accommodate people with visual, auditory, and physical disabilities. These strategies aim at aiding in the adoption of effective accommodations to promote access and independence at the workplace. Some strategies fall in the category of universal design and others refer to assistive technology. Examples of universal design strategies are Braille stickers or tactile markers for the keyboard and other control buttons, flashing alerts instead of auditory features of the operating system’s control panel, adjustable height workstations with adjustable keyboard trays large enough to accommodate a mouse, and voice activated software. Assistive technologies include screen-reading software, amplification systems, and voice activated software. [http://www.onestops.info/article.php?article_id=115&subcat_id=25]

“The Perceptions of People with Disabilities as to the Effectiveness of the American with Disabilities Act”. Cathy Hinton, an assistant professor of physical therapy at Belmont University in Nashville, Tennessee, prepared a study that examines the perceptions of people with disabilities as to the effectiveness of the ADA concerning to accessibility issues covered by Titles II, III, and IV. She found that there is not a statistically significant relationship between people’s perceptions and the four independent variables studied: disability type, age of onset of disability, disability organization membership and employment status. However, she found that there were differences in the perceptions about three different titles of the ADA. “Title II (public sector) was rated somewhat higher than Title III (private sector) in improved accessibility of covered entities since the passage of the ADA. However, in neither case did a majority of respondents rate accessibility issues covered by these titles as better than in contrast to a majority of respondents rated Title III

better. In contrast, a majority of respondents rated Title IV (telecommunications) as better." In the discussion of her results, she argues that people with visual disabilities rated accessibility significantly lower than those with hearing or mobility disabilities on Titles II (public sector) and III (private sector) issues. This finding about a pattern of lower rating by those with visual disabilities raises the questions of whether the ADA and its accompanying advisory guidelines fail to address accommodations for people with visual disabilities adequately, whether accommodations for this group are more difficult to implement than for other groups, and whether the accommodations fail to meet their intended purpose. (Hinton, Cathy. "The Perceptions of People with Disabilities as to the effectiveness of the American with Disabilities Act." *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*. Volume 13, Number 4, Spring 2003).

Funding Sources for Assistive Technology, Equipment, and Accommodations. There is a variety of options available for funding assistive technology, equipment, and accommodations needed to perform job tasks. In the article "Funding Assistive Technology and Accommodations," the Institute for Community Inclusion presents a guide of the available options. Which option is best for a business will depend on the level of services being provided to the individual with disabilities, the complexity of the individual's situation, and the time available to obtain funding. For example, employers, who are required to pay for reasonable accommodations under the ADA, have several options, including the ADA Small Business Tax Credit that may provides up to \$5,000/yr [<http://www.irs.ustreas.gov>], and the WOTC & WTW Tax Credit, which may grant up to \$2,400/employee from WOTC and \$8,500/employee from WTW.

[<http://www.doleta.gov/employer/wotc.htm>]

[http://www.onestops.info/article.php?article_id=22]

RERC Bookshelf

Callahan, Michael J. & Garner, J. Bradley. (March 1997) *Keys To The Workplace. Skills and Supports for People with Disabilities*. Paul H Brookes Publishers Company. Baltimore, MD. This book focuses on the processes involved in ensuring meaningful and personalized employment opportunities for people with disabilities, and their integration into the community. It provides a step-by-step procedure to maximize the effectiveness of strategies and techniques that may be used for teaching employees, analyzing tasks, motivating workers, and collecting data on jobs to promote community integration of people with disabilities.

[<http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/1557662762/002-0859463-0168058?v=glance&s=books#product-details>]

Lazzaro, Joseph J. (July 2001) *Adaptive Technologies for Learning and Work Environments*. American Library Association Editions; 2nd edition. Chicago, IL. This book presents a detailed overview of the various types of adaptive technologies available for individuals with disabilities. "Lazzaro uses the expressions "adaptive technology" and "assistive technology" interchangeably throughout his book, but seems to favor the former expression rather than the more universally used term "assistive technology" (Jean Balutanski, *A Review of: Adaptive Technologies for Learning and Work Environments - Second Edition*. [www.rit.edu/~easi/itd/itdv08n2/review1.html]) Five chapters describe adaptive technologies for people with disabilities covering the following categories: vision impairments, deaf or hard of hearing, motor disabilities, speech disabilities, and learning disabilities. Each has a corresponding section in the Appendix with specific products, specifications, and vendor information.

[<http://www.specialneeds.com/store/product.asp?subject%5Fid=6&sku=12253>]

Thatcher, Jim, et. al. (April 2002) *Constructing Accessible Web Sites. Glasshaus; 1st edition. Birmingham, U.K.* This book (authors include: Cynthia Waddell, Shawn Henry, Sarah Swierenga, Mark Urban, Michael Burks, Bob Regan, Paul Bohman) is about designing web pages that people can create and interact with according to their needs and preferences. Although a primary focus is on access by people with disabilities, increasing their abilities to effectively use different web sites, the authors argue that their principles would help everybody. The authors focus on the differences between accessibility and usability, and the concept of universal design as a process rather than the resulting product.

[http://www.amazon.com/exec/obidos/tg/detail/-/1904151000/gid=1050942534/sr=1-4/ref=sr_1_4/002-0859463-0168058?v=glance&s=books#product-details]

Workplace Accommodations Policy Highlights 1.2

April 2003

Daira Abolins, Editor: daira.abolins@gcatt.gatech.edu



This is a publication of the Rehabilitation Engineering Research Center on Workplace Accommodations supported by the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research of the U.S. Department of Education, grant # H133E020720. The opinions contained in this publication are those of the grantee and do not necessarily reflect those of the U.S. Department of Education

The Office of Technology Policy and Programs (OTP) produces a monthly newsletter, Workplace Accommodations Policy Highlights, for the purpose of identifying policy, regulatory framework and market factors that can be useful in reducing barriers to integrating people with disabilities into the workforce. These monthly highlights support the Center's other research efforts and provide people with disabilities and industry with a centralized source of information supportive of the principles of the ADA and other regulations whose intent is to promote fairness and equity for people with disabilities.

For further information on items summarized in this report, or if you have items of interest that you would like included in future editions, please contact the editor, Daira Abolins (daira.abolins@gcatt.gatech.edu) or Andrew Ward, PH.D., MPH, Project Co-Director, Workplace Accommodations Policy Initiatives (RERC) (andrew.ward@gcatt.gatech.edu).