

Slide 1

The Interactive Process: Lessons from
Case Law

will begin at 12:30 PM ET

Audio and Visual are provided through the on-line webinar system. This session is closed captioned. Individuals may also listen via telephone by dialing 1-857-232-0476
Access Code: 368564 This is not a toll-free number.

Slide 2

Captioning

Real-time captioning is provided; open the window by selecting the “CC” icon in the AUDIO & VIDEO panel

You can move and re-size the captioning window.

Within the window you change the font size, and save the transcript

Slide 3

About Your Hosts...

TransCen, Inc.

Mission Statement: Improving lives of people with disabilities through meaningful work and community inclusion

Mid-Atlantic ADA Center, a project of TransCen, Inc.
Funded by National Institute on Disability, Independent Living, and Rehabilitation Research (NIDILRR),
Administration for Community Living, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Slide 4

Listening to the Webinar

Online:

Please make sure your computer speakers are turned on or your headphones are plugged in

Control the audio broadcast via the AUDIO & VIDEO panel

If you have sound quality problems, please go through the AUDIO WIZARD by selecting the microphone icon within the AUDIO & VIDEO panel

Slide 5

Listening to the Webinar (cont.)

To connect by telephone:

1-857-232-0476

Passcode: 368564

This is not a toll free number

Slide 6

Customizing Your View

Resize the whiteboard where the presentation slides are shown to make it smaller or larger by choosing from the drop down menu located above and to the left of the whiteboard; the default is “fit page”

Slide 7

Customize Your View continued

Resize/Reposition the CHAT, PARTICIPANT, and AUDIO & VIDEO panels by “detaching” and using your mouse to reposition or “stretch/shrink”

Each panel may be detached using the icon in the upper right corner of each panel

Slide 8

Technical Assistance

If you experience technical difficulties

Use the CHAT panel to let us know

E-mail ADAtraining@transcen.org

Call 301-217-0124

Slide 9

Archive

This webinar is being recorded and can be accessed within a few weeks

You will receive an email with information on accessing the archive

Slide 10

The Interactive Process: Lessons from Case Law

Presented by: Rachel Weisberg, Equip for Equality

Image: Cycle: Interactive process, accommodation request, gather information, explore accommodation options, choose an accommodation, implement the accommodation, monitor the accommodation.

Slide 11

CLE Credit for Attorneys

This session is eligible for 1.5 hours of continuing legal education credit for Illinois attorneys.

We can provide certifications to attorneys in other states; some other states will accept CLE certification.

Attorneys interested in obtaining continuing legal education credit should contact Rachel Weisberg at: rachelw@equipforequality.org

Slide 12

Today's Webinar

Background and Legal Framework

Legal Result of Failing to Engage in the Interactive Process

Lessons from Case Law

Triggering the Interactive Process

Engaging in the Interactive Process

Selecting and Implementing Accommodations

Recap of Lessons Learned

Slide 13

What is the Interactive Process?

Generally speaking

An informal process where an employer and an individual with a disability work collaboratively and in good faith by engaging in discussion and sharing information with the goal of identifying an effective, reasonable accommodation

Unique aspect of the ADA

Recognizes that communication is often the key to identifying workable accommodations

Forces parties to be problem solvers

Slide 14

Legal Framework

Statute: No reference to the interactive process

Regulations: 29 C.F.R § 1630.2(O)(3)

Definition of “reasonable accommodation”

“To determine the appropriate reasonable accommodation it may be necessary for the covered entity to initiate an informal, interactive process with the individual with a disability in need of the accommodation.”

“This process should identify the precise limitations resulting from the disability and potential reasonable accommodations that could overcome those limitations.”

Slide 15

Guidance Material

EEOC

Appendix to 29 C.F.R § 1630.9 (Title I Regulations)

“Process of Determining the Appropriate Reasonable Accommodation”

EEOC Enforcement Guidance on Reasonable Accommodation

www.eeoc.gov/policy/docs/accommodation.html

Job Accommodation Network

<https://askjan.org/topics/interactive.cfm>

Slide 16

Legal Result of Failing to Engage in the Interactive Process

Not an independent claim under the ADA

But courts examine interactions to pinpoint which party is responsible for the breakdown in communication

Employee responsible? Employer typically prevails

Employer responsible?

Some courts deny summary judgment *Snapp v. United Trans. Union*, 547 Fed. Appx. 824 (9th Cir. Nov. 5, 2013)

Some courts examine whether breakdown prevented parties from finding accommodation and if so, deny summary judgment *Stern v. St. Anthony's Health Center*, 788 F.3d 276 (7th Cir. 2015)

Slide 17

Triggering the Interactive Process:
Lessons from Case Law

Step 1: The interactive process is generally initiated by an employee, who requests a reasonable accommodation

Lesson: Employees can request reasonable accommodations without following specific processes and without using specific forms

Jones v. Clark County School District

2017 WL 1042463 (D. Nev. Mar. 17, 2017)

Jones worked as a bus driver for students with disabilities

He developed depression and other mental health disabilities, including anxiety about driving kids

Jones took a medical leave

Slide 18

Triggering Interactive Process:
Lessons from Case Law

Jones v. Clark County School District (continued)

During his leave, it became clear that Jones could not return to his position as a bus driver

Jones asked his supervisor if he could be accommodated through a transfer to a different position where he did not have to drive

Supervisor told Jones to talk to the County's ADA Coordinator about a potential placement as an accommodation

Jones sent a fax to the ADA Coordinator

Fax said: Doctor advised Jones to retire from driving due to his medication and mental health disabilities

ADA Coordinator interpreted this fax as a resignation

Jones filed a charge of discrimination with the EEOC and then lawsuit under the ADA

Slide 19

Triggering Interactive Process:
Lessons from Case Law

District asked court to dismiss case (filed motion for summary judgment)

Argued: Jones did not request an accommodation from the ADA coordinator

Court: Found for Jones (denied summary judgment)

Jones needed to inform the District about his condition and his requested reasonable accommodation and he did that

“The fact that one of [the District’s] administrators did not communicate Jones’s request to another administrator is not Jones’ fault.”

See also *Dugger v. Stephen F. Austin State University*, 2017 WL 478297 (E.D. Tex. Feb. 6, 2017) (rejecting

defendant's argument that an injured police officer did not request an accommodation because did not fully follow University policy)

Slide 20

Triggering Interactive Process:
Lessons from Case Law

Lesson: Employers should initiate the interactive process if they know of an individual's disability and desire for accommodation, even if an employee does not use specific words or phrases in her request

Kowitz v. Trinity Health

839 F.3d 742 (8th Cir. 2016)

Kowitz worked as a respiratory therapist

She had cervical spinal stenosis and took FMLA leave to have corrective neck surgery

She returned with a number of work-related restrictions

Her employer posted a memo requiring all department employees to have their basic life support certifications

Certification required a written test and a physical demonstration

Slide 21

Triggering Interactive Process: Lessons from Case Law

Kowitz told her supervisor that she could not do the physical portions of the exam until she had medical clearance following physical therapy – about four months

Did not specifically request accommodation (temporary waiver of requirement or reassignment)

She was fired

Issue: Did Kowitz trigger interactive process?

8th Cir: Found for Kowitz (reversed and remanded summary judgment to the employer)

Although she did not “ask for a reasonable accommodation for her condition in so many words ... her notification to her supervisor that she would not be able to obtain the required certification until she completed physical therapy implied that an accommodation would be required until then.”

Slide 22

Triggering Interactive Process: Lessons from Case Law

“An employee is required only to provide the employer with enough information that, under the circumstances, the employer can be fairly said to know of both the disability and desire for an accommodation.”

Must take into account information an employer's knowledge of the employee's disability and prior communications

Here, employer was aware of the employee's condition

“She was not required to ‘formally invoke the magic words reasonable accommodation’ to transform that notification into a request for accommodation.”

Employer was aware of her specific condition

Her request referred to her surgery, prior leave and ongoing pain

Slide 23

Triggering Interactive Process:
Lessons from Case Law

Employers:

Train staff to recognize accommodation requests

Train staff about how to follow up on requests

Document employee requests and follow up conversations

Employees:

Even if not legally required:

Use employer-created processes, including specific forms

Use magic words “I am requesting a reasonable accommodation under the ADA”

Confirm the request in writing

Slide 24

Engaging in the Process:
Lessons from Case Law

Step 2: Both parties engage in the interactive process

Parties exchange reasonable information

Discuss employee’s limitation and/or current work issue

Employer may request limited medical support if the individual’s disability or need for accommodation is not obvious

Parties explore accommodation ideas

Employer considers individual’s preference

Parties consult with others, as appropriate, including employee’s supervisor, human resources, doctors, computer experts, vocational rehabilitation experts, etc.

Case Law Lessons: Why things go wrong

Slide 25

Engaging in the Process:
Lessons from Case Law

Lesson: Parties need to share information, especially information more readily available to one party

Suvada v. Gordon Flesch

2013 WL 5166213 (N.D. Ill. Sept. 13, 2013)

Suvada was diagnosed with stage-four cervical cancer

Suvada disclosed her disability during a meeting with her supervisor; she expressed concern that she was having difficulty lifting boxes and did not know what her treatment would be

Suvada asked her supervisor if she knew of any easier jobs

Her supervisor said no because all the jobs in her division were mail-room and print shop positions with similar work

Supervisor asked Suvada if she was going to resign; Suvada later did because she didn't want to "screw over" her coworkers

Slide 26

Engaging in the Process:
Lessons from Case Law

Court: Employer arguably broke down the interactive process (denied employer's motion for summary judgment)

Supervisor did not tell Suvada to check the company website for a comprehensive list of job openings

Supervisor did not tell Suvada to contact HR

Instead asked only about resignation, leading employee to believe that resignation was the only option

“Suvada needed direction from [her supervisor] about what her options were, and [her supervisor] failed to provide adequate guidance.”

Rejected employer’s argument that the employee already had information from employee orientation calling the ADA’s reasonable accommodation requirement “an affirmative duty”

Slide 27

Engaging in the Process:
Lessons from Case Law

Ortiz-Martinez v. Fresenius Health Partners, PR, LLC
853 F.3d 599 (1st Cir. 2017)

Ortiz-Martinez injured her hand while working as a social worker

Took leave and returned with diagnoses of sprained left shoulder, arm, forearm, and hand and bilateral carpal tunnel syndrome

She returned with information about her diagnoses and some information about her restrictions (ex: difficulty with repetitive tasks, lifting, holding/manipulating heavy and large objects)

Employer asked for clarification (ex: how much weight could employee lift; what repetitive movements she needed to avoid)

Ortiz-Martinez did not provide any additional information

1st Cir: Found for employer – Ortiz-Martinez caused breakdown

Requested additional details were “not unreasonable”

Slide 28

Engaging in the Process:
Lessons from Case Law

Lesson: Parties should not make accommodation decisions before engaging in the interactive process

Mosby-Meachem v. Memphis Light, Gas & Water Div.
883 F.3d 595 (6th Cir. 2018)

Mosby-Meachem asked to telework for 10 weeks while she was on bed rest for pregnancy-related complications

Employer held a telephonic process meeting with an ADA Committee; Mosby-Meachem explained how she could do job

Request still denied

Jury Trial: Jury found for Mosby-Meachem

6th Cir: Affirmed decision. Employer did not engage in an interactive process because it had already made decision

Ex: “nobody can telecommute” and we “said no already”

Slide 29

Engaging in the Process:
Lessons from Case Law

Lesson: Parties should discuss alternative accommodation ideas in good faith

Romero v. County of Santa Clara

666 Fed.Appx. 609 (9th Cir. 2016)

Romero asked for an additional medical leave after he already had received three extensions

He refused to discuss anything other than medical leave and called employer’s attempt to initiate process “harassment”

9th Cir: Found for employer. Romero responsible for breakdown

See also *Lafata v. Church of Christ Home for Aged*, 325 F. Appx. 416 (6th Cir. 2009) (offering a lower position on a “take it or leave it” basis without further discussion of possible accommodations may indicate a failure to participate in the interactive process in good faith)

Slide 30

Engaging in the Process:
Lessons from Case Law

Lesson: Parties should let other side respond to concerns

Keith v. County of Oakland

703 F.3d 918 (6th Cir. 2013)

Keith was given a conditional job offer to work as a lifeguard

County doctor cleared him to work but because he is deaf, said he would need “constant accommodation”

County concluded that Keith could not safely do job

6th Cir: County failed to engage in interactive process

If the County had discussed with Keith, Keith could have:

Explained that he can detect loud noises through his cochlear implant if he wears an external sound transmitter

Referred County to people with expertise about deaf lifeguards

Clarified needs for an ASL interpreter

Slide 31

Selecting and Implementing Accommodation

Step 3: Employer chooses accommodation

Employer must give employee's preference "consideration"

Employer can ultimately can choose an alternative accommodation, so long as it is effective

Step 4: Employer and employee implement accommodation and evaluate its effectiveness

Implementation should occur in a timely fashion

Employer should follow up to ensure the accommodation is effective

The duty to accommodate is ongoing – changes may be needed over time as individual's disability or job changes

Slide 32

The Interactive Process:
Lessons from Case Law

Employers:

Engage in the interactive process in good faith before making any final decisions and any employment decisions

Share information that is easier for employers to access (especially job vacancies)

Identify your concerns and give the employee a chance to respond to them

Consider employee's preferred accommodation

If you want to use an alternative accommodation, explain why, discuss employee's concerns and try to find solutions

Make sure medical requests are limited to information that you need to evaluate the request

Use all available resources – like Job Accommodation Network

Document your process

Slide 33

The Interactive Process:
Lessons from Case Law

Employees:

Remember that the interactive process is a two-way street

Respond to reasonable requests for medical documentation

If your employer asks for too much information, don't just refuse – explain what is too broad and propose solution

Be open minded about alternative accommodations

If you know an alternative accommodation won't work, explain why

If you're not sure, agree to give the alternative accommodation a try, so long as your employer will revisit your initial request with you

If it doesn't work, document why and follow up with your employer

Slide 34

QUESTIONS?

Rachel Weisberg

(312) 895-7319

rachelw@equipforequality.org

Slide 35

Thank You!

Mid-Atlantic ADA Center

Toll Free: 800-949-4232 (DC, DE, MD, PA, VA, WV)

Telephone: 301-217-0124

ADAinfo@transcen.org

ADAinfo.org