

W
by W S

Submission date: 14-Oct-2020 09:46PM (UTC+0800)

Submission ID: 1414943298

File name: Interactive_process.edited.docx (17.27K)

Word count: 726

Character count: 4143

Question 1

More often when the workforce with disabilities requests accommodations, the accommodation tends to be not so apparent. Nonetheless, a supple, interactive process can best help determine a suitable accommodation option (skjan.org, 2018). Thus, based on the recommendations from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) to managers, the latter group has to subscribe to the following components of the interactive process: evaluate the specific profession involved as well as determine its objective and fundamental operations; Talk with the person with an incapacity to find out the exact activity-related constraints forced by the person's inability and how those restrictions could be overwhelmed with a sensible accommodation; In talking with the person to be obliged, recognize possible accommodations besides evaluating the adequacy each would have in empowering the person to play out the fundamental elements of the position. Finally, consider the inclination of the person to be obliged and choose and execute the accommodation that is generally proper for both the worker and the business.

To appraise the significance of the interactive process, it necessitates that one should consider the employers' requirement of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). ADA demands that all insured employers offer operative, judicious accommodations for workers with frailties (skjan.org, 2018). To determine the effectiveness of this accommodation, EEOC employs an interactive process thus inferring that staff, as well as employers with disabilities who request accommodations mutually, collaborate to come up with accommodations.

People looking for security against segregation for the most part have the choice of submitting an authoritative question to a suitable organization or looking for help in a court of law. Of specific ongoing interest is the accompanying decision mirroring a developing number of

choices that anticipate that entities ought to involve in an interactive process to determine contradictions about accommodation matters (Rothstein, 2018). In the case, *Schneider v. Shah*, 2012 WL 1161584, the commitment to take part in an interactive process in accommodations closes on the day the understudy sues the college. The case entailed an understudy in a paralegal program that had an abundance of absenteeism.

References

Rothstein, L. (2018). A Primer on Disability Discrimination in Higher Education. *Laws*, 7(3), 25.
skjan.org. (2018). *Accommodation and Compliance: Interactive Process*.

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

Question 2

Affirmative yes, Joan would prevail in the complaint. The fact that Joan is deaf and her communication is through speech and lipreading necessitate that the college should engage in an interactive process with Joan as well as review her request for accommodation on a personal as well as on case basis. Joan's request to use CART services (computer-assisted real time transcription) for all of her classes implies she has assessed the nature as well as functional confines of the documented incapacity and regarded CART to be a legible means of her accommodation. College rejection of CART contravenes ADA provision under Title II and III that call for communication with folks with communication infirmity to be equally operative relative to those deprived of disabilities. The excuse cited by the college has a list impact on court's ruling against Joan. Instead, the college should have acknowledged its obligation to consult with Joan to discuss which auxiliary aid or service would be most appropriate in meeting her communication needs. The goal would then be for the college to provide that aid or service to

ensure an effective mode of communication for Joan. During their consultation, they could find out that besides CART, Joan might be qualified to utilize an assistive listening device, captioning or sign language interpreter. This will see the college meet Title III entity of ADA.

Certainly, for Bob to emerge a clear winner in this case, a condition has to be met. That is, his request for accommodation will propel him to an equal level to participate in his classes with those without a disability. Nonetheless, even if Bob prevails, he still has an uphill task of taking notes as well as looking at the interpreter. Yet, this is not the end of the road for Bob as a myriad of accommodation options are at his disposal following a successful consultation with the college. Similar to Joan's case, Bob could consider CART, assistive listening device or caption (psu.edu, 2018). But to guarantee best and effective accommodation, the college and Bob should consider an interactive process.

Reference

psu.edu. (2018). *Assistive Listening Devices, Sign Language Interpreters, CART, and Captioning*.

<http://equity.psu.edu/student-disability-resources/accommodations/hearing>

ORIGINALITY REPORT

0%

SIMILARITY INDEX

0%

INTERNET SOURCES

0%

PUBLICATIONS

0%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude bibliography On

Exclude matches Off