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**Introduction**

This is a plain language summary of the response to the draft General Comment 8. It is about Article 27: The Right to Work and Employment. It was written by the following groups.

* Inclusion Canada (IC)
* People First of Canada (PFC)
* University of British Columbia’s Canadian Institute for Inclusion and Citizenship (CIIC)

General Comment 8 speaks about disability in general terms. It treats people with disabilities as one group of people with the same needs. It does not recognize the issues that people with intellectual and developmental disabilities face. They are unemployed at much higher rates. They are underemployed at much higher rates. This is a problem. This group has major work and employment issues. These issues need to be recognized.

Research shows that quotas have a negative effect on some groups. They have a negative effect on people with intellectual and developmental disabilities. Quotas often mean they are the last to be hired. Quotas also continue the stereotypes and negative views about people with intellectual disabilities.

A person’s disability should not affect their equal access to work and jobs. People with severe or major disabilities should have equal access to jobs and work. Yet, there is a general view that people with more severe disabilities cannot be employed. People should have the right to work. But it is a different question as to whether employers will hire them.

There are major barriers to work and jobs for some groups of people with disabilities. This includes people with intellectual and developmental disabilities. They face barriers to getting and keeping a job. This should be recognized in General Comment 8.

Below are the general and specific recommendations to the draft General Comment 8. It is just called the ‘Comment’ in the sections below.

**Plain Language: General Recommendations**

**Accessibility of Responding to General Comment 8**

With respect, the process of making this response was very difficult. There are many materials to read. There are no plain language resources with the materials. It is difficult for self-advocates, supporters and families to take part. It is difficult for them to respond. There should be plain language resources available. The Committee needs to follow this practice.

**Reference to Families**

The Comment does not mention families. Families should be included in several areas. They should be in the ‘social protection’ section. They should also be in the ‘reasonable accommodation’ section. This will help family members who are also caregivers. It will make sure that employers give them the flexibility they need at work.

**Sheltered Workshops**

There was confusing information about sheltered workshops. The information was not all in one place in the Comment. It was in different places in the text. In some places it seemed to say that people do not have to be moved out of sheltered workshops right away. This is if labour standards are used, like paying minimum wage. But other places in the text seem to say that it is still against the rights to work even if minimum wage is paid. This is because is it not “open, inclusive and accessible.” A better section on sheltered workshops may help to make the information more clear.

It is easy to close sheltered workshops. The challenge is finding meaningful work and activities for people who don’t work full time. Sometimes when a sheltered workshop closes there may be larger day programs. These day programs are segregated. But they are not considered as work and employment. This issue is often ignored. It should be more important. The Comment should include best practices for transitioning people with disabilities out of sheltered work. Meaningful work should be a priority. There should be real work for real pay. There should be guidelines for people who are not working full time.

**The Employment Cycle**

People with intellectual and developmental disabilities are often overlooked. This happens when ‘disability’ is treated as one group. This is true in the job cycle. They face more barriers getting into a workplace. Research shows they have major barriers in getting recruited and hired. Employers have views and attitudes that limit this group from getting interviews or jobs. The whole job cycle is important. But this area needs more attention in the Comment.

**Labour Unions and Organized Labour**

The Comment states that organized labour and unions are important. But it does not do enough. It does not help people with intellectual disabilities to be included in unions. For example, some labour groups are against changes to job descriptions. These changes would accommodate people with disabilities. This means people with intellectual disabilities are not hired in union jobs. Or they are forced out of union positions. The Comment should focus on what organized labour can do. It should focus on how to support the hiring of people with disabilities. It should focus on how employers can create the equal opportunity to work in union jobs.

**Economic Development**

Communities that are just starting to develop their economies should have plans to be inclusive. People with disabilities need to be included from the beginning. Practices like sheltered workshops should not be used. People with disabilities should not be in segregated jobs.

**Wage Subsidies**

The Comment recommends wage subsidies in several areas. Wage subsidies should not be used or recommended. These do not help people with major barriers to work. These subsidies create many short-term positions. These numbers are often used to show a lower employment rate. But they do not result in continued employment. Inclusive hiring means that employers need to create positions that are necessary for their business to succeed.

**Reinforcing Comments on Quotas**

The need to stop quotas is not in this version of the Comment. It is important and needs to be repeated. This response supports Inclusion International’s call on quotas.

Quota systems may work well for people with physical or sensory disabilities. But people with intellectual disabilities do not usually benefit from these systems. If quotas are used they must be designed to make sure they also benefit from the system. This includes people who face serious barriers to being employed. Employers must have clear rules. People with disabilities should not be without the accommodations they need in the workplace.

**Plain Language: Specific Recommendations**

This section speaks to the Comment’s strengths. It identifies areas that need more work. And it makes several recommendations, as follows.

**Gender**

The final version of the Comment should be more inclusive of gender. It should not use terms like ‘women and men.’ It should not use terms that leave out other genders.

**Youth Transitioning to Employment**

Youth with disabilities face an important transition when they first look for a job. It would help if the Comment would refer to this. Youth with disabilities need the tools and training to get a job as early as possible.

Youth who have a job in secondary school are more likely to be employed as adults. But access to tools and training, like internships, are most often available to youth without disabilities.

**Benefits and Part-Time Employment**

Many people with intellectual and developmental disabilities do not get the same benefits and protections that other workers get. This includes many kinds of leave like sick leave or parental leave. It also includes benefits like pensions and paid holidays. This is because they often do not have enough work or hours on the job to get these benefits. They do not have the same opportunity as other workers to get these benefits. These rights must be protected on an equal basis. People with intellectual disabilities should have access to these benefits. The Comment should include this issue.

**Ableism**

Every person has value and dignity as a human being. This is not affected by their job status.

The Comment does a good job of explaining ableism. It compares ableism to taking away the value of a person as a human being. But there needs to be more information on how to stop ableism. Human rights laws alone cannot change the attitudes that cause ableism. For people with intellectual disabilities, this often means they can only get certain types of jobs. Other job opportunities are not open to them.

There needs to be a change in how society views people with disabilities. The Comment should note that there also needs to be a focus beyond human rights that speaks to changing attitudes.

**Career Development in the Context of Education**

The Comment only speaks briefly to career development in education. Adding the word ‘inclusive’ will help make some parts stronger. This is important for education. This is important in places where ‘vocational training’ is used. It is important for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities. Much of their history with education and vocational training has been segregated. These both need to be inclusive.

**Minimum Wage, Income Assistance, and a Living Wage**

No one should be paid less than minimum wage. This could be made stronger in the Comment.

**Reference to National Minimum Wage**

The word ‘national’ should be removed when referring to a minimum wage. This is because not all countries have a national minimum wage law. Some states or provinces have their own minimum wage laws.

**Income Assistance**

There is not much in the Comment about income support as it relates to job earnings. Most working age people with intellectual and developmental disabilities are on income support. Many programs will claw back money from the income support when a person earns money from a job. Sometimes people will lose other benefits from income programs when they start a job. This can include medical or dental support. Often, people with intellectual disabilities are worse off in terms of finances when they move from income support to a job.

**Minimal Reference to Job Support and Supported Employment**

Accommodations are mentioned in the Comment. But on-the-job supports are not. These need to be added. The language of ‘accommodations’ may not be enough. Some people may require a job coach or job support. When these are needed, it should be considered more of a right than an optional ‘accommodation.’

Supported employment is only referred to once in the Comment. Job coaches and work assistance is only referred to once as well. These references need to be made stronger. These are major parts of the job model for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities. These programs and supports need more priority in the Comment.

**Reference to a Living Wage**

The Comment speaks a lot about social protection programs for people with disabilities. These parts should include the term ‘living wage.’

**Accessible Transportation**

A major barrier to having a job is accessible transportation. People need transportation to get to their workplace. This section of the Comment needs to be stronger. It needs to show how important transportation is to an inclusive job. It needs to show how access to transportation is related to having a job. The text proposed by Inclusion International will help to include this issue.

**Endorsement of Global Affiliates**

Inclusion Canada and People First of Canada are members of Inclusion Inter-Americana and Inclusion International. These are the regional and global federations working to advance the full inclusion and human rights of people with an intellectual disability and their families. Inclusion Canada and People First of Canada fully support and agree with Inclusion International's submission on GC no. 8. This response is a Canadian perspective on the draft comment.

**Joint Submission to the CRPD Committee on Draft General Comment 8 on Article 27 on the Right of Persons with Disabilities to Work and Employment**

***December 2021***

**Introduction**

Inclusion Canada (IC), People First of Canada (PFC), and University of British Columbia’s Canadian Institute for Inclusion and Citizenship (CIIC) welcome the opportunity to respond to the Committee on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities’ calls for submissions on draft General Comment (GC) no. 8, *Article 27: The Right to Work and Employment*.

General Comment 8 speaks to disability as one group of people not recognizing that those who live with the label of intellectual or developmental disability experience unemployment and underemployment at significantly higher rates and for distinctly different reasons.[[1]](#footnote-1) This is a problem as there are many significant work and employment issues unique to intellectual and developmental disability. For example, research demonstrates internationally that people with intellectual and developmental disabilities are the last to be hired in countries which use quotas and incentives to promote employment.[[2]](#footnote-2) In many situations these and other approaches to employment - that may work for others are inadequate for persons with intellectual disabilities and developmental disabilities - serve to perpetuate not only ingrained stereotypes about intellectual and developmental disability but systemic and unstained unemployment.[[3]](#footnote-3)

The severity or significance of somebody's disability should not be a factor in having equal access to employment. Indeed, from our experience, there is a general view that if your disability is more significant, you are deemed unemployable.[[4]](#footnote-4) Persons should have a right to work but whether or not an employer will hire you is often an entirely different question. General Comment 8 should acknowledge that people with an intellectual or developmental disability face unique and significant barriers in the context of work and employment, both attaining and maintaining.

***General Recommendations***

**The Accessibility of the Development of General Comment 8**

With respect for the Committee and its work, the development and call for submission on draft General Comment 8 have been difficult for self-advocates, allies, and persons with intellectual and developmental disabilities and their families to participate and respond given the density of the materials and the lack of plain language resources accompanying related materials. Plain language must be made available - the Committee should ensure that consultative materials are made available in an array of accessible formats.

**Reference to Families**

The current draft has no mention of families - We will ask for additional references to families in the social protection section and in the reasonable accommodation section. Specifically, proposing that the Committee make reference to ensuring employers give family members who are caregivers/primary supporters the flexibility they need to execute their support role - "reasonable accommodation by association," which the Committee has referenced in its concluding observations in the past as fulfilment of Article 5 but isn't concretized anywhere.

Where text references "consulting people with disabilities and their representative organizations," we will also recommend that this be amended to say "consulting people with disabilities and their families through their representative organizations"

**Sheltered Workshops**

A reader of draft General Comment 8 may conclude that there is no obligation to move people out of sheltered workshops expeditiously into employment or prevent people from entering them if one implements labour standards within the sheltered workplace (for example, pay people minimum wage rates). As references to sheltered workplaces are scattered throughout the text a reader may not derive from the text that even if you are paid minimum wage in a workshop, it is still an abrogation of a right to inclusive employment.[[5]](#footnote-5) A more concentrated and comprehensive section on sheltered workshops explicitly calling for their carefully planned and certain closures while moving those confined there into inclusive employment may serve to avoid confusion or misinterpretations on the issue.[[6]](#footnote-6)

A significant challenge associated with closing sheltered workshops is that they are often easy to close down. However, it is much more challenging to ensure people have access to meaningful inclusive work and other meaningful day occupations for those who don't work full time. When a sheltered workshop closes the result may be larger day programs that are still segregated but not classified as work and employment.[[7]](#footnote-7) This issue frequently goes unaddressed. The general comment should include rights-based and effective/proven best practices for transitioning people with disabilities out of exploitative work, including the importance of prioritizing meaningful employment (real work for real pay) and guidelines for what should be done when a person is not working full time.

**The Employment Cycle**

The introductory paragraph of this submission highlights that when there is an overall gaze or focus on disability as a homogenous construct, individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities get overlooked.

Echoing this point, much of the research on intellectual and developmental disability and employment tends to focus on the recruitment process. Individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities face more significant barriers based on employers' stereotypes and assumptions at the recruitment and hiring phase.[[8]](#footnote-8) So while we agree with the focus on the entire employment cycle, special attention needs to be made to ensure that job seekers with intellectual and developmental disabilities get their foot in the door.[[9]](#footnote-9)

**Labour Unions and Organized Labour**

While the importance of participating in organized labour is raised in the draft, the draft does not do enough to make it possible for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities to be included in organized labour itself.

The language of draft General Comment 8 speaks favourably to labour unions and organized labour generally as progressive institutions. However, trade union approaches and practices and even collective agreements sometimes restrict the rights of persons with intellectual and developmental disabilities. For example, our organizations have encountered organized labour groups opposing modifying and adapting job descriptions to employ people or forcing them into out-of-scope positions rather than remaining hired within a union context. In other instances union locals have said “no” to somebody being employed because a required modification of the job description is not within the collective agreement, which in their view, weakens their bargaining position. There may be a view that once a labour group makes an accommodation, then they think the employer will ask for another.

We recommend to the Committee that draft General Comment 8 contain language that focuses on what trade unions and organized labour can do to support the right to work by recognizing the need for accommodations and flexibility in the hiring and employment process for persons with a disability as union members. This flexibility should not be viewed as a concession to employers, but rather creating conditions for equal opportunity to work within unionized workplaces.

**Economic Development**

In jurisdictions with limited economic development, officials should develop plans to expand and grow economies inclusively. People should not have to be segregated to grow and create economic prospects in their community. Representatives of and people with disabilities should be included as active participants in economic development initiatives from the outset, rather than being excluded or confined to segregated enterprises which may reflect current and therefore outdated economic development practices.

**Wage Subsidies**

Wage subsidies, which the draft comment recommends in more than one clause, should not be recommended or condoned. Subsidies designed to encourage hiring or increasing labour force participation of marginalized groups do not work, serve to create temporary positions to the largest degree and as they do not result in sustained employment are used by states to artificially lower unemployment statistics on a short term basis. Sustained inclusive hiring required employers to create positions that are necessary to their business success or organizational success which subsidies do not.

**Reinforcing our Comments on Quotas**

Our [previous comments](https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/HRBodies/CRPD/DGD/2021/Incl_Canada_PFCan_and_CInst_InCi.docx) failed to make this version of the draft comment. However, again, we echo Inclusion International's call on quotas.

People with intellectual disabilities, who are among the most marginalized within the disability community, rarely benefit from cross-disability quota systems, which generally only create a path to employment for people with physical and sensory disabilities. When States do introduce quotas, they must be intentionally designed to ensure that people with intellectual disabilities, including those with the most significant barriers to employment, also benefit. There must be clear requirements for employers to ensure that people are not being hired without the appropriate accommodations in their workplace.[[10]](#footnote-10)

As well, with the requirement of quotas, they sometimes are accompanied by wage subsidies.

***Specific Recommendations with Amended Text***

Our response highlights the GC’s strengths, identifies areas that require additional effort, and makes several recommendations. Suggested text additions for each relevant paragraph are identified in yellow, and suggested removals are indicated in red.

**Gender**

The final version of General Comment 8 should be much more inclusive and not recreate a gender binary. In the first paragraph draft General Comment 8 speaks to decent work for all women and men. And then, later in paragraph 4, GC8 talks about respecting gender identity. [[11]](#footnote-11)

 **Proposed Amended Text (paragraph 1)**

*…by 2030 achieve full and productive employment and decent work for all women and men, including for young people and persons with disabilities, and equal pay for work of equal value.*

**Youth Transitioning to Employment**

It would be helpful for General Comment 8 to make particular reference to the crucial transition that youth with disabilities face when beginning their journey into the labour market.[[12]](#footnote-12) The development of a career identity coupled with parental expectations of employment being within the home and family during early childhood and progresses from there. An inclusive education including access to inclusive post-secondary education enhances the prospects of meaningful employment and a career. Research has shown that parental expectations of employment can increase the likelihood of employment in adulthood by 5 to 6 times.

The earlier youth with disabilities are supported to develop a career identity and are embedded in normative life pathways, then the transition to post-school employment can follow the same normative transition process the young people without disabilities experience successfully. Transition programs are more reflective of outdated special education constructs and are not particularly effective.

Having an inclusive part time job at a minimum wage or above outside school hours, for example, while in secondary school, is one of the biggest predictors of adult employment. Making the labour market available proactively and ultimately giving people access to that which already exists like experiential learning, internships, studies, etc., all exist in the school systems now, but these are not available to persons with disabilities.

**Proposed Amended Text (paragraph 25(b))**

*Disability and age also interact to mean that youth and older persons with disabilities can face substantially different challenges to realize the right to work. Youth with disabilities face a crucial transition when beginning their journey into the labour market.*

**Benefits and Part-Time Employment**

Favorable conditions of work and benefit protections for persons with disabilities are wonderful and important initiatives, such as superannuation, sick leave, long service leave, parental leave. However, they still exclude people with intellectual and developmental disabilities, many of whom have only secured work for a few hours a week, which often falls below the threshold to receive much needed employment benefits.

**Proposed Amended Text (paragraph 30)**

*Just and favourable conditions of work for persons with disabilities includes the benefits and protections that other workers have such as superannuation, sick leave, long service leave, parental leave, promotion, rest, leisure, and periodic holidays with pay. These rights must be protected on an equal basis when persons with intellectual and developmental disability are not afforded the same opportunities.*

**Ableism**

A person's value as a human being cannot be equated to their value as a worker. In other words, a person should not be forced to participate in the workforce to be considered a dignified and valued human being.

Draft General Comment 8 does a good job of explaining ableism by equating it to the devaluation of the person as a human being. Still, the text does not address this sufficiently because human rights frameworks in themselves cannot counter this form of devaluation. This issue is a common issue in rights frameworks because addressing devaluation requires, in effect, a cultural change or shift. In effect, you could have a right to work and still be devalued as a person. Addressing the broader issue of devaluation even within a rights framework requires additional focus beyond access to rights - it requires attention to cultural norms under which people routinely face devaluation. This can be seen in situations where people with an intellectual disability are routinely targeted for certain types of occupations.

**Proposed Amended Text (paragraph 3)**

*Ableism is the foundation of social prejudice and leads to inequality and discrimination against persons with disabilities, as it informs legislation, policies and practices such as segregated employment, for example ’sheltered workshops’, or can result in involuntary participation in the informal economy. Addressing the broader issue of devaluation even within a rights framework requires additional focus beyond access to rights - it requires attention to cultural norms under which people routinely face devaluation.*

**Career Development in the Context of Education**

There is very little mention about career development within the context of education. This could be strengthened by labelling tertiary or post-secondary education inclusive.

**Proposed Amended Text (paragraph 91)**

*The transition from school, inclusive secondary or tertiary education to work needs particular attention to realize the right to work. It is important point to ensure that persons with disabilities do not pass into segregated settings of work. Lifelong education is a key component to ensure and foster the continued career development of persons with disabilities.*

This could also be applied to other draft General Comment 8 sections on vocational training **(See paragraph 38 for example)**. We suggest that it is better to preface these sections with the word inclusive, which may appear redundant to some, but so much of the history of vocational training is exclusionary and segregating.

This would help counter the fact that so much of education and vocational training for persons with intellectual and developmental disabilities has historically been segregated.

**Minimum Wage, Income Assistance, and a Living Wage**

No one should be paid less than minimum wage; this could be strengthened within the draft comment.

Reference to National Minimum Wage

The language of a national minimum wage is not applicable to all states in all circumstances, especially those with federated countries where minimum wage is a state or provincial jurisdiction.

**Proposed Amended Text (paragraph 62)**

*…refraining from denying or limiting equal access to decent work for all persons with disabilities, refraining from exempting organizations from paying national legislated minimum wages based on disability, and prohibiting forced or compulsory labour.*

Income Assistance

The draft General Comment mentions income assistance programs concerning the issue of employment incentives, but one sentence is not sufficient. Most working age persons with intellectual and developmental disabilities are on income assistance. The lack of emphasis specific to intellectual and developmental disability creates a limitation in its applicability to the population that our work serves.

Unfortunately, where these programs are in place, they are not adequate. Many of these assistance programs have disincentives to employment in terms of how much you can earn before clawbacks, and the loss of crucial medical and dental supports or insurances. In many instances the individual who moves from income support to employment is worse off financially.

**Proposed Amended Text (Paragraph 72)**

*d. Ensure …*

*i that persons with disabilities are paid no less than minimum wage and that income assistance recipients are not deterred from participation in paid employment through loss of income and/or other benefits provided.*

Minimal Reference to Job Support and Support Employment

Draft General Comment 8 touches on the issue of accommodations but fails to talk about on-the-job supports. This omission needs to be corrected as there is potential for some employers to abuse it. For example, if a person requires somebody else to be with them (e.g. job coach) on the shop floor, and that is perceived as creating a safety issue, the language of “accommodation” may be insufficient. When personal job support or coaches are needed, those supports should be considered as a right more so than an optional accommodation.[[13]](#footnote-13)

The draft general comment only contains one reference to supported employment and one solitary reference to job coaching and work assistance. References to supported employment need to be strengthened. Given the significance of the model for persons with intellectual and developmental disabilities these concepts deserve more weight in the document.

**Proposed Amended Text (Paragraph 72)**

 *D. Ensure-*

*v. access to job supports and supported employment services as are required to obtain employment, learn or complete job-related tasks, and maintain employment or to advance to other desired positions or occupations.*

Reference to a Living Wage

The draft General Comment speaks extensively to social protection schemes for persons with disabilities, not being means-tested, etc. In this context, we suggest that the section mention a living wage.

**Accessible Transportation**

One immense barrier to work and employment is accessible transportation. Accessible transportation is often a prerequisite for employment. We recommend this section be strengthened to reflect the vital importance and relationship of accessible transportation to meaningful and inclusive jobs and support the text of Inclusion International’s proposed amendments.

**Proposed Amended Text (paragraph 89)**

*Article 20 on personal mobility—requires States parties to take measures to ensure personal mobility with the greatest possible independence for persons with disabilities. They should be provided for use in work, or for mobility related to work, including travel to and from work. This requires efforts to ensure that people with disabilities have full access to available, affordable, and accessible public or private transport systems that facilitate their access to their place of employment.*

**Endorsement of Global Affiliates**

Inclusion Canada and People First of Canada are members of Inclusion Inter-Americana and Inclusion International, the regional and global federations working to advance the full inclusion and human rights of people with an intellectual disability and their families. Inclusion Canada and People First of Canada fully endorse Inclusion International's submission on GC no. 8 and submit the following as a Canadian perspective on the draft comment.

*March 2021 - Previous Joint Submission*

In March of 2021, Inclusion Canada, People First of Canada, and UBC’s Canadian Institute for Inclusion and Citizenship made a previous submission for the Day of General Discussion on Draft General Comment no.8 on Article 27 [available here.](https://www.ohchr.org/Documents/HRBodies/CRPD/DGD/2021/Incl_Canada_PFCan_and_CInst_InCi.docx)
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*Director of Public and Legal Affairs, Inclusion Canada*
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