

## FINISHED TRANSCRIPT

GETTINGHIRED  
DECEMBER 10, 2013  
12 P.M. CT  
GH ADVISORY COUNCIL SESSION

Services provided by:  
Caption First, Inc.  
P.o. Box 3066  
Monument, CO 80132  
1-877-825-5234  
+001-719-481-9835  
[Www.captionfirst.com](http://Www.captionfirst.com)

\* \* \*

This text is being provided in a rough draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

\* \* \*

(Standing by).

>> AMIRA FAHMY: Welcome, everyone, to the GettingHired Advisory Council. This is Amira Fahmy. And we're going to wait a few minutes before we get started so we can get more people on the line. Thank you for your patience.

Hello? Hello?

>> PETE RUTIGLIANO: Hello.

>> AMIRA FAHMY: Hi, everyone, thank you for joining. We're just going to wait two more minutes before we get started. Actually looks like we have a number of attendees that we're expecting, so we'll go ahead and get started.

Again, this is Amira Fahmy, I'm Director of Community Development at GettingHired. I just want to welcome you to our fourth and final advisory council for 2013. We're very glad you can be with us today for our special presenter and guest, Pete Rutigliano from Sirota Consulting.

Before we get started, a couple housekeeping items. I want to remind you all that your lines should be on mute. In case they're not, go ahead and mute your lines so there's not much feedback on there. Also, we're going to have an opportunity to ask questions later in the presentation after Pete speaks. So if you do have any questions, please feel free to send them in through the Q and A box on the right-hand portion of your screen.

Before I hand over the controls to Pete for his presentation today, I do have two updates from GettingHired that I would like to mention. Mostly just want to talk to you

about a couple of things we have coming up in 2014 just to make you aware, and so you can let us know if you have any interest. The first is we're going to start hosting virtual career fairs for GettingHired. So we talked to quite a few of you about doing virtual career fairs, there seems to be interest. If that's something you would like to participate in in 2014 let us know by reaching out to your GettingHired representative and letting us know you'd like to participate.

Also we're going to be putting on a new monthly educational Webinar series. We had our first program last month, and it went very, very well, and we're hoping to continue that throughout 2014. Basically we're just going to host a Webinar for about 30 minutes each month on a topic to provide some additional value and information to you as employers. We're also going to be doing a couple of them for job seekers as well just to help them with the job search and preparing. Our first session will be hosted with the Job Accommodation Network, or JAN, in January, and it's going to cover DBA and the interactive interview. We hope you can all join us for that. That's about it on the GettingHired side.

We are very excited about the new things coming up in 2014. If you have any questions, please let me know and send them in through the Q and A box. And also, excuse me, at the end of the presentation we're going to leave a little bit of time for you to give feedback to Pete. So at the end of the call I'll go ahead and un-mute all of the lines so that you can provide some information to him about what you experience.

So with that, I will go ahead and introduce Pete Rutigliano, who is our speaker for today. He is a senior consultant with Sirota Consulting and has 20 years of internal consulting -- external consulting experience. He's worked with several organizations to conduct surveys, onboarding surveys, etcetera, with organizations like Sony Playstation, eBay, Bank of Montreal, LinkedIn and Montreal. He investigates the work experience of people with disabilities, which is why we wanted to bring him in on the call today because he's been doing some amazing research and found some very interesting information in that area.

With that, Pete, I'll go ahead and hand it over to you and you can get started.

>> PETE RUTIGLIANO: Great. Thanks a lot, Amira, and I really appreciate that introduction. Why don't we get started.

The long and short of it is, I started getting involved in this research because I started noticing some interesting trends, and I'm going to take you through basically the story of where we got today. We've now been doing this research since about 2008, and we have quite a large database now. So the results are just really intriguing.

One of the things you should know about this is these results were actually presented by Howell Glazier from the National Organization on Disability for Barack Obama and the White House, so I'm extremely proud some of my research actually made it up that far, but more importantly the voice of what's going on with employees with disabilities are getting heard, and as you're seeing, some the laws are changing because of that.

Without further ado, let me move into the presentation. Let me tell you a little bit about Sirota first. Sirota Consulting, we've a consulting firm, we've been around about 40 years, many of you have probably heard about us. Our singular mission is to improve the lives of employees and enable organizations to achieve sustained business success

by creating stronger more productive relationships.

And basically, that's basically what we're trying to do, we're trying to make the working world a better place for everyone. And we do that through a couple of different ways. We do it through, first off, assessing, figuring out what's going on for employees. And that could be through engagement surveys, pulse surveys, cultural assessment, onboarding and exit surveys, 360 feedback surveys. We use this database approach to figure out what's going on with the organization and to truly understand what's going on and what the experience is like for employees on a day-to-day basis. We do that through executive analysis, through fiscal analysis, path analysis, predictive analytics, etcetera. We do life employee research, and on the flip side we give that data back to employees in terms of managing reports that have been very successful, really helping people understand what's going on. And then finally, giving tools to help people act and actually evidence change within the organization.

Now, through this presentation, while we do a whole bunch of different things at Sirota, most of what you're seeing here in the results that I'm going to speak to will be about engagement survey research that we do on our current group of clients. And I'll speak to that as we move through the deck.

This work, though, is in conjunction with The National Organization on Disability. When I started noticing some patterns in the data, I reached out to them as I had a previous existing relationship, and we started talking about what was going on with the data, and they had been extremely helpful in really helping me understand what's going on.

As you guys well know, the NOD has been around for years. They help the workforce by helping people hire people with disabilities and helping them with their employees with disabilities. So we joined the partnership together a number of years ago, around 2008, 2009. When I first came to them about our data, they were very excited and, quite frankly, and I was very excited to have them involved. So Sirota's 40 years of experience and NOD's 30 years of experience, we really joined forces together in a very real way and we've -- what we've been doing is collecting this data and speaking about it really trying to create change within organizations, but also from a political perspective, also try to change some of the laws that are going on as well.

I'm sure I'm probably speaking to the choir in this statement, but why is this important? And really I'm putting this together to ground us in terms of really what are we seeing going on with this group of people. People with disabilities are the largest minority group, you probably know, about 20% of the U.S. has a disability. But nearly 80% of employees, people with disabilities, are not employed. And many of them really want to go out and work, but unfortunately they've been having a couple blockades keeping them from doing so. The OFCCP regulations will really change this.

I'm very excited about this change. As I mentioned before, Caroline Sirota had a piece in really changing some of the laws in the United States, and we're really excited about that. Some of the things we noticed is that employers report employees with disabilities are typically more dedicated and less likely to leave but they're not benefiting from this. This last point, I'm going to counter this later on, and this will be a discussion point that people with disabilities are less likely to leave. But more importantly, item number five, employees with disabilities are less satisfied than their colleagues without

disability. And really very little has been done in terms of researching this segment.

And finally, comprehensive work plan, diversity programs really need to include a specific vice for employees with disabilities. And I'll speak to that -- about this when I go through the data, but one of the things that was most disheartening for me, when I spoke with groups, many placed little emphasis on placement with people with disabilities. More focus was on diversity, age, gender, race, what have you. So this really is starting to show a shift in people's thinking.

As you guys know, we have some new OFCCP regulations, and I highlight some of the points and how it affects some of the data I'm going to present here. Some of the federal contractors according to OFCCP regulations must set a hiring goal of 10% of employees with a disability. They're required to track the number of employees with disabilities, written procedures in place for commendations and also provide linkage agreements with various disability organizations, whether it be public or private. Now, I will speak to this as I go through the deck and how some of these implications might wind up impacting the data. It should be fairly interesting.

Let's get into it. Let's start talking about this. So I'm going to speak to this as a true researcher, which is how we found out about this, which was our discovery, how we -- is there some sort of trend that has been established around this, and I'll get to that in the next section. And the final section is I'm really going to start doing a little deeper dive to help us learn a little bit more what's going on and that will help guide us in some of decisions we make and then in terms of actioning we might take as a response to that. So let's start talking about the discovery.

So my goal is to investigate attitudinal differences with people with disabilities and those without. I collected from about six different projects, which is relatively strong, a group just under 300,000 people. All of these data were conducted through engagement surveys. Engagement surveys are done by companies across the entire organization, so it would be a census survey, where they ask questions about their attitudes about the company, which would include things like overall I am satisfied with the company, my manager is doing a good job, I understand my goals and direction, I think my career goals can be met, a number of questions. Average survey length is around 65 questions. And we do that for many, many, many organizations. In fact, our database we collect about a million and a half employees each year in that data set.

>> (Unintelligible).

>> PETE RUTIGLIANO: Hello? Is there a question? Okay. I'll continue.

The last thing I want to point out is how we're collecting basically our key variable here, which is how employees identified whether or not they were disabled or not. And typically the question was do you consider yourself a person with a disability. It was a simple yes/no question. So what did we find? Well, when looking at disability status, looking across the 267,000 employees, 97% of them identified as not having a disability, but only three of them identified as having a disability. So now when you think about this and how it relates to the regulations, you're finding 3% in the data I collected, but we have 7% is what our targeted goal is. There's a little bit of a disconnect there. I'm going to talk about this in more detail but I just want to draw your attention to that right off the bat.

What can we say about this initial discovery set of data? Employees with

disabilities are less satisfied, less proud, less likely to recommend the company and also less motivated. So let me -- I'm going to speak in this format for quite a while, but if you'll notice on the left-hand side we have the percents, and that goes from 11 to 100%. At the bottom the four different engagement questions, the green column represents those without disabilities and the blue column represents those with disabilities. And it's really rather profound. In fact, this shocked me to see this level of difference. I saw an eight-point difference in overall satisfaction with the company. Pride had a seven-point difference, recommend five-point, and motivated to go up and beyond with a six-point difference. These four questions represent some of the most common engagement questions that we ask in some of these engagement surveys, it talks about our key dependent variable.

How do people feel about their organization? Before I go deeper into this, is this important if the question comes up, should an eight-point difference in satisfaction be a concern? Bottom line, yes, absolutely. Typically we consider at Sirota a five-point difference notable, a call to action. This is a fair industry standard, five points saying when there's a difference between groups something is going on. But in doing so, I want to compare this to some of the other things I mentioned before, that we have diversity inclusion groups looking into factors. What do we typically see in those data sets? What do we see in the usual areas of investigation?

So for instance, gender race and even sexual orientation, which isn't very typical, but I have data on that. For gender, we typically see a one-point difference. In the data set that I describe here, the 267,000, there's a one-point difference where males are scoring higher than females. Now, that's for us, we consider that statistical noise. There's brand-new information, females are now one point higher in our data set, but it's statistical noise, it doesn't mean anything. For Sirota, we say there's really no difference.

Okay. Fine. What about race? Race, we typically don't see any notable differences in race and ethnicity. This typically is one of those areas that is a real strong interest area for DNI groups. Let's go off the board, let's go a little more wild and unusual. How about sexual orientation? Do we see any differences there? For this data set for this 267,000, there is only one-point difference in heterosexual and homosexual populations. I'm seeing an eight-point difference for employees with disabilities compared to those without, but I'm not seeing differences in some of the other DNI groups. So that's really what started hitting home to me, wow, there's something going on here. What I really found that was very profound, these four questions overall, there was no one question where employees with disabilities were more favorable than those without disabilities. And that's huge. I just figured from a statistical point of view, just random chance, I figured I'd have a handful of employees, people with disabilities would score higher than those without. So that really surprised me. This is the first time we did this analysis. Maybe this is just a statistical fluke.

What was really interesting about this, and I think you guys will find it particularly interesting, despite all of these differences, I'm finding very few companies are really looking into this information, they're really investigating employees with disabilities. Out of 150 projects at Sirota at this point in time, only six inquired of the question about disability status. So only 4% of all of the projects that we had worked on that point in time even investigated disability status. Now, slowly that's changing, but it's still not that

great. But again, I mentioned, this discovery section, you know, this was us looking into some really interesting findings but really is this a consistent finding? Is this a statistical anomaly?

So the green section, let's establish a trend. We did this the first time around, a good researcher should always replicate the results, so I did the study again. So in 2010, I want to see if I could replicate this, so I analyzed engagement survey from 11 new projects which brought up my end to 755,000. This is in addition to the 260-something thousand. Again, the question whether or not people identified themselves -- voluntarily identified themselves as do you consider yourself a person with a disability. What's interesting is my first confirmation, it's still following the same trend of about 3% of organizations, about 3% of people in organizations identify themselves as having a disability, again, consistent with what I found last time and far below the 7% cutoff that we're looking on based on the OFCCP regulations.

Again, I did this same analysis that I did previously. What about engagement? What are we seeing here? I'll give you guys a second to look through this. What we're seeing, a very similar pattern, very large differences. By the way, the difference in the previous one showed an eight-point difference in satisfaction, this is showing a ten-point difference in satisfaction. I don't want you to think, oh, it's getting worse. Keep in mind this is random sampling of data so there might be some statistical variability, but if you just take the more conservative view, that is an eight-point difference, that's still a very large difference we're seeing.

In fact, what's interesting, if you look across all of the projects, now I'm taking the first data set in any discovery phase and the second data set in the tracking trends, I put them all together. Here you see every project and they're arranged from the largest differences to the smallest differences. Out of all of those 17 projects not one of them, A, had higher scores for employees with disabilities, and B, some of them had very large variability. You can see project A there, there's 14-point difference between those with disabilities and those without. And out of those, 12 of the 17 had that statistical five-point difference that we typically look for.

So okay, we did the discovery phase, as a good researcher I replicate the findings, now I can join all the data together and let's see what else can we learn from this group. What are we seeing here in this data? So again, just repeating it together, I take all one million records now, put them together, obviously the percentages remain the same with the 3% of our employees with disabilities and 990,000 do not have a disability, or at least identifying themselves as having a disability. And let's do a little bit of the deeper dive into this. What else can we learn from this?

So the largest differences, two groups of these has to do with employees' relationship with the company. Some of the largest differences that I saw is how people feel about the company and their relationship with it. So again, using the same format I did earlier, remember, the first one is company communicates to employees on matters that affect them. There's a 12-point difference between employees with disabilities and those without disabilities. Right? So I don't feel like an employee with a disability, I don't feel like the company communicates with me about matters that affect me as well as those without disabilities. So there's a bit of a disconnect with communication. The next one is interesting. We do not compromise on quality in order to meet other

requirements, a ten-point difference there. This is interesting. Why would employees with disabilities be more negative about the quality of stuff going on in the organization? Well, again, it has to do with my relationship with the company and the goods and products and services we develop, I'm feeling less positive about it because I'm less connected from the company, I don't feel that bond with the company that most of the employees with disabilities, without disabilities have. Again, another question about having enough information to do my job well. Do I have -- am I getting communicated to, similar to the first one. The next one didn't surprise me, much dissatisfied with working conditions, describes what I mentioned before about having a slightly more soured view of the organization, but also people with disabilities are going to be more coming -- cognizant when physical conditions are not up no snuff, because it will affect them in a more profound way than people without stabilities.

So the first one is, okay, my relationship with my company, we've seen the disconnect with the engagement questions, we're seeing, excuse me, the difference with these other questions. But what else do I see here? And this is the most important aspect I find here. The second set of largest differences had to do with personal performance. Related to -- encouragement and opportunity to achieve. Look at this, it's about skills, enjoying your job, about my job latitude and advancement. First one I've been given the opportunity to improve my skills, there's a 12-point difference there. I have the freedom to use my own judgment, again, another 12-point difference. I can express myself without fear of retribution. There's a certain aspect of them not being able to be themselves and speak up for one reason or another. And then satisfaction with the opportunity for advancement. Again, we're seeing a ten-point difference there.

Now, there's a couple of different factors when looking at these variables, there's a couple of things we want to keep in mind. One is how are employees being treated by the company, but the other aspect we want to think about is what are employees with disabilities bringing to the table such that they may or may not feel like they could do things but perhaps that hasn't necessarily been shown? Maybe they had some bad experience, so that causes them to be a little bit more gun shy, if you will. So that's some of the things that we're thinking about, as I'm sure you guys on the phone probably have quite a number of experiences where you've heard these bad stories. And I've heard some of these bad stories with employees with disabilities and once bitten, twice shy, they're a little less likely to come forward and actually speak their mind or push themselves ahead in terms of opportunity for advancement and whatnot.

So I've mentioned some of the negative side. Where are we seeing smaller differences? I already mentioned we're seeing big differences with my relationship with the company and advancement. Those are the two big areas. Where do we see smaller differences? Well, the smaller differences were typically around local environment variables, like my relationship with my manager. I didn't show all of them here, but there are a couple of questions about my supervisor giving feedback to help me with my performance, overall my manager is doing a good job. The number of my manager questions there were a smaller difference. The other thing that came up on the left-hand side. I'm better compensated, the better my performance the more I'm rewarded. I'm not too surprised about the fair compensation, because typically we use compensation models, that assesses people regardless of what their -- what their

disability status is. I was very pleased to see the better my performance the more I'll be rewarded, so that shows there's not as much of a difference between employees with disabilities and those without in that if I do strive and I do perform better, I will likely be rewarded for that.

But I should point out too that these are -- these are the smallest differences and we're still seeing a fairly large difference. Four point is just below the threshold of that five meaningful difference between the two groups.

I've also been able to do some other interesting analysis. So the differences that we saw with all of the variability -- variables, I decide to look at what about those people who skipped the questions? Okay? Remember this was a voluntary question. I could choose to answer the question about having a disability or not answer it. And we did find a very high number of people who skipped this. In fact, it was 12%. Now just to put that into context in terms of 12%, Pete, is that a big number, this 12%? Absolutely.

Typically we find less than 2, 3% people skipping questions in general. In terms of demographics, we typically find, depending on the company and the specific environment, usually on average about 5%. But look what we're seeing here. We're seeing some profound numbers here. The people who skipped the question had results that were much lower. Now, I can't say that these are people with disabilities who didn't want to answer the question. I can say they -- I can't say they aren't people without disabilities that don't want to ask the question. We had people who skipped gender and other areas, so keep that in mind. One thing I want to bring to your attention typically when people take a survey and are concerned about their anonymity, they'll skip all the demographic questions, not specific demographic questions. When I look at this specific data set, what I found, like I typically find, 4 or 5% of the people skipping all the demographic questions, in which case they would skip the disability question, but that still means about 7% of those only skipped the disability question.

Now, for me, let's go back to what we talked about earlier with the OFCCP, right? We said that number is about 7%. If I was going to ballpark to a certain extent I'm seeing here maybe 7% of those people actually have a disability and that's why they specifically skipped that question. That brings our number up to about 10%, right? The original 3% we mentioned earlier and the 7 we're skipping that brings us to about 7% of people in organizations who have a disability, yet 7% are not claiming it. Again, these are ballpark numbers, but I think that's something interesting and it gives me some optimism in terms of that 7 percentage number should be fairly easy to acquire.

Again, I'm taking a statistical leap there, I don't have data to support that, but based on what I'm finding, it seems logical to come to that conclusion.

Based on this, in my last round I thought it would be interesting to give people an opportunity to skip the question but do it in a way that's less obvious. Let me put it this way, more obvious that they're skipping the question. So for a very small group of people, I decided to add to the question, another response was they had -- whether disabled or not, but also they had the option to say I'd rather not say. And what this did for me was this gave me the ability to see those people who are more likely to say, listen, I don't feel comfortable answering that question, and maybe they have a disability and you could see those results.

This result in particular, you can see the difference because it's pretty obvious

here, one of the things that this led me to is the fact that employees with disabilities are perhaps a little bit more cautious. And they're afraid of being found out to a certain extent. And I have some antidotal data to support this. I have a friend of mine who has bipolar disorder, and he works for a nonprofit organization that specializes in biological disorders. He's bipolar, and he's told me I do not want to tell people I have bipolar disorder because I'm afraid of the treatment I will receive as a result of that.

Now, that's a very profound impact bipolar disorder makes -- has certain issues related to it which you can understand why someone might want to avoid speaking to that, but I think that gives an example of how people might feel about that any disability they have that may not be readily apparent. Maybe will treat me different and I don't want them to know about that. Again, very preliminary data, I want to look more into that, but I think it's a very interesting trend.

So I decided to do a little bit of a deeper dive. And what I've decided was let me take out those employees, I mentioned before there's an eight-point difference but we're still seeing, if we look at these results, I'm still seeing 70% of those with disabilities are engaged. And that's actually not a bad score. Yes, it's less than the 78% but 70% is pretty good, means 30% aren't engage, tells a fairly good story here. Let's look at those employees with disabilities and do it -- what we typically do is a key driver analysis. That is of all of the variables in the analysis, what questions best predict whether or not an employee with disability is engaged. And it's called the T-driver analysis. And we do this for all of our surveys, and all of the results whether or not we're looking at specifically employees with disabilities or not. So what is it that distinguished those employees with disabilities who are engaged from those who are not engaged.

Well, number one, and I already pointed this out earlier, feeling communication from management. Do I feel connected with management. The more connected an employee with a disability connected to management the higher their engaging score.

We also found that if people self-involved in decisions, if their opinions count they were more likely to be engaged. Again, specifically from employees with disabilities. Again, is there a partnership relationship? Do I feel valued in the organization? Do I feel like do they want me to keep me here? That's real important distinction for this group. Do I have the opportunity to get training or to learn? So about job advancement, about doing my job better. The more I had the opportunity to learn and get training in my organization, the more engaged I was.

That my job made good use of my skills and abilities, you'll notice a pattern here. The first two was that first opportunity area I mentioned before, some of the biggest differences, the second two are more about the second opportunity I mentioned.

Career goals can be met, again, dovetails well with the opportunity for advancement, and then the final one, company treats people fairly regardless of gender, age, disability, etcetera, etcetera. And that one makes sense, too, so it's a fair treatment question.

Now, what I found most interesting about this is I do this key driver analysis probably about -- me specifically I do it probably for about 15 -- probably about 20 companies a year, Sirota does it probably for about 150 companies a year. And what I found most interesting about this is any company who has an engagement program, these are almost the exact same key areas that everyone's looking for, so it's not just

employees with disabilities are looking for this, everyone is looking for this.

So what we're doing for any other employee I can do for my employee with disability, we just have to give it a little more focus specifically around this group.

So what else did I find in the data? Again, a lot of this results, I'm just starting to tear apart, I have more data, probably going to add another 150 to 200,000 employees to my data set at the end of this year, which I'm very excited about. I'm going to be presenting it at a conference in Hawaii, actually, in May. But what else can I say about this data set? Well, employees with disabilities in this data set, they're typically much older, not really much of a surprise, right? You guys probably already know the older someone gets, the greater the likelihood they're going to get a disability. They're also much more likely to be part time. There were a lot of people in this data set much more likely to want or be looking for a part-time job or having a part-time job, I should say. They're much less likely to be Asian or Hispanic. Now, I don't believe that that means Asians or Hispanic populations have fewer people who are disabled, I think this has more to do with maybe a certain amount of pride of admitting a disability. More so than actual differences in base rates. You guys probably have seen that yourself. They're also less likely to be a manager, which was a little discouraging. I would have expected to be more likely to be a manager given they're the older populations, but given there's more part-time and maybe because of various other reasons they're not able to move up the ranks. Whether it's through their own leverage or maybe that people say, oh, you know, Bob's disabled, I don't know if he can do that job. I don't know yet at this point is it a company pushing that or is it the employee that's pushing that or is it a little bit of both.

The last point I thought was really interesting, they're more likely to consider leaving the organization in the next year. This is contrary to what some other studies have shown, and it really has more to do with methodology than anything else. I'm looking at employees in organizations and what they're saying about their likelihood to leave. And based on their scores and engagement, it makes sense to me that they would be more likely to leave. What Sirota typically finds is that the more engaged people are the less likely they are to leave an organization. However, the flip side is I'm not exactly sure why we're seeing that result elsewhere. Perhaps that was related previously to benefits or simply the methodology that they were using. We definitely want to investigate this a little bit more, but I did find that difference interesting. You guys might also have some insight about that.

So I painted kind of a gloomy picture, right? I mean, we're seeing some pretty stark differences between employees with disabilities and those without, and definitely something needs to be done. So now, can we make a change? That's a big question about this, it's like, well, if we start looking at this, can we make it? Well, by measuring this difference we can attend to it and make change. And what I'm going to show you here are the results from one particular company that actually has a fairly sophisticated DNI group that are trying specifically to move the dial on employees with disabilities. And we're able to track them over time, that when we first started investigating this, and simply asking the question whether or not employees had a disability, we found that there was a six-point difference. So a little bit less than all the other companies or at least the average that I've seen in the data set, which is still a profound difference. By time two when they started doing work on it and really started moving the dial we started seeing

them chip away at that difference. By time three, the difference now is only down to three points, and I've since looked at their data a few months ago and they've since been able to maintain that difference, that smaller difference. So that's really great news. But the big thing is if you don't measure it, you're not going to find that out. And like I said before, only 4% of companies were actually asking the question.

So what was it about this company? Was it a special company that did this? Well, they weren't really that different of a company or unusual. What made them different, though, is they had a dedicated diversity manager with a new focus on the disability issues. This person actually, when they said diversity inclusion, disability is one of the first one or two things that will come out of their mouth when talking about diversity. Since tracking the data, the company increased their focus on employees disability employee initiatives. They worked on their hiring of employees with disabilities. They did a number of different programs to help employees with disabilities. They had various training programs that they did to help specifically employees with disabilities who may have had trouble. They also, in addition to engagement surveys and asking a question around disability status, they also conducted this diversity survey that dug deeper and what they could do when actioning a little better.

So what do we know more broadly? The good news is employees are really changing the conversation on disability. It's very exciting. It's gone from being a taboo conversation to really being more a part of an open dialogue. And a lot of the laws that -- the laws are going to turn the table on this. And personally, I don't think it's going to change it for government contractors, I think it's going to start a trend change overall that instead of being afraid to talk about it, now people will want to readily talk about it. So when I do this presentation at organizations, one of the things I like to ask people, well, how are your conversations going about this? What are you doing about this? Second point is real important. You can't track or even understand what you don't measure. I've been encouraging people since I started finding the difference, I've been encouraging people to really add this question to their survey. Now, I hit some blockades in some companies, but happily many organizations have seen the value of this and are really starting to investigate it. The good news is once they start seeing the difference, and I point out to them, oh, your differences in gender is different but we have seven-point difference in age. And they say wow, I didn't know that. They get on top of it. About standards, performance requirements should be flexible but not changed for employees with disabilities. This is important. I'm not saying we have to lower the bar for employees with disabilities, but more importantly, the how may be somewhat different, not what they need to do. I'm sure you guys have experienced that as well.

So what can companies do? And here are just a couple of things, and it looks like I'm doing fairly good on time, but I think I'm going to go through these more quickly. Number one, I mentioned before we have to assess the current state. I really want companies to start setting goals, not just the goal in terms of the percentage of employees they hire with disabilities, but also goals, and hey, we want on change this value, this difference we're seeing between employees with and without disabilities and change that value to be a smaller difference. It's also important to have internal champions, to diversity inclusion executive who really pushes on this.

Use your resources that are available. So what other local partners are

available? GettingHired is a great program to use to find employees with disabilities, but there's also various community groups that help with this that can help with resources, finding people, job hosting, etcetera. You want to make sure your staff is completely trained on this as much as possible. And the important -- you know, once we've assessed the current state you want to track it, measure, and manage. You want to be able to do this on an ongoing basis. Are we making the changes we thought we were making, and if not, what can we do to make things a little better?

To that end, and I don't know if you guys on the call have heard about this, but the NOD and Sirota have joined in a partnership with the National Business and Disability Council to create a self-assessment tracker. Basically we call it the disability employment tracker. It's a way for companies to self assess their organizations on how they're doing with their diversity program. Specifically, how they're doing with their disability and also their veterans program. It's free, and this isn't a sales call because there are other opportunities for people to investigate this. I specifically recommend this because it's a way for people to take the survey, find out how they're doing and then compare themselves to benchmarks. We're also going to be providing some training in the reporting module to really help people move the dial. Just real high level, the survey's fairly quick and small, should be able to complete it in 20 minutes. They're all yes and no questions. And then the reporting, and this is a mock up of what we're hoping the recording to look like, for each question it's very simple yes or no, or if they skip you'll be able to see how you responded and how everyone else did in the data set. And then we're going to give some suggestions for leading practices or specifically where this might intersect with the law. So here are some examples. So for instance, if someone clicks on a button they'll find out about what training should be involved for employees with disabilities. Or what will add possibly where the laws around the OFCCP show up. If we ask a question about something, people say why is that question on the survey, and we'll give them some reference point. So it's a little bit stronger connection. Obviously for companies that aren't -- don't have to be OFCCP compliant, they'll skip this, but as with most laws, whatever the federal contractors have to ascribe to, a lot of companies see that as best practice and start ascribing to it, maybe not letter to the law, but at least moving of the general goal post or a guiding point.

So like I mentioned earlier, this is a journey really am looking for companies to change how they're thinking about things. But again, it's not about disability, it's about ability. Disability's a diversity group, and most importantly I want people to see diversity -- excuse me, disability as a diversity group. We wants people to deliberate. Don't hope that change happens necessarily, we want people to be deliberate, let's establish a plan, let's collect the data, let's see what the data says and let's try to change. And the other thing too is stick with it. Disability employment happens in a movement, not by a small moment. We want people to be dedicated to it. Specific talent resources. One thing that came up in a meeting, Pete, this is all well and good with a company that might have 50,000 employees, they have a dedicated diversity inclusion officer. What do companies do that have maybe a hundred or 200 or 300 employees? You could find someone within HR that could be a diversity champion and specifically a disability champion within the organization as a subtitle for that particular person. It doesn't have to be an DNI officer. Sirota is a relatively small organization, our head of HR is our DNI

champion, and she works with local groups in terms of finding employees with disabilities and finding veterans. And we're a very small organization, so if we could do it, every organization can do it.

And more importantly, ask for help. There's a lot of resources out there. I fully understand that people don't know everything themselves, but the more they ask for help the more we ask questions about it the better off we'll get at this.

So it looks like I've ended pretty much on time, so I'm proud on that. So at this point why don't we ask -- open up the questions, on Amira. Amira, do we have any questions?

>> AMIRA FAHMY: Yes, absolutely. So let's go ahead and get started with the questions. With did receive quite a few. So the first one that I'll ask is actually a two-part question. So the question is DNI efforts are usually difficult to gain success if there's an inability to show a clear business reason versus acting solely because it's the right thing to do. How is the data helpful from that perspective?

>> PETE RUTIGLIANO: Yep. Absolutely. So just in terms of a number of different factors, so number one, if we're showing lower engagement -- by the way, an excellent question. If we're showing lower engagement scores for people with disabilities that means they're more likely to leave, that means they're giving less customer service, that means the products they're developing, not because they're disabled but because they're less engaged we're having a worse result. Sirota and other companies who do engagement surveys have seen these clear differences between groups. So from a business perspective just in terms of engagement, the higher engagement we have from a group the better off they will be from business metrics.

Also they're more likely to leave the organization. It's very expensive to hire and train and onboard an employee. Employees with disabilities are much more likely to leave because they have lower engagement scores, then we're losing in on that. And all that money and all that time and investment we made in that employee we're losing.

One of the things I'm hoping to do going forward actually to that point is I would like to specifically find factors that are related to employees with disabilities and what extra do they bring to the table. Now, I'm sure you guys all know the standard diversity speak that we have found data showing a more diverse work group leads to a better outcome rather than having a very homogenous group, and that's been shown time after time. I don't have any data currently that specifically ties that with employees with disability, but I'm kind of hoping to get that data within the next year. Excellent question, by the way.

>> AMIRA FAHMY: That's excellent. I think you answered the second portion of the question, which was other than because we have to for compliance, what suggestions do you have for building business cases for these efforts. And it sounds like that's something you're trying to put together or at least been kind -- some sort of guidelines for that, right?

>> PETE RUTIGLIANO: Absolutely. With the process we're doing with NOD, we're going to put together suggestions and best practices. Now, it's going to be obviously given these laws are brand spanking new, we don't know what best practices are, we're going to start out giving the questions with the people who know best what to do here. Over time these documents are going to be organic and change over time and the more we learn the more we're going to reflect that in the documents we're putting

together.

>> AMIRA FAHMY: Great. Great. All right. So we have about nine minutes left, so I'd like to move to some of the other questions so we have a little bit of time for feedback. One of the questions we received was how do you think that the new regulations for 503 will impact results in the future?

>> PETE RUTIGLIANO: Yeah, you know, that's a great point. I think I alluded to this a little bit in the presentation, but the way I see it is one of the things I didn't mention early in my presentation is I've gone to every company that I do work with, I really push hard obviously because this is my strong research interest, hey you know what? You really should ask a question about employees with disabilities. As a consultant, and I'm a vendor, I have to do what my client likes, so if they don't want to ask that question, I don't have -- I can't force them to ask it. And what happened most frequently is people would say, oh, our legal department won't let us. Or, you know what? If we find their differences then we have to do something about it. And that was a real big sticking point about this, and especially when I mentioned how big the differences were, it actually made people even less likely, unfortunately, to want to make changes here. The new law I believe is going to change the taboo about asking employees about their disability status. I think it's going to open up the door, I think it's going to stop being the dirty little secret and I think what we're going to wind up seeing is, A, more companies asking the question about disability status and as a result seeing a difference. But more importantly, I think a level of openness and acceptance about employees with disabilities in and of itself will start seeing some differences in the results. So I think initially -- I think initially in the results over the next couple of years will start seeing the results stay with a fairly large difference, but then over time we're going to start to see the differences start to erode as people action on it, and B, a certain level of acceptance, I don't have this dirty little secret I don't have to be quiet about, now I can act on it.

>> AMIRA FAHMY: That's great, it goes into the next question. Why do you think there's a hesitation from companies to include a question about people who have a disability?

>> PETE RUTIGLIANO: I mentioned before, there's some organizations it came down to a legal thing that it was an invasion of privacy asking about disability status, which is really interesting because I feel like if I can ask employees about their sexual orientation legally, I should certainly be able to ask about their disability status. As I see disability status having a more -- a larger impact potentially on work. But that was the initial question we get from a lot of legal departments, it's an invasion of privacy, we can't ask that. Don't get me wrong, I really like the legal departments and they're there to protect the company, and unfortunately what it means, sometimes it's easier, hey, if we don't ask the question, we don't have to worry about the consequences of it. The second thing more specifically is I've heard from a number of organizations if we start investigating employees with disability and we don't do anything about it then it opens ours up for lawsuits. I'm not a lawyer, nor do I aspire to be one, but the CEO of our company is our chief legal counsel, he has good insight about this. He said there's not a lot of legal precedence showing that if we ask these questions in and of itself it shows we're interested in doing something about it. And you don't have to show you made huge changes but simply you looked at the data and started looking at it. He said that in

and of itself typically will help benefit the company regarding disability status rather than the opposite. But again, lawyers will only take the more conservative route because they want to avoid litigation and cost for the company. But again, I think the OFCCP regulations (unintelligible) and I think we'll start seeing profound changes.

>> AMIRA FAHMY: Excellent. One final question before we open it up. Why do you think there's a difference between employees with disabilities and employees without disabilities?

>> PETE RUTIGLIANO: Yeah. That -- this is one of those questions that is always very difficult for me to answer. Specifically because I don't know for a fact is it the company or is it the -- is it what people are coming to the table with, right? I know that, for instance, I've done a lot of research specifically in the psychological world, and employees who are depressed have lower engagement scores than employees who aren't depressed, having absolutely nothing to do with the company. There's a certain factor I bring to the table as an employee with a disability. Are they less likely to be engaged in general? Are they just likely in general because of their situation? It's harder for them to do their work than it is for someone without a disability. There's bigger issues going on in their life. There's only so much psychological energy people have at the end of the day and part of the psychological energy may be taken up with their disability. So there's a certain part that comes to the table, they come to the table with, but there's also certain things we're doing as an organization, and it may not necessarily be the obvious things that you might think, which is, oh, Bob at the table, he can't do that, and maybe people are saying that, but maybe it's the stuff people aren't saying, oh, I have two people in my department, Bob who is disabled, Mary is not, let me give the work to Mary, not consciously saying Bob can't do it, but just leaning in one direction. I believe both of those are involved in this equation. And to be honest with you, I would love to teeth that out. I'm starting to look into that. I see a little bit when looking at new hire data, I have seen employees with disabilities are slightly lower, but I want to tease that a little bit more and these results are very preliminary, I'm hoping to have that for my conference in May. But good question.

>> AMIRA FAHMY: So that's it for our questions. I've gone ahead and un-muted all the lines. So if anyone out there has any more questions for Pete or has any feedback on his presentation today, please speak up.

All right. Well, if no one has any questions, I'm going to say go ahead and say thank you so much, Pete, for being with us today and providing all the information on your research. You're doing amazing things and getting great information and that's how we'll be able to move the bar forward when it comes to improving employment opportunities for people with disabilities. Thanks for all you do and thanks for sharing with us today.

>> PETE RUTIGLIANO: Absolutely. Thank you guys for giving me the opportunity to speak about this. I know we're all on the same team here, we really want to create the opportunities for employees with disabilities and really make some change, so I'm really excited we've got so many people showing up for this presentation. Thank you guys for actually coming and helping us to move the dial, that's great.

>> AMIRA FAHMY: Absolutely. So to close out our session, I just want to go ahead and say thank you very much to all of our advisory councilmembers for attending. We really appreciate your involvement and your commitment to employment

opportunities for people with disabilities. Looking forward to working with you in 2014 on some of our new initiatives, and if you have any ideas or topic you would like covered on any of our monthly educational sessions or on our advisory council, please reach out and let me know because we'd like to cover anything you guys find of interest. Please let me know. Otherwise, happy holidays from the GettingHired team. We wish you all a very happy new year and look forward to speaking to you next year. Thanks, everyone, and have a great day.

>> PETE RUTIGLIANO: Thanks.

\* \* \*

This text is being provided in a rough draft format. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

\* \* \*