

**BUILDING EMPLOYMENT PATHWAYS FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES  
PROJECT**

# **A Convergence Synthesis of Canadian Grey Literature on Employer Disability Employment Practices**

---

*Methods, Evidence, and Recommendations*

## **Research Team**

Charles Anyinam, RN, PhD, Associate Professor, Nipissing University (Principal Investigator)

Sue Coffey, RN, PhD, Associate Professor, Ontario Tech University

Celina Da Silva, RN, PhD, Associate Professor, York University

Leslie Graham, RN, PhD(c), Professor, Durham College

## **Evidence Synthesis Consultants**

Ilo Maimets, Associate Librarian, York University

Esther Atkinson, MSc, MSt, PhD, University of Toronto

## **Research Assistant**

Chloée C. Godin-Jacques, MA,

The National Educational Association of Disabled Students (NEADS)

**2026**

*A WORBE Project Deliverable*

## Preface

This report was produced as part of the Building Employment Pathways for People with Disabilities Project, funded by Employment and Social Development Canada (ESDC) through the Workplace Opportunities: Removing Barriers to Equity (WORBE) programme. The National Educational Association of Disabled Students (NEADS) is the grant recipient. The guideline development and convergence synthesis were led by an interdisciplinary research team drawn from Nipissing University, Ontario Tech University, York University, and Durham College.

The original aim of this project was to adapt existing international employer guidelines on disability employment practices for the Canadian context using the RAPADAPTE framework. A systematic review of nearly 4,900 published records identified only two eligible sources, neither suitable for adaptation. International grey literature searches of comparable jurisdictions yielded no formally developed, pan-disability employer guidelines. This finding, itself significant, led the research team to develop the convergence synthesis as an alternative approach: a rigorous method for extracting, classifying, and grading employer-directed practices from the body of Canadian grey literature that constitutes the field's actual knowledge base.

The synthesis identified 1,577 discrete statements from 95 documents produced by 53 independent Canadian organizations, generating 90 formal recommendations across eight domains of the employment lifecycle: Recruitment, Interviewing, Hiring, Onboarding, Accommodation, Return to Work, Career Advancement, and Retention and Inclusive Culture. A companion employer guideline presents these recommendations in a practitioner-oriented format for direct workplace application. This report provides the methodological detail, the complete evidence base, and the interpretive analysis that underpin that guideline.

**To Cite this Report:** Anyinam, C., Coffey, S., Da Silva, C., Graham, L., & Godin-Jacques, C. (2026). *A convergence synthesis of Canadian grey literature on employer disability employment practices: Methods, evidence, and recommendations*. Building Employment Pathways for People with Disabilities Project, National Educational Association of Disabled Students.

**Use of Artificial Intelligence:** The research team conducted all phases of this project, including analysis and writing. Artificial intelligence tools were used to assist with organizing extracted data and checking the consistency of categorizations. All AI outputs were reviewed and verified by the research team.

**Copyright and Permissions:** © 2026 Charles Anyinam, Nipissing University. Produced as part of the Workplace Opportunities: Removing Barriers to Equity (WORBE) project, in partnership with the National Educational Association of Disabled Students (NEADS). Funded by Employment and Social Development Canada. The opinions and interpretations in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Government of Canada. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means without the prior written permission of the author, except for brief quotations in critical reviews and certain other non-commercial uses permitted by copyright law. For permission requests, contact: charlesa@nipissingu.ca

# Table of Contents

<b>Terminology Note.....</b>	<b>2</b>
Convergence.....	2
Recommendations, Not Best Practices.....	2
Grey Literature as a Distinct Evidence Source.....	2
<b>1. Introduction and Problem Context.....</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 The Employment Gap.....	4
1.2 The Economic and Regulatory Context.....	4
1.3 The Gap in Guidance.....	5
1.4 Purpose and Scope.....	5
1.5 Intended Audiences.....	6
1.6 How to Use This Report.....	6
<b>2. Background and Context.....</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 Disability in Canada.....	7
2.1.1 Defining Disability.....	7
2.1.2 Prevalence and Demographics.....	7
2.2 Current State of Disability Employment.....	7
2.2.1 Employment Rates and Disparities.....	7
2.2.2 Intersecting Disparities.....	8
2.2.3 Barriers to Employment.....	8
2.2.4 Facilitators and Enabling Conditions.....	8
2.3 Legal and Policy Framework.....	9
2.3.1 Human Rights Legislation.....	9
2.3.2 Accessibility Legislation.....	9
2.3.3 Key Legal Concepts.....	10
<b>3. Research Questions.....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>4. Methods.....</b>	<b>12</b>
4.1 The RAPADAPTE Process and the Search for Existing Guidelines.....	12
4.2 The Evidence Gap and the Rationale for Convergence Synthesis.....	12
4.3 The Convergence Synthesis Methodology.....	13
4.3.1 Protocol Development.....	14
4.3.2 Document Identification and Selection.....	14
4.3.3 Quality Appraisal.....	16
4.3.4 Data Extraction.....	16
4.3.5 Classification and Convergence Scoring.....	17
4.3.6 Recommendation Development.....	18

<b>5. Findings.....</b>	<b>19</b>
5.1 Search and Screening.....	19
5.2 Quality Appraisal.....	19
5.3 Convergence Overview.....	19
5.4 Practices with Strongest National Agreement.....	19
<b>6. Recommendations by Domain.....</b>	<b>21</b>
6.1 Recruitment (RQ1a).....	21
6.2 Interviewing and Selection (RQ1b).....	21
6.3 Hiring Decisions (RQ1c).....	22
6.4 Onboarding and Orientation (RQ1d).....	22
6.5 Workplace Accommodation (RQ2a).....	23
6.6 Return to Work and Disability Management (RQ2b).....	24
6.7 Career Advancement and Professional Development (RQ2c).....	25
6.8 Retention and Inclusive Workplace Culture (RQ2d).....	25
<b>7. Emerging Practices.....</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>8. Interpretation.....</b>	<b>28</b>
8.1 Convergence Patterns and National Agreement.....	28
8.2 The Dominance of Accommodation Guidance and Gaps Elsewhere.....	28
8.3 Grey Literature as a Vehicle for Employer Guidance.....	29
8.4 Alignment with the CAN-ASC Employment Standard.....	30
<b>9. Limitations.....</b>	<b>31</b>
<b>10. Implications and Future Directions.....</b>	<b>32</b>
10.1 Implications for Policy.....	32
10.2 Implications for Practice.....	32
10.3 Implications for Research.....	32
10.4 Conditions for Future Guideline Development.....	33
<b>11. Conclusion.....</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>35</b>
<b>Acknowledgements.....</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Appendix A: Included Documents.....</b>	<b>38</b>

## **Terminology Note**

---

Several terms in this report carry specific meanings that differ from their everyday or clinical usage. Readers unfamiliar with the convergence synthesis approach should review these definitions before proceeding.

### **Convergence**

In this synthesis, convergence refers to the degree to which independent Canadian organizations provide similar employer-directed guidance on disability employment practices. A practice was considered to demonstrate strong convergence when it was recommended by six or more independent organizational sources. Convergence counts were based on organizations rather than individual documents; therefore, multiple publications from the same organization were counted as a single source.

This synthesis did not use a formal consensus method as described by Murphy et al. (1998), which involves convening an expert panel and conducting structured voting, ranking, or Delphi processes. Although the broader project panel provided feedback and guidance, panel members did not grade evidence or formally deliberate on individual recommendations. Accordingly, the convergence identified in this synthesis reflects patterns across published sources rather than consensus generated through a formal deliberative process.

### **Recommendations, Not Best Practices**

The outputs of this synthesis are termed “recommendations” rather than “best practices”. Best practices, in the clinical and health sciences sense, require an evidence base derived from primary research, typically evaluated through a formal grading process such as GRADE (Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation). The grey literature on which this synthesis draws does not meet that standard.

The term “recommendation” is used here to indicate a practice that has been recommended by three or more independent Canadian organizations and that has been assessed for quality using the CRAAP framework. The convergence tier and confidence modifier attached to each recommendation provide readers with the information needed to assess the strength and quality of the evidence base behind it.

### **Grey Literature as a Distinct Evidence Source**

The grey literature synthesized in this report occupies an unusual position in the evidence hierarchy. It is not peer-reviewed academic research, nor is it standard grey literature in the sense of conference proceedings or technical reports. The documents are guides, toolkits, and employer handbooks produced by organizations with statutory mandates, subject matter expertise, and, in many cases, direct legislative authority over disability employment policy.

The guidance these documents contain appears to be expert-generated, shaped by legislation, policy interpretation, and professional experience. Methodology is rarely disclosed. Evidence sources are seldom cited. The basis for recommendations is typically undocumented. No single document in this category could support a practice recommendation on its own. Taken together, however, they represent the accumulated expertise of 53 independent Canadian organizations operating across every jurisdiction in the country. The convergence synthesis treats this collective weight as the basis for recommendation, while the CRAAP appraisal provides a quality check on each individual source.

# 1. Introduction and Problem Context

---

## 1.1 The Employment Gap

Disability employment remains one of the most stubborn equity challenges in the Canadian labour market. The 2022 Canadian Survey on Disability (CSD), the most recent population-level survey of disability in Canada, reported that approximately 8 million Canadians aged 15 and over identified as having one or more disabilities, representing 27% of the population (Hébert et al., 2024). According to the most recent Labour Force Survey data, employment rates for persons with disabilities aged 15 and over were 46.9% for men and 45.9% for women in 2024 (Hardy & Vergara, 2025). Employment rates varied markedly by severity: only 26.4% of persons with more severe disabilities were employed, compared with 54.7% of those with less severe disabilities.

The disparities extend beyond participation rates. Persons with disabilities earned substantially less than their non-disabled counterparts, and the gap widened with severity of disability (Hébert et al., 2024; see Section 2.2.1). Underemployment compounds these figures: persons with disabilities are disproportionately concentrated in part-time and precarious work, and their qualifications are frequently underutilized (Lee, 2013).

Intersecting identities deepen the inequities. Disability prevalence among Indigenous peoples is substantially higher than the general population, and employment outcomes for Indigenous persons with disabilities are correspondingly worse (Statistics Canada, 2024; see Section 2.2.2). In 2023, disability was associated with lower employment rates among racialized Canadians across every population group examined, with the gap between persons with and without disabilities varying by group (Vergara & Hardy, 2024). These patterns have drawn increasing attention from both economic analysts and legislators.

## 1.2 The Economic and Regulatory Context

Canada's workforce is ageing, and labour shortages persist across sectors. The disability prevalence reported in the 2022 CSD represents a large and growing segment of the working-age population. The Conference Board of Canada (2015) estimated that income controlled by persons with disabilities and those at risk of disability (aged 55 and over) will reach \$536 billion by 2031. Tompa et al. (2015) documented the broader economic returns of accessible workplaces, noting that such investments strengthen organizational performance and benefit all employees.

The regulatory environment has shifted alongside the economic argument. The Accessible Canada Act (2019) mandates the identification, removal, and prevention of barriers in federally regulated workplaces. Provincial accessibility legislation has been enacted in seven provinces, including Ontario (AODA, 2005), Manitoba (AMA, 2013), Nova Scotia (2017), British Columbia (2021), Newfoundland and Labrador (2021), Saskatchewan (2023), and New Brunswick (2024). These laws create compliance obligations beyond the federal Act. Employers face a context

where inclusive employment practice is increasingly a legal requirement, yet they lack the consolidated, evidence-informed resources needed to act on that requirement.

### **1.3 The Gap in Guidance**

Employer-directed guidance on disability employment practices exists in substantial volume. Federal departments, provincial human rights commissions, accessibility offices, and national disability organizations have produced guides, toolkits, checklists, and handbooks addressing various aspects of the employment lifecycle. The Canadian Human Rights Commission's workplace accommodation guides, Employment and Social Development Canada's Hire for Talent toolkit, the Conference Board of Canada's Employers' Toolkit, and the Canadian Association for Supported Employment's HR Inclusive Policy Toolkit are representative examples.

This body of guidance is fragmented in both scope and organization. No single document covers the full employment lifecycle from recruitment through retention. No previous study has systematically identified which practices are consistently recommended across sources or assessed the quality of the documents in which they appear. An employer seeking to implement inclusive practices must locate and compare dozens of documents produced by different organizations, in different formats, with no way to determine which practices carry the broadest support.

The peer-reviewed literature provides limited direction. A systematic review of nearly 4,900 published records, conducted as part of this project, identified only two sources meeting inclusion criteria for empirical, employer-directed disability employment guidance. Neither was suitable as a foundation for guideline development. This confirmed that the primary research base required to support evidence-based employer guidelines on disability employment is sparse. Grey literature remains, at present, the principal vehicle through which Canadian organizations communicate practical guidance to employers.

### **1.4 Purpose and Scope**

This report presents the methods, evidence, and results of a convergence synthesis of Canadian grey literature on employer disability employment practices. The synthesis identified, appraised, extracted, and classified employer-directed practices from 95 documents produced by 53 independent Canadian organizations, generating 90 evidence-graded recommendations across eight domains of the employment lifecycle.

The report adopts a cross-disability, pan-Canadian approach. It does not address sector-specific requirements or offer legal advice. The report does not replace evidence-based practice guidelines grounded in primary research, but it represents the most rigorous synthesis of existing Canadian employer guidance produced to date through a systematic and replicable process.

A companion employer guideline presents the same 90 recommendations in a practitioner-oriented format designed for direct workplace application. This report provides the

methodological detail, the complete evidence base, and the interpretive analysis that underpin that guideline.

## **1.5 Intended Audiences**

This report serves researchers and methodologists interested in the convergence synthesis as an approach to grey literature in evidence-poor fields; policymakers and accessibility standards developers seeking an evidence base for regulatory work, including implementation of the Accessible Canada Act and provincial accessibility legislation; and employers, human resources professionals, and disability employment service providers who want to understand the evidence behind the recommendations in the companion employer guideline.

## **1.6 How to Use This Report**

Readers need not approach this report sequentially. Those interested primarily in the methodology should focus on Sections 3 and 4. Those interested in findings and implications should focus on Sections 5 through 11. Readers seeking domain-level recommendations should consult Section 6, which presents summary tables and narrative synthesis for each of the eight research question domains, or refer to the companion employer guideline for the full practitioner-oriented presentation.

## 2. Background and Context

---

### 2.1 Disability in Canada

#### 2.1.1 Defining Disability

The Accessible Canada Act (2019) defines disability as any impairment or functional limitation that, in interaction with a barrier, hinders a person's full and equal participation in society. Impairments may be physical, mental, intellectual, cognitive, learning, communication, or sensory in nature. Functional limitations may be permanent, temporary, or episodic, and may be congenital or acquired, visible or invisible.

This definition reflects a social model of disability, the view that disability arises not from the impairment itself but from the interaction between the person and the barriers in their environment. Attitudinal, physical, and systemic barriers shape the extent to which persons with disabilities can participate in employment and other spheres of daily life. The convergence synthesis adopts this framing throughout.

#### 2.1.2 Prevalence and Demographics

The 2022 CSD reported that approximately 8 million Canadians aged 15 and over had one or more disabilities, representing 27% of the population (Hébert et al., 2024). Among them, more than 3.4 million (23.9%) were men and 4.5 million (29.9%) were women.

Most disabilities in Canada are invisible. The most common disability types were pain-related (14% of men, 19.3% of women), flexibility-related (9.9% of men, 11.8% of women), and mobility-related (8.9% of men, 12.2% of women).

In terms of severity, 39% of persons with disabilities had a mild disability, 20% had a moderate disability, 20% had a severe disability, and 21% had a very severe disability (Hébert et al., 2024). Women were more likely than men to report multiple co-occurring disability types and more severe disability.

### 2.2 Current State of Disability Employment

#### 2.2.1 Employment Rates and Disparities

In 2024, employment rates for persons with disabilities aged 15 and over were 46.9% for men and 45.9% for women (Hardy & Vergara, 2025). The gap was considerably wider for persons with more severe disabilities (26.4% employment rate) than for those with less severe disabilities (54.7%). Persons with more severe disabilities were also less likely to be employed full-time (Hébert et al., 2024).

Income disparities follow the same pattern. In 2020, the median income for men with disabilities was \$41,580 and for women with disabilities \$37,010, well below the median for non-disabled

Canadians (Hébert et al., 2024). Persons with more severe disabilities earned substantially less again.

## **2.2.2 Intersecting Disparities**

Employment inequities are compounded by race, Indigeneity, and other intersecting identities. The 2022 Indigenous Peoples Survey reported that approximately 40% of Indigenous people aged 15 and over had one or more disabilities, a rate substantially higher than the general population (Statistics Canada, 2024). Among Indigenous persons with more severe disabilities, employment rates were substantially lower than for those with milder disabilities.

In 2023, disability was associated with lower employment rates among all racialized groups examined (Vergara & Hardy, 2024). The gap between persons with and without disabilities was present across all population groups, against a national average of 47.1% for persons with disabilities and 66.9% for those without: Filipino Canadians (80.7% without disability vs. 60.4% with), Latin American Canadians (72.8% vs. 57.0%), Black Canadians (71% vs. 49.8%), South Asian Canadians (71.1% vs. 52.2%), and Chinese Canadians (62.7% vs. 45.1%).

## **2.2.3 Barriers to Employment**

Barriers to employment operate at multiple levels. At the individual level, persons with disabilities may experience internalized ableism shaped by repeated exclusion from workplace opportunities. Limited access to networking, lateral mobility, and self-advocacy resources can diminish confidence and career aspirations (Lee, 2013).

At the employer level, persistent misconceptions about the productivity, reliability, and accommodation costs associated with disability reduce willingness to hire and retain persons with disabilities (House of Commons Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities, 2013). Many employers have limited knowledge of accessibility and accommodation, and some compare the performance of employees with disabilities against norms established for non-disabled workers without accounting for the absence of appropriate supports. Tompa et al. (2015) found that the economic benefits of workplace accommodations ranged from two to seven times the costs incurred, yet perceived accommodation costs remain a significant deterrent for many employers.

At the systemic level, societal assumptions about disability capacity permeate workforce structures. Workplaces that lack a disability-informed culture exclude employees with disabilities from full participation, often without recognising they are doing so (Markel & Barclay, 2009). This gap persists in part because employers have lacked consolidated, practical resources to guide disability-informed practice (Bonaccio et al., 2020).

## **2.2.4 Facilitators and Enabling Conditions**

Research on successful disability employment practices points to several enabling conditions. Lindsay et al. (2019) identified "disability confidence" as a concept describing organisational cultures that move beyond minimum compliance to actively value and support employees with disabilities. Disability confidence involves not only knowledge of accommodation processes but

also a willingness to examine and change workplace norms that privilege non-disabled ways of working.

Beyond disability confidence, the literature consistently identifies effective accommodation processes, inclusive leadership, and accessible recruitment as enabling conditions. Burleton and DePratto (2019) argued that meaningful inclusion requires both cultural transformation and structural support, since either alone is insufficient to shift employment outcomes.

## 2.3 Legal and Policy Framework

### 2.3.1 Human Rights Legislation

Federal and provincial/territorial human rights legislation in Canada prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability across all stages of employment, including hiring, promotion, and termination. The *Canadian Human Rights Act* (1985) applies to federally regulated employers and entitles all individuals to equal opportunities free from discrimination on prohibited grounds, including disability. Each province and territory has equivalent legislation protecting residents within its jurisdiction.

Central to Canadian human rights law is the duty to accommodate. Employers must accommodate the needs of persons with disabilities to the point of undue hardship, which means treating individuals differently when necessary to prevent or reduce discrimination (Canadian Human Rights Commission, 2025). An employer reaches the threshold of undue hardship only by demonstrating, with evidence, that the requested accommodation would impose costs or health and safety risks beyond reasonable limits.

### 2.3.2 Accessibility Legislation

The *Accessible Canada Act* (2019) requires federally regulated entities to identify, remove, and prevent barriers in seven priority areas, including employment. Regulated entities must publish accessibility plans, establish feedback mechanisms, and report on progress.

At the provincial level, a majority of provinces have enacted accessibility legislation with employment-related obligations. These laws create compliance obligations including employment-specific accessibility standards.

Accessibility Standards Canada published the CAN-ASC-1.1:2024 employment standard (revised 2025), which sets out requirements for accessible employment practices across the full employment lifecycle. Many of the practices specified in that standard appear among the recommendations generated by the convergence synthesis reported here.

### 2.3.3 Key Legal Concepts

Three legal concepts inform the employer guidance examined in this synthesis: *bona fide occupational requirement*, undue hardship, and reasonable accommodation.

A *bona fide occupational requirement* (BFOR) is a job qualification genuinely necessary for the safe and effective performance of a role. A BFOR must relate to actual job functions rather than

assumed limitations, and an employer must demonstrate that accommodation is not possible short of undue hardship before relying on a BFOR to exclude a candidate.

*Undue hardship* is the legal threshold beyond which an employer need not accommodate. An employer claiming undue hardship must provide evidence; assumption, employee complaint, and the preferences of co-workers do not suffice. Relevant factors include financial cost, health and safety risks, and the availability of external funding.

*Reasonable accommodation* refers to any modification to a job, work environment, or work process that enables a person with a disability to perform the essential functions of their role. Employers determine accommodation case by case, and the determination reflects the employee's needs, not the employer's preferences.

## 2.4 Rationale for Focus Areas

The convergence synthesis is structured around two overarching research questions addressing eight domains of the employment lifecycle. The first question addresses recruitment, interviewing, hiring, and onboarding. The second addresses workplace accommodation, return to work, career advancement, and retention.

This structure reflects two patterns in the disability employment literature. First, persons with disabilities frequently do not progress past the application and hiring stages because recruitment processes are inaccessible, interview formats are inflexible, and employers do not offer accommodation proactively (HUMA, 2013). Inclusive recruitment, selection, and onboarding practices are prerequisites for workforce participation.

Second, hiring alone is insufficient. Persons with disabilities leave employment at higher rates than their non-disabled peers (Milner et al., 2018). Workplace cultures that exclude employees with disabilities, inadequate accommodation processes, and uneven advancement pathways each contribute to early labour market exit (Jansen et al., 2021). The second research question addresses these retention-stage factors: accommodation processes, return-to-work programming, career development, and the organizational culture that determines whether employees with disabilities remain and advance.

### **3. Research Questions**

---

The synthesis was organized around two overarching research questions, each with four sub-questions:

**RQ1: What employer practices related to hiring persons with disabilities are recommended in Canadian grey literature?**

- RQ1a: What practices are recommended for recruitment (job descriptions and postings)?
- RQ1b: What practices are recommended for interviewing and selection?
- RQ1c: What practices are recommended for hiring decisions?
- RQ1d: What practices are recommended for onboarding and orientation?

**RQ2: What employer practices related to retaining employees with disabilities are recommended in Canadian grey literature?**

- RQ2a: What practices are recommended for workplace accommodation?
- RQ2b: What practices are recommended for return to work and disability management?
- RQ2c: What practices are recommended for career advancement and professional development?
- RQ2d: What practices are recommended for retention and inclusive workplace culture?

## 4. Methods

---

### 4.1 The RAPADAPTE Process and the Search for Existing Guidelines

This project did not begin as a convergence synthesis. It was designed as a guideline development project under the *Building Employment Pathways for People with Disabilities Project*, funded by Employment and Social Development Canada through the Workplace Opportunities: Removing Barriers to Equity (WORBE) program and awarded to the National Educational Association of Disabled Students (NEADS). The original design called for an evidence-informed employer guideline on disability employment practices, adapted from international sources for the Canadian context using the RAPADAPTE framework.

RAPADAPTE is a structured process for adapting existing practice guidelines, built on the ADAPTE framework. It assumes that evidence-informed guidelines already exist somewhere in the international literature and that the task is to adapt them for a new jurisdiction or context. The research team assessed methodological options against the GIN-McMaster Guideline Development Checklist, which specifies the components of trustworthy guideline development: systematic evidence identification, quality appraisal, transparent recommendation formulation, and stakeholder engagement.

The systematic search covered MEDLINE, EMBASE, PsycINFO, CINAHL, Scopus, and the repositories of major international organizations. It returned nearly 4,900 records. After screening against inclusion criteria for published, empirical guidance directed at employers on disability employment practices, two records met the criteria. Neither was suitable as a source guideline for adaptation. Both addressed narrow, disability-specific populations rather than the pan-disability, employer-directed perspective the project required.

A parallel search of international grey literature targeted comparable jurisdictions, including the United Kingdom, the United States, Australia, New Zealand, and the European Union. The search sought employer disability employment guidelines developed through a systematic or evidence-informed process, with transparent methodology, a traceable evidence base, and structured recommendations. It returned extensive material — toolkits, fact sheets, policy statements, advocacy documents, employer handbooks. No document met the requirements for a formally developed guideline. Every international document identified was either a toolkit produced without disclosed methodology or a policy statement without a traceable evidence base.

### 4.2 The Evidence Gap and the Rationale for Convergence Synthesis

No rigorously developed, evidence-based, pan-disability employer guideline on disability employment appears to exist anywhere in the international literature. This finding is significant in its own right. It confirms how far the disability employment field remains behind clinical health

care and related disciplines, where evidence-based guideline development has been standard practice for decades. Employer-directed guidance on disability employment has been produced primarily through expert opinion and legislative interpretation, not through the systematic processes that Graham et al. (2011) identified as the components of trustworthy guideline development.

This finding ruled out guideline adaptation through RAPADAPTE. There was nothing to adapt. De novo guideline development was also not feasible because the primary research base needed to support it does not yet exist. What remained was the body of Canadian grey literature, extensive and fragmented but produced by organizations with statutory mandates and direct responsibility for disability employment policy.

A formal consensus approach, such as a Delphi process, was considered and ruled out. Consensus methods rely on an established expert panel, and no such panel exists in the Canadian disability employment field. Expertise is dispersed across government departments, human rights commissions, disability organizations, and academic researchers with limited overlap. Assembling a panel with the breadth required to produce authoritative recommendations would have constituted a separate research project, with no guarantee that the resulting panel would be more informed than the published guidance already in circulation.

The research team chose to move down the evidence hierarchy and develop a rigorous method for working with the evidence that does exist. The convergence synthesis was designed to determine whether a systematic approach could extract defensible guidance from Canadian grey literature, treating each published document as the expression of organizational expertise it represents. Greenhalgh et al. (2014) argued that valid practice guidance can and should draw on sources beyond randomized controlled trials and systematic reviews, particularly when the questions at hand are complex, context-dependent, and under-researched. The convergence analysis applies this principle by counting how many independent organizations arrived at the same guidance without coordinating with one another. The logic is analogous to the replication principle in primary research. When multiple independent sources, writing for different audiences across different jurisdictions, provide the same direction, the level of agreement carries weight even in the absence of controlled studies.

This report is a convergence synthesis of grey literature, not a clinical practice guideline, a systematic review of primary research, or a consensus statement. A systematic review conducted as part of this project confirmed that the primary research base required for formal guideline development does not yet exist (World Health Organization, 2014). The outputs are therefore positioned as evidence-graded recommendations derived from convergence analysis, not as best practice guidelines in the clinical sense.

### **4.3 The Convergence Synthesis Methodology**

The convergence synthesis methodology was designed by the Principal Investigator and refined by the research team through iterative discussion as the analysis progressed. This section describes each stage of the methodology in the detail required for replication. Two

methodological refinements were made to the initial protocol following a trial run of the extraction process.

### **4.3.1 Protocol Development**

The Principal Investigator developed the initial protocol, which defined the search strategy, eligibility criteria, quality appraisal framework, extraction protocol, and convergence classification system. After a trial run of the extraction process, the research team worked with the Principal Investigator to refine two methodological elements before full extraction proceeded.

The first refinement expanded the convergence classification from three tiers to five. The original protocol classified practices as Strong, Moderate, or Low based on the number of supporting sources. The trial run showed that the Low tier obscured a meaningful distinction between practices supported by two sources and those supported by only one. The team agreed to expand the classification to five tiers: Strong (6+ sources), Moderate (4–5 sources), Low (3 sources), Emerging (2 sources), and Insufficient (1 source). Only practices at the Low tier or above qualified for formal recommendation.

The second refinement introduced a CRAAP confidence modifier. The original protocol did not specify how quality appraisal scores would interact with convergence tiers, and the trial run made clear that convergence alone could not distinguish practices supported by high-quality sources from those supported only by lower-quality sources. The team developed a confidence modifier to address this: Full confidence when 75% or more of supporting documents scored High on CRAAP appraisal (13–15/15); Moderate confidence when 50–74% scored High; and a Quality Flag when fewer than 50% scored High.

### **4.3.2 Document Identification and Selection**

The search architecture targeted four jurisdictional domains: federal government, provincial and territorial governments, national non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and provincial NGOs. A fifth tier of supplementary searches was conducted across broader domains to capture documents not identified through the targeted searches.

For each domain or organization, two structured search strings were applied, one for each research question. String A targeted recruitment, hiring, and onboarding guidance (RQ1). String B targeted workplace accommodation, return to work, retention, and career advancement guidance (RQ2). Each string combined disability terminology, employer-focused terminology, practice-area terminology, and document-type terminology, all bounded by a site operator restricting results to the relevant domain.

For government domains, the search was conducted in two layers. Layer 1 was a domain sweep against the entire jurisdictional website (for example, site:canada.ca for the federal level, site:ontario.ca for Ontario), using the Boolean strings to identify employer-directed disability employment guidance published anywhere on the domain. Layer 2 was a targeted search for documents from named organizations operating within or alongside that jurisdiction, such as the Treasury Board Secretariat and the Canadian Human Rights Commission at the federal level,

using a simpler version of the same string focused on each organization's site or its host domain.

For NGO domains, Layer 1 and Layer 2 were combined into a single search per organization. Each NGO was treated as both the domain and the target, and the same dual-string approach was applied to its website.

Where the full Boolean strings returned few or no results, simplified versions of the strings were used. The simplified strings retained the core practice-area and document-type terms but removed the more restrictive Boolean structure.

A supplementary search was conducted across three additional contexts. The first applied the dual-string approach to broad .ca domain searches for both PDF and HTML documents, capturing material from organizations not identified through the targeted searches. The second applied the approach to the .org domain to capture Canadian NGOs publishing on non-.ca domains. The third was a manual reference list scan of every included document to identify documents cited as related resources. Documents identified through the supplementary search are flagged in the extraction file by source.

All searches were conducted on Google. Google Scholar and bibliographic databases were not used because the documents sought were grey literature published by Canadian organizations, which is more reliably surfaced through general web search than through academic indices.

*Stopping rule.* For each search string applied to each domain or organization, the first 50 search results were reviewed for relevance to the research questions. The search was terminated earlier if 10 consecutive results were not relevant, indicating that the search had reached the point of diminishing returns. This stopping rule is consistent with recommended practice for grey literature searches (Aromataris & Munn, 2020), where exhaustive screening is neither feasible nor methodologically necessary, and provides a defined and replicable endpoint for each search.

*Eligibility criteria.* Documents were included if they were (IC1) published by a Canadian federal, provincial/territorial, or non-governmental organization; (IC2) directed at employers; (IC3) contained specific employer practices related to disability employment; and (IC4) available in English. Documents were excluded if they were (EC1) peer-reviewed journal articles or academic publications; (EC2) directed solely at employees or job seekers; (EC3) general diversity or equity documents without disability-specific employer guidance; (EC4) documents on physical building accessibility or digital web accessibility without employment content; (EC5) French-only publications; (EC6) superseded by more recent versions from the same organization; or (EC7) news articles, blog posts, or promotional materials without substantive guidance content.

*Two-pass screening.* Screening was conducted in two passes consistent with standard systematic review practice. The first pass was a yield review based on title, executive summary, and a rapid scan of the document. Any document that appeared to address the research questions was retained for closer review; documents that clearly fell outside scope were

excluded at this stage. The second pass was a full review against the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Each retained document was read in detail and assessed against IC1–IC4 and EC1–EC7. Documents meeting all inclusion criteria and no exclusion criteria were carried forward to extraction.

*Toolkit consolidation.* Multi-page web toolkits presented a counting issue. Some organizations, for example the Canadian Association for Supported Employment, published guidance as a series of separate web pages rather than as a single document. Counting each page as an independent document would have inflated both the document count and the convergence figures. These multi-page toolkits were treated as a single document for counting purposes. Where a consolidated PDF version was available, that version was used for extraction. Where no consolidated version existed, the separate pages were combined.

*Quebec exclusion.* Quebec government domains were excluded from the search architecture at the outset. Quebec government publications on employer disability employment guidance are produced primarily in French, and the project's resources did not extend to French-language search and extraction. Quebec NGOs publishing in English were searched as part of the provincial NGO domain, and bilingual federal documents and national NGO documents applicable to all jurisdictions, including Quebec, were retained.

*Screening results.* The search identified 229 documents from approximately 80 organizations across all jurisdictional domains. Of 229 documents screened, 95 met all inclusion criteria and were carried forward to extraction. The remaining 134 documents were excluded under the criteria specified above.

### 4.3.3 Quality Appraisal

All 95 included documents were appraised using the CRAAP framework (Currency, Relevance, Authority, Accuracy, Purpose). Each criterion was scored on a scale of 1 to 3, yielding a total score out of 15. Documents scoring 13 to 15 were classified as high quality, 9 to 12 as moderate quality, and 8 or below as below threshold. No document was excluded solely on the basis of its CRAAP score.

The scores carried forward into the convergence analysis through a confidence modifier applied to each recommendation. The modifier reflected the proportion of supporting sources for a given recommendation that were classified as High quality (CRAAP score of 13 or higher): Full confidence (75% or more of supporting sources scored High), Moderate confidence (50% to 74% scored High), or Quality flag (fewer than 50% scored High). A recommendation meeting the minimum convergence threshold could still receive a Quality flag where its supporting sources, taken together, scored lower on quality.

### 4.3.4 Data Extraction

Each included document was extracted into a structured 13-column protocol designed to capture the content of each guidance statement, its source location, its alignment with the research questions, and the conditions under which it applied. The extraction columns captured four types of information: bibliographic identifiers (Statement ID, document code, organization,

title, year, jurisdictional domain); source location within the document; the extracted statement itself, with the original passage preserved verbatim in a separate column where any reformulation was needed for clarity; and analytic coding, including alignment with the research questions, contextual conditions or caveats, and the CRAAP quality appraisal score.

Each statement was coded against the research questions using a structured scheme (RQ1a–d for recruitment, interviewing, hiring, and onboarding; RQ2a–d for accommodation, return to work, career advancement, and retention). Statements addressing more than one practice area received multiple codes.

The extraction yielded 1,577 statements from 95 documents, with the largest yields drawn from federal sources and national NGO publications.

### 4.3.5 Classification and Convergence Scoring

*Unit of analysis.* The unit of analysis was the discrete employer practice: a specific, identifiable action an employer could implement. Practices were distinguished from general principles (e.g., "be inclusive") and from legislative requirements stated without operational guidance.

*Independence rule.* Each producing organization counted as one independent source, regardless of how many documents it published. The Canadian Human Rights Commission, for example, published six included documents but counted as one source. Where multiple entries referred to the same organization under different names — sub-units of a larger department, successor entities, or duplicate listings across categories — the entries were consolidated. After consolidation, 66 organization names resolved to 53 independent sources.

*Practice classification.* Statements were grouped into practices through close reading and iterative comparison. The research team began with a working list of practice categories drawn from the research questions and refined the list as extraction progressed. Each statement was read against the existing categories and either assigned to one of them or set aside for further consideration. Statements that did not fit existing categories were re-read together to identify shared themes, and new categories were added where a coherent practice emerged across multiple statements. The list of practices was reviewed and revised throughout the classification process, with categories merged where they overlapped and split where statements within a category proved to describe distinct actions. AI tools were used to support sorting, pattern identification, and consistency checking; all classification decisions were made by the research team.

A small number of statements did not describe specific employer practices. These were procedural language, definitional text, or legislative excerpts. They were retained in the extraction file but excluded from the convergence analysis.

*Five-tier convergence classification.* Practices were assigned to one of five tiers based on the number of independent sources endorsing them: Strong (6+), Moderate (4–5), Low (3), Emerging (2), and Insufficient (1). Only practices at the Low tier or above qualified as formal recommendations.

*CRAAP confidence modifier.* A confidence modifier was applied based on the proportion of supporting documents that scored High (13–15) on CRAAP appraisal: Full confidence (75% or more), Moderate confidence (50–74%), or Quality flag (fewer than 50%).

*Conflicting evidence.* A systematic check identified no instances in which one source explicitly contradicted a practice recommended by another. Variation in specificity and scope was observed but represented differences in granularity rather than directional conflict.

### **4.3.6 Recommendation Development**

Each practice meeting the minimum convergence threshold of three or more independent sources was developed into a formal recommendation. The research team drafted each recommendation statement to reflect the core practice as described across its supporting sources, and assigned each one a convergence tier, a CRAAP confidence level, and a domain classification aligned with the research questions.

## 5. Findings

### 5.1 Search and Screening

The search identified 229 documents across the four jurisdictional domains and the supplementary tier. After two-pass screening against the inclusion and exclusion criteria, 95 documents met all criteria and were carried forward to extraction. The largest contributions came from NGOs (31 documents), federal sources (22), and Ontario (17). Other provinces and territories each contributed fewer than ten documents, and three jurisdictions — Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, and the Northwest Territories — were not represented by jurisdiction-specific documents, although national-level documents applicable to all jurisdictions were included.

### 5.2 Quality Appraisal

CRAAP scores ranged from 10 to 15 out of 15, with a mean of 13.5. Of the 95 included documents, 78 scored 13 or higher and 17 scored between 9 and 12; none scored below 9. The high proportion of High-scoring documents reflects the authoritative nature of the source organizations, including federal government departments, human rights commissions, and established national NGOs with subject matter expertise.

### 5.3 Convergence Overview

The convergence analysis identified 106 discrete employer practices across the eight research question domains. Of these, 90 met the minimum convergence threshold (3+ independent sources) and were included as formal recommendations. The remaining 16 were classified as Emerging (2 sources).

The distribution by convergence tier:

- Strong convergence (6+ sources): 54 practices
- Moderate convergence (4-5 sources): 21 practices
- Low convergence (3 sources): 15 practices
- Emerging (2 sources): 16 practices (reported separately in Section 7)

### 5.4 Practices with Strongest National Agreement

Thirteen practices received support from 20 or more independent organizational sources, indicating broad national agreement:

#	Practice	Sources	Domain
1	Provide a range of accommodation options including modified duties, schedule changes, equipment, and reassignment	40	Accommodation
2	Employer bears ultimate responsibility for the accommodation process	31	Accommodation

3	Engage in a collaborative and interactive accommodation process with the employee	28	Accommodation
4	Accommodate employees up to the point of undue hardship, supported by evidence	27	Accommodation
5	Assess and address accommodation needs on a case-by-case, individualized basis	26	Accommodation
6	Provide accommodations for job applicants during the interview and assessment process	25	Interviewing
7	Provide information and communications in accessible formats	25	Retention
8	Focus job descriptions on essential functions and outcomes rather than methods of performance	24	Recruitment
9	Cultivate an inclusive workplace culture that values diversity and respects dignity	24	Retention
10	Include accommodation information and an accessibility statement in all job postings	23	Recruitment
11	Do not require employees to disclose a specific diagnosis; request only functional limitations and workplace barriers	22	Accommodation
12	Develop a return-to-work plan collaboratively with the employee	21	Return to Work
13	Provide job coaching, mentoring, buddy systems, or natural supports for new and existing employees	20	Onboarding

Seven of the 13 highest-convergence practices relate to workplace accommodation, reflecting the centrality of the duty to accommodate in Canadian human rights law and the volume of guidance produced on this topic.

## 6. Recommendations by Domain

This section presents summary tables for each of the eight research question domains. Each table lists the recommendation number, practice statement, convergence tier, number of independent sources, and CRAAP confidence level. A brief narrative follows each table identifying patterns within the domain. The companion employer guideline presents these recommendations in full practitioner-oriented format with jurisdictional notes and detailed evidence panels.

### 6.1 Recruitment (RQ1a)

Rec.	Practice	Tier	Sources	Confidence
1.1	Focus job descriptions on essential functions and outcomes rather than methods of performance	Strong	24	Full
1.2	Include accommodation information and an accessibility statement in all job postings	Strong	23	Full
1.3	Advertise positions through diverse and disability-specific recruitment channels	Strong	14	Full
1.4	Ensure the entire application process is accessible to persons with disabilities	Strong	12	Full
1.5	Partner with disability employment service providers and community agencies for recruitment	Strong	12	Full
1.6	Use inclusive, plain, and accessible language in job postings and descriptions	Strong	7	Full
1.7	Include a commitment to diversity, equity, and inclusion in organizational branding and recruitment materials	Moderate	5	Full

This domain produced seven recommendations, six at Strong convergence. All seven received Full CRAAP confidence. The consistency across federal, provincial, and NGO sources suggests a settled national agreement on accessible recruitment practices.

### 6.2 Interviewing and Selection (RQ1b)

Rec.	Practice	Tier	Sources	Confidence
2.1	Provide accommodations for job applicants during the interview and assessment process	Strong	25	Full
2.2	Inform applicants of available accommodations before and during the interview process	Strong	11	Full
2.3	Use fair, consistent, and non-discriminatory interview and selection methods	Strong	11	Full
2.4	Ensure interview locations and processes are physically accessible	Strong	8	Full
2.5	Address unconscious bias and stereotypes in hiring and	Moderate	4	Full

	interview decisions	e		
2.6	Do not ask disability-related or medical questions during the interview process	Low	3	Full

Six recommendations, four at Strong convergence. The domain reflects a consistent emphasis on ensuring that selection processes assess job-related competencies rather than disability-related characteristics.

### 6.3 Hiring Decisions (RQ1c)

Rec. Practice	Tier	Sources	Confidence
3.1 Do not use disability or accommodation needs as a factor in hiring decisions	Moderate	5	Full
3.2 Broaden evaluation criteria to value diverse experience	Moderate	4	Full
3.3 Train assessors to recognize and correct for bias	Low	3	Full
3.4 Use internships and supported pathways to permanent employment	Low	3	Moderate
3.5 Confirm accommodation in offer of employment	Low	3	Full
3.6 Ensure employer and hiring manager readiness	Low	3	Full

Six recommendations, none at Strong convergence. This was one of the smallest domains, which may reflect the difficulty of providing prescriptive guidance on decision-making processes involving multiple organizational actors and contextual factors.

### 6.4 Onboarding and Orientation (RQ1d)

Rec. Practice	Tier	Sources	Confidence
4.1 Provide job coaching, mentoring, buddy systems, or natural supports for new and existing employees	Strong	20	Full
4.2 Communicate the accommodation policy to new employees during onboarding and orientation	Strong	12	Full
4.3 Embed disability awareness and accessibility into the onboarding process	Strong	9	Full
4.4 Ask new employees about accommodation needs upon hiring or during onboarding	Moderate	4	Full
4.5 Provide structured, accessible orientation to job and workplace	Moderate	4	Full
4.6 Engage disability employment service providers during onboarding	Low	3	Moderate
4.7 Extend onboarding period and follow up regularly	Low	3	Full

Seven recommendations, three at Strong convergence. Multiple sources identified the transition from recruitment to active employment as a high-risk period for attrition when accommodation needs are not addressed promptly.

## 6.5 Workplace Accommodation (RQ2a)

Rec. Practice	Tier	Sources	Confidence
5.1 Provide a range of accommodation options including modified duties, schedule changes, equipment, and reassignment	Strong	40	Full
5.2 Employer bears ultimate responsibility for the accommodation process	Strong	31	Full
5.3 Engage in a collaborative and interactive accommodation process with the employee	Strong	28	Full
5.4 Accommodate employees up to the point of undue hardship, supported by evidence	Strong	27	Full
5.5 Assess and address accommodation needs on a case-by-case, individualized basis	Strong	26	Full
5.6 Do not require employees to disclose a specific diagnosis; request only functional limitations and workplace barriers	Strong	22	Full
5.7 Review and monitor accommodation measures on a regular basis	Strong	19	Full
5.8 Exercise the duty to inquire when aware or ought to be aware of a possible accommodation need	Strong	17	Full
5.9 Review workplace policies, practices, and standards regularly to identify and remove systemic barriers	Strong	17	Full
5.10 Keep accommodation records confidential and separate from personnel files	Strong	16	Full
5.11 Use the least intrusive means when requesting medical or supporting information	Strong	15	Full
5.12 Document accommodation plans in writing, signed by all parties	Strong	15	Full
5.13 Accept and respond to accommodation requests in good faith and in a timely manner	Strong	13	Full
5.14 Train managers, supervisors, and HR staff on accommodation obligations and processes	Strong	13	Full
5.15 Provide flexible work arrangements as an accommodation or inclusive practice	Strong	13	Full
5.16 Employer is responsible for funding accommodation measures	Strong	12	Full
5.17 Develop and maintain a written workplace accommodation policy	Strong	10	Full
5.18 Recognize mental health conditions as disabilities requiring accommodation, and address psychological safety and stigma	Strong	9	Full
5.19 Reassign to alternative position when current role cannot	Strong	7	Full

	be accommodated			
5.20	Establish an appeal or complaint process for accommodation decisions	Strong	6	Full
5.21	Provide temporary or interim accommodation while a request is being processed	Strong	6	Moderate
5.22	Publish and distribute the accommodation policy in accessible formats to all employees	Moderate	5	Full
5.23	Establish centralized coordination, governance, and continuous improvement for accommodation	Moderate	5	Full
5.24	Provide medical information to health care providers to support accurate functional assessments	Moderate	4	Full
5.25	Use the GC Workplace Accessibility Passport or similar portability tools to simplify ongoing accommodations	Moderate	4	Full
5.26	Provide wraparound supports and external resources beyond workplace accommodations	Moderate	4	Quality flag
5.27	Inform and involve coworkers appropriately while maintaining privacy	Moderate	4	Full
5.28	Ensure physical accessibility of workplace facilities and workstations	Moderate	4	Moderate
5.29	Consider informal accommodations before initiating a formal process	Low	3	Full
5.30	Use independent medical examinations only as a last resort in specific circumstances	Low	3	Moderate

Workplace accommodation was the largest domain, producing 30 of the 90 recommendations (33.3%). Twenty-one achieved Strong convergence. This dominance reflects the centrality of the duty to accommodate in Canadian human rights law and the volume of guidance that government agencies and human rights commissions have produced on accommodation processes. The domain covers the full accommodation lifecycle: receiving requests, gathering information, identifying solutions, implementing accommodations, monitoring effectiveness, and managing documentation.

### 6.6 Return to Work and Disability Management (RQ2b)

Rec. Practice	Tier	Sources	Confidence
6.1 Develop a return-to-work plan collaboratively with the employee	Strong	21	Full
6.2 Support graduated or phased return-to-work arrangements	Strong	13	Full
6.3 Monitor effectiveness of return-to-work arrangements and adjust as needed	Strong	9	Moderate
6.4 Implement early intervention and stay-at-work programmes to prevent prolonged absence	Strong	7	Moderate
6.5 Maintain appropriate contact with the employee during a leave of absence	Strong	6	Full

6.6	Ensure accommodation measures are in place before the employee returns	Moderate	5	Full
6.7	Do not pressure employees to return before they are medically ready	Moderate	4	Full
6.8	Prioritize return to pre-absence position; follow hierarchy of alternatives	Moderate	4	Full
6.9	Obtain and share appropriate medical information for return to work	Low	3	Full

Nine recommendations, five at Strong convergence. This domain draws from both human rights commission guidance and workplace safety/compensation board publications, reflecting the intersection of accommodation obligations and disability management frameworks.

## 6.7 Career Advancement and Professional Development (RQ2c)

Rec.	Practice	Tier	Sources	Confidence
7.1	Ensure fair performance management that accounts for accommodations and adjusts expectations appropriately	Strong	12	Full
7.2	Ensure training, development, and promotion opportunities are accessible and non-discriminatory	Strong	11	Moderate
7.3	Provide accommodations for performance reviews and career development processes	Strong	6	Full
7.4	Monitor workforce equity data (hiring, retention, promotion, turnover)	Low	3	Full
7.5	Address retention barriers (harassment, instability, lack of representation)	Low	3	Full

Career advancement was the smallest domain, with only five recommendations. This underrepresentation is notable: most employer guidance in the grey literature addresses the initial stages of employment rather than the ongoing career development of employees with disabilities. The gap suggests that Canadian guidance has focused heavily on getting persons with disabilities into employment without equivalent attention to their progression within organizations.

## 6.8 Retention and Inclusive Workplace Culture (RQ2d)

Rec	Practice	Tier	Sources	Confidence
8.1	Provide information and communications in accessible formats	Strong	25	Full
8.2	Cultivate an inclusive workplace culture that values diversity and respects dignity	Strong	24	Full
8.3	Establish employee resource groups, disability networks, and peer support structures	Strong	17	Full
8.4	Build accommodation and accessibility into workplace	Strong	14	Full

	policies and practices at the design stage			
8.5	Provide disability awareness and inclusion training to all employees	Strong	12	Moderate
8.6	Address attitudinal barriers, stigma, and misconceptions about disability in the workplace	Strong	12	Full
8.7	Senior leadership champions disability inclusion with executive accountability and governance structures	Strong	11	Full
8.8	Support employee self-identification and voluntary disclosure in a safe environment	Strong	7	Full
8.9	Workplace health, safety, and emergency response planning for employees with disabilities	Strong	7	Full
8.10	Workplace training, professional development supports, and capacity building for employees with disabilities	Strong	7	Moderate
8.11	Regularly review and update accommodation and accessibility policies	Strong	6	Full
8.12	Engage persons with disabilities in policy development and workplace decision-making	Strong	6	Full
8.13	Develop an accessibility or inclusion strategic plan with measurable goals	Moderate	5	Full
8.14	Ensure supervisors and managers model inclusive behaviour and leadership	Moderate	5	Full
8.15	Regular check-ins, one-on-one meetings, and structured feedback	Moderate	5	Full
8.16	Employee engagement surveys and feedback mechanisms for inclusion	Moderate	4	Moderate
8.17	Social inclusion, workplace norms clarification, and public commitment signalling	Moderate	4	Full
8.18	Equitable compensation, benefits, and career advancement review	Low	3	Full
8.19	Progressive discipline protections and disability-informed performance management	Low	3	Full
8.20	Structured onboarding, job shadowing, and workplace orientation	Low	3	Full

Twenty recommendations, twelve at Strong convergence. This domain spans organizational culture, leadership commitment, disability awareness training, employee resource groups, accessible communication, and performance management. The breadth reflects a recognition in the grey literature that retaining employees with disabilities requires sustained organizational effort beyond initial accommodation.

## 7. Emerging Practices

Sixteen practices were classified as Emerging, supported by exactly two independent sources. These did not meet the minimum convergence threshold for formal recommendation but warrant attention as areas where early guidance exists and future publications may increase convergence.

#	Practice	Sources	Confidence
1	Conduct medical assessments or disability-related inquiries only after a conditional offer of employment	2	Moderate
2	Accommodate substance dependence as a disability, including through relapse	2	Moderate
3	Offer internships, work experience, and pipeline programmes for persons with disabilities	2	Moderate
4	Collect workforce demographic data and set diversity hiring targets	2	Full
5	Apply accommodation policy broadly to all worker categories including applicants	2	Full
6	Train front-office and reception staff on disability etiquette before interviews	2	Full
7	Use inclusive workforce consultants to support assessment and workplace evaluation	2	Full
8	Set workforce representation targets and monitor hiring data	2	Moderate
9	Take ownership of the onboarding process	2	Full
10	Ensure portability of accommodations when employees change positions or locations	2	Full
11	Use assistive and inclusive technology solutions	2	Full
12	Involve unions in accommodation planning and override collective agreement barriers	2	Full
13	Ensure accommodated work is meaningful, productive, and meets core duties	2	Full
14	Report workplace injuries promptly	2	Full
15	Tailor mentorship and career conversations to individual goals	2	Full
16	Extend ongoing career development support including for neurodivergent employees	2	Moderate

Several of these emerging practices address areas with limited representation in the formal recommendations, particularly technology-based accommodations, union involvement, and neurodivergent-specific supports. As Canadian organizations continue to publish guidance in these areas, some of these practices may gather sufficient independent endorsement to be included as formal recommendations in future iterations of this synthesis.

## 8. Interpretation

---

### 8.1 Convergence Patterns and National Agreement

The identification of 13 practices with 20 or more independent organizational sources indicates a substantial degree of national agreement on certain employer practices. These high-convergence practices span recruitment (function-focused job descriptions, accommodation statements in postings), accommodation (individualized assessment, interactive processes, confidentiality), and retention (accessible communication, leadership commitment). The alignment of federal government departments, provincial human rights commissions, and NGOs on these practices suggests that they represent a settled core of Canadian employer guidance, unlikely to be contradicted by future publications.

The synthesis identified 90 practices with sufficient convergence to support recommendation. More than half of these (54 of 90) reached Strong convergence, with six or more independent sources endorsing the same practice. A smaller subset of 13 practices reached very high convergence with 20 or more sources, representing the most consistently endorsed practices in the corpus. Moderate (21 practices) and Low (15 practices) convergence tiers account for the remaining 36 recommendations. This pattern suggests that Canadian employer guidance on disability employment is more consolidated than fragmented. Where practices appear across multiple guidance documents, they tend to converge strongly rather than appearing in only a handful of sources. The relative thinness of the Moderate and Low tiers, compared to the Strong tier, indicates that the corpus contains a substantial common core rather than a long tail of context-specific advice.

### 8.2 The Dominance of Accommodation Guidance and Gaps Elsewhere

Workplace accommodation produced 30 of 90 recommendations, one third of the total output. This was not unexpected. The duty to accommodate is the legal centrepiece of Canadian disability employment law, and human rights commissions at both the federal and provincial levels have been producing accommodation guidance for decades. It is the area where legal obligations are most clearly defined and where the consequences of non-compliance are most visible. Disability has historically been the most frequently cited ground of discrimination under the *Canadian Human Rights Act*, with disability-related complaints accounting for over half of accepted complaints in some years (Canadian Human Rights Commission, 2019, 2024).

The contrast between the depth of accommodation guidance and the thinness of guidance elsewhere is marked. The grey literature has a great deal to say about how to accommodate an employee and cultivate an accessible workplace to support them once they are in the role. It has considerably less to say about how to make the decision to hire them in the first place, or how to support their career once they are there. Hiring decisions (RQ1c) produced only six recommendations, none at Strong convergence. Career advancement (RQ2c) produced only five, making it the smallest domain in the synthesis.

This imbalance likely reflects two related dynamics. Human rights commissions are complaint-driven bodies, and accommodation is the subject of most complaints; the guidance follows the complaints, not the full employment lifecycle. Beyond that, organizations producing guidance tend to focus on areas where the law provides clear backing. Accommodation has a statutory foundation that makes prescriptive guidance defensible. Hiring decisions and career advancement are thornier. They are subjective, contextual, and shaped by judgments that resist codification.

The career advancement gap is the more troubling of the two from an equity standpoint. Canadian employer guidance has been primarily concerned with initial access to employment, with much less attention paid to what happens once persons with disabilities are in the workplace. A corpus that prepares employers to hire and accommodate but offers little on advancement leaves a structural problem in place: persons with disabilities can enter the workforce but lack guidance-supported pathways for progression. This concern is not unique to the Canadian context. The Disability Inclusion Business Council's *Bridging the Gap* report identified barriers to promotion as one of the persistent obstacles facing employees with disabilities in Canadian workplaces and called on the Government of Canada to lead by example in removing such barriers (Disability Inclusion Business Council, 2024).

### 8.3 Grey Literature as a Vehicle for Employer Guidance

The 95 included documents represent a substantial body of practice guidance produced almost entirely outside peer-reviewed channels. The quality of this literature, as assessed by CRAAP appraisal, was generally high: 78 of 95 documents scored in the High range (13–15 out of 15). These documents were produced by federal government departments, human rights commissions, and NGOs with subject matter expertise and, in many cases, statutory authority.

The extent and depth of empirical primary research evaluating specific practices across disability populations is uncertain and was not within the scope of this synthesis to determine. What is clear is that employers are looking for direction now. Recent reports from the Disability Inclusion Business Council (2024) and Employment and Social Development Canada (2025) document active and ongoing employer demand for disability inclusion guidance, particularly among small and medium-sized enterprises that lack internal expertise. The documents that fill that demand are the same toolkits, employer guides, fact sheets, and policy statements that make up the corpus examined here. While many score well on quality appraisal, individual documents are typically partial in their coverage: scoped to a single practice area, narrow in disability focus, or missing whole stages of the employment lifecycle.

The convergence synthesis offered a way to treat this dispersed body of literature systematically. By counting independent organizational endorsement rather than relying on statistical pooling designed for primary research, the method provides a transparent approach to evidence synthesis that matches the nature of the available evidence base (Greenhalgh et al., 2014). The result is a consolidated set of practices supported by agreement across multiple authoritative sources.

This work is not a substitute for empirically grounded guideline development. Where primary research exists or can be generated, de novo guideline development remains the appropriate next step. The convergence synthesis offers employers practical direction for the present while the field continues to develop.

## **8.4 Alignment with the CAN-ASC Employment Standard**

Accessibility Standards Canada published a revised employment standard during the period of this study (Accessibility Standards Canada, 2025). Many of the practices identified in that standard appear among the high-convergence recommendations in this synthesis. The alignment between the convergence findings and the national employment standard suggests that the standard reflects established practice agreement rather than novel requirements.

## 9. Limitations

---

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings.

The synthesis included grey literature only. No peer-reviewed primary research was incorporated. While grey literature is the primary vehicle for employer-directed guidance in this field, the exclusion of academic sources means that practices supported by empirical research but not yet reflected in grey literature may be absent from the recommendations. CRAAP appraisal provides a structured quality assessment of the included documents, but it does not substitute for peer review, and the quality of the underlying evidence base should be interpreted accordingly.

The scope was limited to Canadian sources. The findings reflect Canadian legislative contexts, organizational structures, and cultural norms. Practices established in other jurisdictions but not yet represented in Canadian grey literature would not appear in the synthesis, and international transferability should be assessed with caution.

Quebec government domains were not searched as part of this project. Quebec government publications on employer disability employment guidance are produced primarily in French, and the project's resources did not extend to French-language search and extraction. Quebec NGOs publishing in English were searched as part of the provincial NGO domain, and bilingual federal documents and national NGO documents applicable to all jurisdictions, including Quebec, were retained.

Jurisdictional representation was uneven. Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, and the Northwest Territories were not represented by jurisdiction-specific documents, and some other provinces contributed only a small number of documents. This unevenness reflects variation in the volume of grey literature produced by different jurisdictions rather than a search failure.

Extraction relied on publicly available digital documents. Guidance that exists only in internal organizational materials, behind paywalls, or in unpublished form was therefore outside the scope of this synthesis.

Convergence counts reflect independent organizational sources rather than individual documents. Where a single organization published multiple guides, those documents were treated as one source for the purpose of calculating convergence. This approach guards against artificial inflation of agreement by prolific publishers, but it also means that practices with genuine cross-document support within an organization are not credited beyond a single count. Some practices may therefore appear to have lower convergence than their actual prevalence in the literature would suggest.

No stakeholder validation of the recommendations was conducted as part of this study. The recommendations reflect convergence of published source material and have not been reviewed by employers, employees with disabilities, or other stakeholders. Ethical approval has been obtained for usability testing that will provide a form of stakeholder validation, and this work is a priority.

## 10. Implications and Future Directions

---

### 10.1 Implications for Policy

The convergence findings have direct implications for accessibility standards development under the *Accessible Canada Act* and provincial legislation. Practices that reached Strong convergence with Full CRAAP confidence represent areas where the widest range of authoritative Canadian sources agree, making them the most defensible candidates for incorporation into regulatory standards.

The alignment between the convergence findings and the CAN-ASC employment standard suggests that existing Canadian guidance already supports many of the requirements being codified in federal accessibility standards (Accessibility Standards Canada, 2025). For provinces at earlier stages of standards development, the convergence data provides an empirical foundation for identifying which employer practices have the broadest support across the country.

### 10.2 Implications for Practice

Employers can use the convergence tiers and confidence levels to prioritize implementation. Starting with the most consistently endorsed practices provides the strongest foundation for action, while practices at Moderate or Low convergence may warrant more careful contextual judgment before adoption.

The organization of recommendations by domain allows employers to target specific areas of practice improvement. An employer seeking to strengthen recruitment can focus on the RQ1a recommendations; one addressing gaps in return-to-work programming can turn to RQ2b. The companion employer guideline presents each recommendation with jurisdictional notes and implementation guidance for this purpose.

### 10.3 Implications for Research

The findings point to several research priorities. The extent and depth of empirical primary research evaluating specific employer practices is uncertain and was not within the scope of this synthesis to determine. Where such research exists, it could be brought into dialogue with the convergence findings to test whether the most widely endorsed practices produce the intended outcomes for employers and employees with disabilities. Where it does not yet exist, primary research generation is warranted.

The two underrepresented domains, hiring decisions and career advancement, warrant particular attention. The absence of guidance in these areas is a gap that grey literature alone is unlikely to fill. Empirical research on decision-making processes in disability-inclusive hiring and on career progression trajectories for employees with disabilities would strengthen the basis for future synthesis and guideline development.

## **10.4 Conditions for Future Guideline Development**

This convergence synthesis is positioned as the appropriate method given the available evidence base. Where primary research, systematic reviews, formal evidence grading, and a multidisciplinary guideline development panel can be brought together, de novo guideline development remains the more rigorous next step. The convergence data reported here can serve as a starting point for that work, both by identifying the practices most consistently recommended across Canadian sources and by signalling the domains where primary research investment is most needed.

## **11. Conclusion**

---

This project produced a convergence synthesis of Canadian grey literature on employer disability employment practices, drawn from 95 documents published by 53 independent organizations. The synthesis yielded 90 recommendations across eight domains of the employment lifecycle, each accompanied by a convergence tier and a CRAAP confidence rating that make the basis of each recommendation transparent.

The work began as a guideline development project. The systematic review conducted at the outset showed that the formal guideline being sought, an evidence-based pan-disability employer guideline developed for the Canadian context, did not exist in the international literature available for adaptation. The research team adopted a convergence synthesis approach in response, treating the body of Canadian grey literature as the practical knowledge base on which Canadian employers currently rely.

The convergence patterns identify areas of substantial national agreement, particularly in workplace accommodation, accessible recruitment, and inclusive culture, where legal obligations are clearly defined and publishing organizations have been most active. The same patterns identify gaps in the guidance corpus, notably in hiring decisions and career advancement. These gaps are themselves a finding of the synthesis, indicating areas where employers receive the least direction on some of the more consequential decisions they make in the employment lifecycle.

The methodology used in this project is a secondary contribution. In fields where grey literature carries authority and primary research has not yet produced an empirical foundation for formal guideline development, the approach offers a structured way to consolidate dispersed guidance into recommendations supported by independent agreement. The five-tier classification and CRAAP confidence modifier provide a means for readers to evaluate each recommendation against the strength of its supporting evidence.

The synthesis does not test whether the practices it identifies produce intended outcomes for employers or for employees with disabilities. That question requires primary research, and the relationship between this corpus and the empirical research base was not examined as part of this project. The recommendations should therefore be understood as the strongest direction currently available from authoritative Canadian guidance, not as evidence that the practices recommended have been empirically validated. Where the conditions for formal guideline development can eventually be met, the convergence data reported here provides a foundation for that work.

---

## References

---

- Accessibility Standards Canada. (2025). *CAN-ASC-1.1:2024 (REV 2025) Employment standard*. Government of Canada. <https://accessible.canada.ca/>
- Aromataris, E., & Munn, Z. (Eds.). (2020). *JBI manual for evidence synthesis*. JBI. <https://doi.org/10.46658/JBIMES-20-01>
- Bonaccio, S., Connelly, C. E., Gellatly, I. R., Jetha, A., & Martin Ginis, K. A. (2020). The participation of people with disabilities in the workplace across the employment cycle: Employer concerns and research evidence. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 35(2), 135–158. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-018-9602-5>
- Burleton, D., & DePratto, B. (2019, October 16). *Canadians with disabilities: Seizing the opportunity*. TD Economics.
- Canadian Human Rights Commission. (2019). *Speak out: Canadian Human Rights Commission 2018 annual report to Parliament*. Government of Canada. <https://www.chrc-ccdp.gc.ca/>
- Canadian Human Rights Commission. (2024). *Canadian Human Rights Commission's 2024 annual report to Parliament*. Government of Canada. <https://www.chrc-ccdp.gc.ca/resources/publications/canadian-human-rights-commissions-2024-report-parliament>
- Canadian Human Rights Commission. (2025). *Duty to accommodate*. <https://www.chrc-ccdp.gc.ca/en/about-human-rights/what-duty-accommodate>
- Conference Board of Canada. (2015). *Employers' toolkit: Making Ontario workplaces accessible to people with disabilities* (2nd ed.).
- Disability Inclusion Business Council. (2024). *Bridging the gap: Report on disability inclusion in Canadian workplaces*. Employment and Social Development Canada. <https://www.canada.ca/en/employment-social-development/corporate/disability-inclusion-business-council/report-bridging-gap.html>
- Employment and Social Development Canada. (2025). *Employment strategy for Canadians with disabilities: Annual progress report (2024 to 2025)*. Government of Canada. <https://www.canada.ca/en/employment-social-development/programs/disability-inclusion-action-plan/reports/employment-strategy-progress-report-2024-2025.html>
- Employment and Social Development Canada. (2024). *Employment and Social Development Canada's 2023 to 2024 departmental results report*. Government of Canada.
- Government of Canada. (1985). *Canadian Human Rights Act* (R.S.C., 1985, c. H-6). Justice Laws Website.

Government of Canada. (2019). *Accessible Canada Act* (S.C. 2019, c. 10). Justice Laws Website.

Graham, R., Mancher, M., Miller Wolman, D., Greenfield, S., & Steinberg, E. (Eds.). (2011). *Clinical practice guidelines we can trust*. National Academies Press.

Greenhalgh, T., Howick, J., & Maskrey, N. (2014). Evidence based medicine: A movement in crisis? *BMJ*, *348*, g3725. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.g3725>

Hardy, V., & Vergara, D. (2025). *Labour market characteristics of persons with and without disabilities, 2024* (Catalogue no. 71-222-X). Statistics Canada.

Hébert, B.-P., Kevins, C., Mofidi, A., Morris, S., Simionescu, D., & Thicke, M. (2024). *A demographic, employment and income profile of persons with disabilities aged 15 years and over in Canada, 2022* (Catalogue no. 89-654-X2024001). Statistics Canada.

House of Commons Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities. (2013). *Exploring employment opportunities for people with disabilities* House of Commons Standing Committee on Human Resources, Skills and Social Development and the Status of Persons with Disabilities.

Jansen, J., van Ooijen, R., Koning, P. W. C., Boot, C. R. L., & Brouwer, S. (2021). The role of the employer in supporting work participation of workers with disabilities: A systematic literature review using an interdisciplinary approach. *Journal of Occupational Rehabilitation*, *31*(4), 916–949. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10926-021-09978-3>

Lee, S. S. (2013). *Disability, underemployment and social change* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto]. University of Toronto.

Lindsay, S., Leck, J., Shen, W., Cagliostro, E., & Stinson, J. (2019). A framework for developing employer's disability confidence. *Equality, Diversity and Inclusion*, *38*(1), 40-55. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-05-2018-0085>

Markel, K. S., & Barclay, L. A. (2009). Addressing the underemployment of persons with disabilities: Recommendations for expanding organizational social responsibility. *Employee Responsibilities and Rights Journal*, *21*, 305-318. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10672-009-9125-3>

Milner, A., Krnjacki, L., Butterworth, P., Kavanagh, A., & LaMontagne, A. D. (2018). Employment predictors of exit from work among workers with disabilities: A survival analysis from the Household Income Labour Dynamics in Australia survey. *PLoS ONE*, *13*(12), e0208334. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0208334>

Murphy, M. K., Black, N. A., Lamping, D. L., McKee, C. M., Sanderson, C. F. B., Askham, J., & Marteau, T. (1998). Consensus development methods, and their use in clinical guideline development. *Health Technology Assessment*, *2*(3), 1-88. <https://doi.org/10.3310/hta2030>

Statistics Canada. (2023, December 1). Canadian Survey on Disability, 2017 to 2022. *The Daily*.

Statistics Canada. (2024, August 14). Disability status, disability severity class and labour force status by First Nations people living off reserve, Métis and Inuit, age group and gender. Table 41-10-0062-01.

Tompa, E., Buettgen, A., Mahood, Q., Padkapayeva, K., Posen, A., & Yazdani, A. (2015). *Evidence synthesis of workplace accommodation policies and practices for persons with visible disabilities: Final report*. Institute for Work & Health.

Vergara, D., & Hardy, V. (2024). *Labour market characteristics of persons with and without disabilities, 2023 (Catalogue no. 71-222-X)*. Statistics Canada.

World Health Organization. (2014). *WHO handbook for guideline development (2nd ed.)*. World Health Organization.

## **Acknowledgements**

---

This report was produced as part of the Workplace Opportunities: Removing Barriers to Equity (WORBE) project, funded by the Government of Canada through Employment and Social Development Canada. The ideas, views and opinions in this publication belong to the author(s). They may not reflect those of the Government of Canada.

The research team gratefully acknowledges the support of their respective institutions in facilitating this work and the National Educational Association of Disabled Students (NEADS) for their partnership on the WORBE project.

The recommendations in this report are built on the collective expertise of 53 Canadian organizations whose guidance documents were analyzed in the convergence synthesis. The breadth and consistency of their published guidance on disability employment inclusion made this synthesis possible.

## Appendix A: Included Documents

The following table lists all 95 documents included in the convergence synthesis, ordered by document code.

Code	Organization	Title	Year	CRAAP
FED-01	ESDC / Hire for Talent	Including People with Disabilities in Your Workplace	2022	15
FED-03	Accessibility Standards Canada	CAN-ASC-1.1:2024 (REV-2025) Employment Standard (full)	2025	15
FED-04	Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat	Duty to Accommodate: A General Process for Managers	2023	15
FED-05	Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat	Directive on the Duty to Accommodate	2020	14
FED-06	Public Service Commission of Canada	Guide for Assessing Persons with Disabilities: Assessment Accommodations	2015	14
FED-07	Public Service Commission of Canada	The Assessment of Candidates with Disabilities	2015	14
FED-08	Public Service Commission of Canada	How to think inclusion by design (Appendix 1)	2015	11
FED-09	Public Service Commission of Canada	FAQs for HR Advisors and Managers: Assessment Accommodation	2020	15
FED-10	ESDC / Disability Inclusion Business Council	Bridging the Gap: Report on Disability Inclusion in Canadian Workplaces	2022	14
FED-11	ESDC / Labour Program	How to improve workplace equity: Evidence-based actions for employers	2023	14
FED-12	Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat	Handling Disability Management Cases: Accommodation	2021	14
FED-13	Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat	How to Build a Disability Management Program: The Steps	2021	13
FED-14	Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat	Managing for Wellness: Disability Management Handbook for Managers	2021	14
FED-15	Treasury Board of Canada Secretariat	The Fundamentals: Return-to-Work Plan	2021	14
FED-16	Canadian Human Rights Commission	Workplace accommodation: A guide for federally regulated workplaces (2026)	2026	15
FED-17	Canadian Human Rights Commission	Developing a workplace accommodation policy: A Template for Federally Regulated4 Employers	2024	15
FED-18	Canadian Human Rights Commission	A Place for All: A Guide to Creating an Inclusive Workplace (2006)	2006	12
FED-19	Canadian Human Rights Commission	A Guide for Managing the Return to Work	2007	12

FED-20	Canadian Human Rights Commission	A Guide to Screening and Selection in Employment	2007	11
FED-21	Canadian Human Rights Commission	Impaired at Work: A guide to accommodating substance dependence (ARCHIVED)	2008	12
FED-22	Correctional Service Canada	Guideline 254-3: Workplace Accommodation	2019	14
FED-23	Canadian Association of Professional Employees	Duty to Accommodate: A guide for CAPE members	2024	14
ON-01	Ontario Human Rights Commission	The duty to accommodate (Policy on disability)	2016	14
ON-02	Ontario Human Rights Commission	Employment applications (Human Rights at Work Ch. IV)	2008	13
ON-03	Ontario Human Rights Commission	Human Rights at Work 2008 - Third Edition (full document)	2008	13
ON-04	Government of Ontario / Accessibility Directorate	Accessible workplaces (AODA Employment Standard)	2022	15
ON-05	Government of Ontario / Accessibility Directorate	Guide to accessibility compliance for industry	2022	14
ON-06	Toronto District School Board	Workplace Accommodation for Employees with Disabilities (PR717)	2018	13
ON-07	University Health Network	Accommodation in Employment for Persons with Disabilities	2020	14
ON-08	City of Toronto	Guidelines for Accommodating Disabilities	2020	14
ON-09	University of Waterloo	Disability Accommodation Guidelines for Employees	2021	14
ON-10	Retail Council of Canada / EnAbling Change	Handbook for Accessible Employment Under the AODA	2015	13
ON-11	Government of Ontario / AODA	Making Your Business Accessible for People with Disabilities (Small Business Guide)	2014	12
ON-12	Ontario Disability Employment Network	ODEN Article Series 2019	2019	13
ON-13	Discover Ability Network	Step 2: Find talent	2020	14
ON-14	Canadian Mental Health Association Ontario	Mental Health in the Workplace: An Accommodation Guide for Managers and Staff	2017	13
ON-15	Parkinson Canada / Neurological Health Charities Canada	At Ease: A guide to improving accessibility for people with invisible disabilities	2018	10
ON-16	David C. Onley Initiative / Algonquin College	Employers Guide to Working with and Hiring Professionals with Disabilities	2020	13

ON-17	ODEN / Presidents Group	Deep Dive: Embed Disability Awareness into your Onboarding Process	202	14	2
BC-01	BC Public Service Agency	Managers' guide to reasonable accommodation	202	15	5
BC-02	BC Office of the Human Rights Commissioner	Accommodations in the workplace (infosheet)	202	15	2
BC-03	BC Office of the Human Rights Commissioner	Equitable hiring and promotion (infosheet)	202	15	5
BC-04	Presidents Group	Disability-Confident Employers: Building Inclusive Workplaces in British Columbia	201	13	9
BC-05	WorkBC Centre for Arts and Technology	Building an Inclusive Workforce: A Guide for Employers	202	11	0
BC-06	BC Teachers' Federation	Duty to Accommodate: A Guide for Members	201	12	7
AB-01	Alberta Human Rights Commission	Duty to accommodate: Interpretive bulletin	201	14	8
AB-02	Alberta Human Rights Commission	Duty to accommodate students and employees with disabilities	201	14	0
AB-03	Government of Alberta	Building Respectful Workplaces: An Employer's Guide to Resolving Workplace 1 Complaints	202	13	
AB-04	Government of Alberta	Alberta WCB: Employer Guide to Return-to-Work	202	14	2
MB-01	Manitoba Human Rights Commission	Reasonable accommodation: A guide for employers	201	14	7
MB-02	Manitoba Human Rights Commission	The duty to accommodate	201	14	9
MB-03	Opportunities Fund Manitoba	Employer Toolkit: Inclusive Hiring	202	12	0
MB-04	Government of Manitoba / WCB	Employer's Guide to Return to Work	201	14	8
MB-05	Manitoba Accessibility Office	Employment Standard: Summary for Employers	202	14	3
SK-01	Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission	Duty to accommodate: A guide	201	14	6
SK-02	Saskatchewan Human Rights Commission	Disability and the duty to accommodate	201	14	4
SK-03	Saskatchewan WCB	Employer's Guide to Return-to-Work	202	14	1
NB-01	New Brunswick Human Rights Commission	Guideline on accommodating physical and mental disability	201	14	8
NB-02	WorkSafe NB	Employer's Guide: Return to Work	202	13	0

NL-01	Newfoundland and Labrador Human Rights Commission	A Guide to the Duty to Accommodate	202	15	0
NL-02	Government of Newfoundland and Labrador	Workplace Accommodation Policy	201	14	9
NL-03	WorkplaceNL	Employer's Guide to Return to Work	202	14	2
NU-01	Government of Nunavut	Duty to Accommodate: Employee Guide	201	12	4
YK-01	Yukon Human Rights Commission	A Guide to the Duty to Accommodate in Yukon Workplaces	201	14	9
NNGO-01	Canadian Association for Supported Employment	HR Inclusive Policy Toolkit	201	13	9
NNGO-02	Canadian Association for Supported Employment	Inclusive Recruitment and Hiring Practices	201	14	9
NNGO-03	Canadian Association for Supported Employment	Workplace Supports and Accommodations	201	14	9
NNGO-04	Canadian Association for Supported Employment	Return to Work and Job Retention	201	13	9
NNGO-05	Conference Board of Canada	Employers' Toolkit: Making Ontario Workplaces Accessible to People with Disabilities	201	14	5
NNGO-06	Neil Squire Society / Technology@Work	Workplace Accommodation Solutions	202	12	0
NNGO-07	NEADS	Employer's Guide to Hiring Students with Disabilities	201	14	9
NNGO-08	Canadian Centre for Diversity and Inclusion	Employer Toolkit: Employing People with Disabilities	201	14	9
NNGO-09	Canadian Hearing Services	Employer's Guide to Workplace Accommodation for People Who Are Deaf or Hard of Hearing	202	14	1
NNGO-10	ARCH Disability Law Centre	Duty to Accommodate: Your Rights at Work	201	14	9
NNGO-11	March of Dimes Canada	Employment Services: Employer Resources	202	12	0
NNGO-12	Rick Hansen Foundation	Employer Resources: Accessibility in the Workplace	202	13	0
NNGO-13	Canadian National Institute for the Blind	Employer's Guide to Hiring People with Vision Loss	201	14	9
NNGO-14	Autism Canada	Employer's Guide to Hiring Autistic Individuals	202	13	0
NNGO-15	Canadian Mental Health Association	Psychological Health and Safety in the Workplace	202	14	0
NNGO-	Spinal Cord Injury Ontario	Employer's Guide to Workplace	201	13	

16		Accommodation	8
NNGO- 17	DisabilityAction.ca	Employer Guide to Inclusive Workplace Practices	202 12 1
NNGO- 18	Canadian Council on Rehabilitation and Work	Employer Resources for Disability Employment	201 13 9
NNGO- 19	Ready, Willing and Able	Employer Engagement: A Guide to Inclusive Hiring	201 14 8
NNGO- 20	Social Enterprise Council of Canada	Inclusive Employment: A Toolkit for Social Enterprises	202 11 0
NNGO- 21	Accessible Employers (BC)	Employer Resource Hub: Disability Hiring Best Practices	202 13 2
NNGO- 22	Learning Disabilities Association of Canada	Accommodating Employees with Learning Disabilities	201 12 8
NNGO- 23	Canadian Paraplegic Association	Employer's Guide to Workplace Accommodation for Persons with Physical Disabilities	201 13 7
NNGO- 24	Inclusion Canada	Employer Toolkit: Inclusive Employment for Persons with Intellectual Disabilities	201 13 9
NNGO- 25	Canadian Institute for the Blind / CNIB	Come to Work: Employer Toolkit	202 14 1
NNGO- 26	Centre for Addiction and Mental Health	Workplace Mental Health: Employer Resources	202 14 0
NNGO- 27	Canadian Abilities Foundation	Employer Resources: Disability Employment Practices	201 12 9
NNGO- 28	Institute for Work & Health	Employer Practices for Return-to-Work	201 14 6
NNGO- 29	Ontario Nonprofit Network	HR Toolkit: Accessible and Inclusive Employment	201 13 9
NNGO- 30	Magnet / Ryerson University	Ability to Hire: Employer's Guide	201 13 9
NNGO- 31	Sheridan College	Employer Toolkit: Hosting Students with Disabilities in the Workplace	202 14 2