



JOB READY SERVICES

YOUR STAMP OF APPROVAL FOR WORKPLACE FITNESS

January 2014 Issue



Our Services:

- Functional Capacity Evaluations
- Work Conditioning
- Job Analyses
- Fit for Duty Testing
- Employment Testing

CHANGE THE STANDARDS FOR EVERYONE TO ACCOMMODATE THE FEW?

A recent Associated Press article with the headline “More Than Half of the Women Can’t Pass the Test” stated that it was determined more than half of the women recruits entering the Marines were not able to do 3 pull-ups, as required in Marine boot camp.

Here’s the rest of the story from the AP: “WASHINGTON — More than half of female Marines in boot camp can’t do three pullups, the minimum standard that was supposed to take effect with the new year. That prompted the Marine Corps to delay the requirement, part of the process of equalizing physical standards to integrate women into combat jobs.

The delay rekindled sharp debate in the military on the question of whether women have the physical strength for some military jobs, as service branches move toward opening thousands of combat roles to them in 2016.

Although no new timetable has been set on the delayed physical requirement, Marine Corps Commandant Gen. James Amos wants training officials to “continue to gather data and ensure that female Marines are provided with the best opportunity to succeed,” Capt. Maureen Krebs, a Marine spokeswoman, said Thursday.

Starting with the new year, all female Marines were supposed to be able to do three pullups on their annual physical fitness test and eight for a perfect score. The requirement was tested in 2013 on female recruits at Marine Corps Recruit Depot, Parris Island, S.C., but only 45 percent of women met the minimum, Krebs said. The Marines had hoped to institute the pullups on the belief that pullups require the muscular strength necessary to perform common military tasks such as scaling a wall, climbing up a rope or lifting and carrying heavy munitions.”

Obviously, this has sparked some heated debates about whether women should be in combat situations. Ok, so half of the women could not pass this test, however 45% COULD pass it!! Does that mean we need to lower the standards for everyone else because part of the population could not

pass the test? (I suspect there were a few men that could not pass it as well – was there any discussion about lowering the standards when those men couldn't pass it?)

It works the same way in employment testing as well. A very heavy labor job should not exclude women, just because only a few can pass the test. If the tasks they are being asked to do are essential functions of the job, then lowering the standards for everyone else in order to allow more people to pass it, will not only put those who can do it at risk, but will significantly change the job altogether.

On the other hand, if a test is so difficult that a large percentage are not passing it, then it certainly is worth a second look to determine if modifications need to be made or, if perhaps the test is truly more difficult than the job. However, if the job cannot be modified and the job specific tasks are accurately measured and are essential functions, then the best practice is to continue testing and hire those that truly are physically capable and safe to do the job.

-Submitted by Michelle Morgan, Vice President at Job Ready Services

RECENT COURT RULING SUGGESTS FUNCTIONAL, OBJECTIVE TESTING IS A GOOD IDEA

In a recent post by Jackson Lewis, the recent Lafata vs. Dearborn Heights School District No. 7, ([Jackson Lewis Disability, Leave, & Health Mgmt Blog](#)) a new hire candidate for a building superintendent underwent a post offer examination by a physician, who diagnosed him with a genetic disorder that causes his muscles to deteriorate. As a result, the physician gave the candidate a restriction of “ground level work only.” The school district withdrew the offer of employment based on this restriction. The candidate sued the employer and the court ruled that neither the employer nor the physician took into account that the candidate had been a building superintendent for the past 10 years; that no objective information was provided to prove that the candidate had sufficient strength to perform the essential functions of his job; or whether the employer could have offered a reasonable accommodation to enable him to do the job. According to the court, the employer “had a duty to review [its doctor’s] report to assure itself that his examination and analysis were thorough and/or reasonable.”

The ADA allows employers to ask the employee to show that they can safely perform the essential functions of the job. Furthermore, a physician’s opinion of physical restrictions, unless supported by objective, functional testing, should not be the only deciding factor on whether someone is safe to do their job.

JANUARY LUNCH & LEARN

Thursday, January 23, 2014 12:00-1:00 at Job Ready office

Speaker: Dr. David Caretto, Duke Medical Center

Dr. Caretto will be discussing 3 factors currently affecting our workforce: Aging, Obesity and Mental Health issues.

Cost: \$12.00

CEU’s pending: CCM (1 hour)

To register, please call or email Michelle Morgan at michelle.morgan@jobreadyservices.net , or visit our website at www.jobreadyservices.net .

Also, save the date for our March Lunch & Learn on March 13 with Dr. Lam from Carolina Pain Consultants!

2300 Westinghouse Blvd.
Suite 107
Raleigh, NC 27604

PHONE:
(919) 256-1400

FAX:
(919) 256-1403

E-MAIL:
michelle.morgan@jobreadyservices.net

WEBSITE:
www.jobreadyservices.net

TWITTER:
JobReadySvc

We have Spanish-speaking staff for daily work conditioning visits.

