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>> Good morning, everyone! It's nice to see everyone. Thank you. Let's say that again. Good morning, everyone!

>> ALL: Good morning!

>> Wow, that's much better. We're supposed to be jubilant. Good morning, and welcome to the final day of the 2013 AUCD Conference. I hope you have been thoroughly enthralled as I have by the conference events so far. We're going to start this morning with the annual business meeting, yay, this is what we're doing right now described by the AUCD bylaws not purpose of updating members on the State of the association and for the transaction of such other business as may come before the meeting. That's right from the bylaws. We plan to keep this very short and sweet and move along quickly to the prize drawing, and then the plenary session. We would encourage you all, there is a 15‑minute break, but we would encourage you to take a short break so that we can get going so that we can get you all up on to the Hill as soon as possible. I would like to first introduce you to the 2013/2014 officers of the AUCD Board. Leslie Cohen, President. Yay!

(Applause)

Olivia Raynor, President‑Elect.

(Applause).

Karen Edwards, Secretary. Karen, where are you? I don't see Karen. We'll give her a hand anyway.

(Applause).

Harold Kleinert, treasurer. Harold is here.

(Applause).

I will become Past‑President, and Tony Antosh will be Past‑Past‑President. And the two newest members of the Board recently elected by the membership at large, at large members of the Board are Cynthia Ellis. Cynthia, thank you!

(Applause)

Cynthia is the LEND director at the Monroe‑Meyer institute for genetics and rehabilitation at the University of Nebraska medical center.

And Phillip Wilson, Phil, are you here?

(Applause)

Phil is the UCEDD director of the Human Development Center at Louisiana State University. Two new individuals will be joining our Board representing councils are Jodie Pirtle.

(Applause).

Jodie is faculty at the Northern Arizona University, and representative of the Arizona UCEDD. She is chair of the newly named council on technology and innovation in interdisciplinary services. And Michelle Schladant. Thank you. I also get it wrong. Michelle Schladant is the training director at the Mehlman center for child development at the University of Miami. And the new chair of the national training council. Let's give her a hand. Thank you!

(Applause)

This year we also have a returning council chair, Dawn Olson representing the North Dakota center for persons with disabilities who will continue as the Chair for another term. Thank you, Dawn!

(Applause)

We welcome these new and returning Board Members, and look forward to their full participation and governance and leadership of the AUCD.

At this time I would like to introduce our treasurer, Olivia Raynor, to provide you with an overview of the organization's fiscal status. Olivia, the financial committee are, well, you can tell them that, that you are committed to the financial security of the organization. So welcome!

(Laughter)

>> OLIVIA RAYNOR: Okay. Thank you! Good morning, everybody! I like this responsiveness, he is especially about money. This is great! It is my pleasure to review with you this morning the financial status of the organization. But before I make my remarks, I do want to thank our finance manager, Elia Bishop, and congratulations on her new baby, and her diligent work on behalf of the association this last year fans manager. We have a very strong system of checks and balances overseeing our finances. I will spend a few minutes with you this morning reviewing our revenue, our expenses, some of the financial trends, and moneys of the association received and re‑granted to our centers. A key fiscal accomplishment this year is that we have achieved our goal of six months' emergency fund savings. We also weathered the storm of losing one of our more substantial CDC grants that historically generated anywhere from $2‑$4 million annually to the association. So first let's take a look at our support and revenue. This slide represents our support and revenue by the key areas that we generate funds. This has been consistent for many years. The majority of our revenue comes from contracts and grants, and next is membership. Membership dollars are very important to our association, because they represent unrestricted funds, and it is here that we are able to generate the necessary funds to support our policy and legislative activities. Our interest account is where we maintain and generate our money market and banking reserve funds. Typically we hold and reserve around $90‑$100,000 in quick cash. Next slide, please. Our expenses. Our expenses were slightly more than our revenue this year by approximately $32,000. I do want to share with you that this was an anticipated loss as, in fact, last year ‑‑ this year we had approved a budget with an anticipated loss of $100,000 knowing that we had the necessary cash reserves to protect us. But, in fact, our administrative and other costs were well administered, and we actually minimized our anticipated loss again at a $30,000 loss. The majority of our funds, as you can see, are spent on contracts and consultants. Those are the funds that predominantly represent what's re‑distributed to our centers or for the use of consultants such as our accountants, I.T., and lobbying firm. In addition, these are the pass‑through dollars through AUCD. Next slide, please. Here we have a visual depiction of our assets, grants, and contracts revenue, and our overall revenue between 2006‑2013. The top line, which is gray, is our overall assets. The dips and valleys correspond to our generation of contracts and grants over time. The dip over this last year, again, relates to decreased revenue related to the CDC grant. And the winding down of some of our other grants in postsecondary education and self‑determination. The orange, middle line, represents our earnings from contracts and grants over time. And the bottom line, the blue line, is our net assets. It shows how over time our surplus of funds has accrued. Each year we have gained a surplus with the exception, again, of what I've just discussed in terms of our anticipated loss for this year. The point is that although our revenue has gone down, we are very stable as an organization. You see the ebbs and flows, and overall there is a steady gain in our asset. We did receive new CDC‑based funding which puts us in a position to secure other opportunities. Other grants and contracts that we receive from NCH and AIDD are more stable and multi‑year grants. The next slide called our give‑back funds, depicts the association's historical trends of generating contracts and grants that we give back through our network. Again, you can see that there was return to our network in 2012/2013 with a decrease in the postsecondary education grants. In conclusion, I would like to point out some of the key financial accomplishments. We achieved, as I said at the beginning of my remarks, a important milestone and target. We have our emergency reserves. Importantly, we also received a clean and unqualified audit from our reviewers. The financial health of our organization is strong. Thank you for your attention this morning. I will now turn this back over to Leslie after ‑‑ oh, excuse me! I have one other thing to point out to you which is our 2014 financial trends. Looking to the 1st Quarter of next year, our accountants anticipate a decrease in both revenue and expenses. So we're going to come out just fine. We have 70% ‑‑ we have a 70% less revenue, but we also have 58% reduced expenditures. The trend overall remains very positive for us as we move into this 1st Quarter. And the association will be very attentive to its fixed costs, overhead, and administrative costs and deploy personnel as necessary to meet the needs of the association. Andy is very committed to diversification of funds, and the Board will be engaging in a lively discussion I believe in this next year in terms of strategic planning and our future investments, and securing additional funds. So before I conclude, I would like to thank our finance committee members, Leslie Cohen, Tony Antosh, Shannon Caldwell, Dan Crimmins, Julie Fodor, Bruce Kissling, Harold Kleinert, and our wonderful staff Andy and Elia Bishop. So thank you!

(Applause)

>> Olivia has done an exemplary job as treasurer. You can just give her another round of applause? Thank you, Olivia!

Because ‑‑ if you are a very clever person and you get handed an additional part of your script you can incorporate it in because sometimes I'm not so clever I forgot to incorporate some of this into the script. I am going to do this now. This year we also have a returning ‑‑ oh, no, we did that one. Stephanie Weber UCEDD LEND will serve as the trainee representative on the Board. Stephanie, are you here? We wanted to just give her a round of applause.

(Applause).

Thank you. I think that's all that I left off. I just wanted to summarize some of the activities of this past year. AUCD staff and Board Members engaged in a process guided to change the fabric of who we are by embracing activities that fundamentally will increase the cultural and linguistic nature of our network, and promote inclusion of people, and people that we serve by reaching out to those who are underrepresented and underserved. The process was amazing. It brought us all closer to realizing our own identities through a cultural lens and the belief and vision that cultural Linguistic representation strengthens the sphere of our influence and our support. So thank you for helping us go through this process. We really did have an amazing time. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

As we continue to embrace inclusion and diversity on all levels, we encourage all of you through your centers, programs, and State activities to actively engage in this pursuit. Under the leadership of Amy Hewett and Amy Sharpe, the Board approved two name changes to network council. First was Amy Hewett as Chair, the council for interdisciplinary services is now the council for technology and innovation in interdisciplinary services. This change brings intentionality, moving technology, application in the work that we do and universal design for learning to a place of prominence in the forefront, and is an important acknowledgment of our continued progress as a network. Thank you for making that change.

Second, the national community education director's council, that's changed its name to the community education and dissemination council under the direction of Amy Sharpe. The rationale for the name change is to, number one, remove the word "directors" from the name to illustrate that the council was much more than directors. To include ‑‑ number two, to include the core function of dissemination in the name and mission. And, number three, to make it shorter and easier for you to remember. So see if you can remember it now.

(Laughter).

Community education and dissemination council. So I do think that these changes were important. I think that they are instrumental in helping us move forward this next year and the years to come. Also, in an effort to increase the diversity of the AUCD Board of Directors, the multi‑cultural council under the leadership of Tom recommended to the Board that two members of the multi‑cultural council be included on the Board of Directors. This motion was passed by the Board on Saturday. Congratulations, and thank you, Tom, and others, Dan, Leslie for your continued leadership in this endeavor. Thank you.

(Applause).

As you know, well, by now you've been told several different times during the course of this conference this year was also one that brought change in leadership of AUCD. And as reluctant as we were, a search process ensued. And while the shoes of George cannot be filled, we were fortunate to find another talented leader in Andy who fills shiny new shoes with a compelling vision and future for the AUCD network. Thank you, Andy!

(Applause)

Okay. It now is the time for me to pass the gavel and leadership of the Board to Leslie Cohen. It has been an honor for me to serve as President of AUCD for the past year. The Board Members are engaged in advancing our work in very impressive ways, as all of you are. So, Leslie, you would come on up? We'll switch the gavel. I look forward to working with you!

(Applause)

>> JULIE FODOR: There you go!

(Laughter)

(Gavel pounding).

>> LESLIE COHEN: The reason I wanted this job is I thought that the gavel was cool.

(Laughter).

Well, I want to thank the Board, the staff, and the membership. This is really a great honor. I look forward to leading you in new and exciting directions in the year to come. I'm very pleased that my first act as President of the Board of Directors is to thank Julie for her service.

(Applause)

Julie has been an inspired and an engaged leader at the network. I think when she took this job she didn't realize that it would be such a transition year, but she managed our search for a new director, and the transition process with grace and good humor. And on behalf of the network, I want to give you a big thanks.

Well, so it's now my pleasure to give out prizes! This will be like the most funny have as Board President for the whole year. The first prizes we're going to give are for the poster session. And we have, I believe, it's we have prizes that the recipient with pick. It's a $25 gift certificate to either iTunes or Starbucks. I want to tell you that our first poster winner identified as most creative is poster number 15, navigating EHDI through the Marshall Islands.

(Applause).

So are either of them here? No? Is anyone here from ‑‑ oh, oh, okay. Great! Come on up!

(Applause)

The second poster winner is the poster identified as the most appealing, and that is poster 67, disability in society, a course to equip interdisciplinary students to embrace disability as diversity by Jo Lynn Webster and Paula Burkhardt.

(Applause).

>> LESLIE COHEN: And the last award goes to the poster identified as the most informative, and that is poster number 1, bridging the gap, collaboration between disability and spiritual education programs by Tanya Waley, Eric Moody, Kristin Kaiser, and Corey Robinson.

(Applause).

>> LESLIE COHEN: All right! Well, I want everybody to give a big hand for all of the posters. We had a fabulous poster session!

(Applause)

And I know it's one of the highlights of the conference for every one to get to see the breadth and the depth of the great work in our organization. So we now have, and I hope that all of you picked up your raffle tickets last night at the gala, because we have some really fantastic prizes to raffle off. And you have to be here to win. The first prize is the ‑‑ and, you know, I'm assisted here by my trusty assistant Crystal Pariseau, and our first prize is a FitBit Force. So I had to practice saying that. A FitBit Force. As you all know this will track your activity so that you can see how many times you've walked to the coffee machine and ‑‑

(Laughter).

‑‑ and your calories, too. How many calories that you burn up in an anxiety‑producing meeting.

(Laughter).

So, all right, the first number is 3‑0‑3‑6‑7‑4. Next number? Okay. 3‑0‑3‑6‑3‑4! Joanie!

(Applause)

Joanie the triathlete is getting the FitBit? I don't know. I don't know!

(Laughter)

I swear to you that I did not, you know, plan this. All right. The next prize is the speakers that are wireless speakers. It's very cool. You can have tunes in your office. And the first number is 3‑0‑3‑7‑3‑5. Oh! Oh! Who? Right there! Wow! Steve Brown! Great! Congratulations!

(Applause)

I realize I was remiss. We also have a prize for filling out the poster passport. You may have seen that in your program. You know, to show that you had seen all of the posters. And that went to Kenneth Tature. Is Kenneth here? Great!

(Applause)

Good!

>> LESLIE COHEN: Congratulations, Ken!

All right. Our next prize is a Samsung Galaxy note 10.1. So this is a really, really nice prize. And the number is 3‑0‑3‑7‑5‑6. All right. Going once? Going twice?

All right. 3‑0‑3‑9‑2‑4. No?

All right. 3‑0‑3‑7‑2‑5. Oh! Wow!

(Applause)

All right. All right! And last but not least is an iPad® Air. I know. I know. I had to take myself out of the running, but I really wanted this one. I'm ready! All right. 3‑0‑3‑6‑1‑4.

Oh!

(Applause)

>> LESLIE COHEN: So there you have it. The end of our business meeting. And we thank you all for coming this early in the morning. We want you to stick around, because in a few minutes our fabulous closing plenary will start. And I believe just, you know, it will start in about five minutes. So, you know, please just if you are going to get more coffee, do it quickly, and we'll all be back here. Thank you!

(Break).

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Good morning, everybody! If folks could take their seats, we're going to get started in a couple of minutes.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Good morning, everybody. My name is Andy Imparato, and I am new as executive director for AUCD. I am delighted to have met so many people in the last several days during this conference. I am really excited about this closing panel, which I think is very in sync with the theme of the conference. So the title for the panel is Federal Initiatives to Promote Diversity, Reduce Discrimination, and Address Disparities. I think that we have a compelling panel, and I am so happy everybody that was able to be with us. I am going to introduce our panelists. They're each going to speak, starting with Commissioner Feldblum, and then Mrs. Shiu. And we have Jim Langevin from Rhode Island, so Congressman Langevin we expect to get here around 10:00. When he gets here, I guess our now Past‑Past‑Chair Tony Antosh will introduce him. We will have him speak briefly, and then he will need to leave. He will need to get back to the Hill. And then we'll pick the panel where we left off. But I am delighted that we have so many people here for this. And I know that this is going to be a real treat to hear what our panelists have to say. So without further ado, I want to introduce our panelists. We have Chai Feldblum, Vincent Campbell, Rebecca Bond, and Patricia Shiu. They're going to talk about federal initiatives that are related to reducing discrimination and health disparities and increasing civil rights and equalities for people with disabilities and those from other diverse populations. Commissioner Chai Feldblum is one of five Commissioners at the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. She played a leading role in helping to draft and negotiation the Americans With Disabilities Act of 1990, and at the time she was working for the ACLU Washington office. She was also instrumental in drafting and negotiating the ADA Amendments Act of 2008 in her role at Georgetown working closely with the Epilepsy Foundation, the American Association of People with Disabilities, and lots of other coalition partners. Commissioner Feldblum has also been a professor of law at Georgetown where she represented clients such as the national disability rights network through the law center's federal legislation and administrative clinic which she founded. So please join me in welcoming Commissioner Chai Feldblum.

(Applause).

To Chai's left and your right is Vincent Campbell who is a senior health scientist with the National Center on Birth Defects and Developmental Disabilities at the Centers For Disease Control and Prevention, or the CDC. He serves as the CDC associate director for disability inclusion and public health. In addition to positions at the CDC, he has served as a science advisor to a number of disability and health state projects and research grants. He has published several papers and spoken at numerous national conferences on health surveillance and comparative health status of people with disabilities with a particular focus on health issues of people with intellectual disabilities. And let's welcome Vincent.

(Applause).

To Vincent's left is Rebecca Bond who is eight months into her job as chief of the Disability Rights Section in the Civil Rights' Division at the United States Department of Justice where she oversees the section's interpretation, technical assistance, and enforcement of the Americans With Disabilities Act. Rebecca and I can relate to each other because we both are replacing people that are hard to replace. She came after I don't even know how many years of John Wodatch being the founding director of the Disability Rights Section. And I know that John is working hard on the U.N. Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities. Rebecca served as a trial attorney and deputy chief in the Civil Rights' Division housing and civil enforcement section, taking on Fair Housing, sexual harassment, race discrimination, and disability cases. She also handled cases under the Americans With Disabilities Act, religious land use, and Institutionalized Persons Act, and Title II of the Civil Rights' Act of 1964. Welcome, Rebecca!

(Applause)

And last but not least we have our honoree from last night. Patricia Shiu is the director of the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs at the U.S. Department of Labor. There she is dedicated to protecting workers, promoting diversity, and enforcing the law. Prior to joining the Obama Administration, Director Shiu spent 26 years at the legal aide society employment law center in San Francisco where her cases focused on issues such as disability, gender, race, sexual orientation, national origin, and immigration. Dr. Shiu also received a AUCD Special Recognition Award last night for her work in creating enforcement standards for Section 503 of the Rehabilitation Act. And I know that Commissioner Feldblum was also involved and supportive of that effort. That requires federal contractors to take affirmative steps to recruit, retain, and advance qualified workers with disabilities within their companies. So please join me in welcoming back!

(Applause)

So before we start with Commissioner Chai Feldblum, I just want to point out that it's interesting. We have a lot of representation on this panel from people who have come as the topic of civil rights and disability with a broad lens. Many of the folks on the panel have worked in civil rights' enforcement, and are working in rights' enforcement, not just for people with disabilities, bus for all of the classes under the Federal Civil Rights' Laws. So I think that they have a unique perspective on how civil rights for people with disabilities who are also members of other protected classes can play out in an enforcement context. And I think as we think about the theme for our conference, promoting inclusion in an increasingly diverse world, I think we have a lot to learn from our panelists about how to be a champion for people with disabilities, and for people from other diverse groups at the same time, and looking at those intersection issues. So Commissioner Chai Feldblum, welcome, and we look forward to your remarks.

(Applause).

>> CHAI FELDBLUM: Good morning! I actually was going to sit, but then I realized that you guys were not going to see me at all if I sat. So as an accommodation, I'm standing.

(Laughter)

Okay. I want to talk about just work. Just work. So one of my icons, actually in the disability rights movement is someone named Bob Williams who I worked with when I was working on the ADA 23 years ago. Bob often quotes FDR's 1944 State‑of‑the‑Union speech, also called the Economic Bill of Rights speech, where FDR said, "True individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence. True individual freedom cannot exist without economic security and independence."

If people don't have that, if they don't have economic independence, they can't really be free. That's the reality. So the way that one achieves economic security and independence in this country is by having a job. Have a job. So another way of saying that is that all people need jobs, including people with disabilities. So the question is: How do we get from here to there? I mean, we live in this sort of patchwork nation right now, I think, with regard to people with disabilities. You can be a 25‑year‑old man or woman now with cerebral palsy, or using a wheelchair, or deaf, blind, bipolar disorder, and you could have grown up with parents who always assumed that you should, you know, you will be working just like everyone else. You've gone through school, you've gotten accommodations through school, you were held to the same standards as your other students, but you got accommodations. You feel part of the disability community. I mean, that 25‑year‑old exists today. There are expectations of, "Of course I'm going to work!" And you could be a 25‑year‑old kid, man or woman today, again, growing up anywhere in this country, and you could have had parents who were told by professionals from the time that you were young, "No, don't expect too much. You don't have to worry about disappointment. Maybe you didn't get the accommodations."

If you have a disability that's hidden now, you might be hiding that I mean, that 25‑year‑old exists today. So we live in this patchwork nation. We have begun to change expectations about the fact that people with disabilities should work, but we haven't changed it enough, and we haven't changed the demand for people with disabilities. I think we're increasing the supply now because we are educating young people with disabilities to assume that they're going to have jobs and integrated, competitive employment, but we have to make sure that the demand exists there as well. So how do we get from here to there? So I want to endorse Andy's commendation of Pat Shiu and the Department of Labor for their Section 503 regulations, and using finally the affirmative action lever of the law with regard to government contractors, and that effort helped inspire the effort that the EEOC is going to be doing in the next year or so in terms of developing Section 501 regulations. We have a lot of guidances, and various other things about Section 501 which requires affirmative action on the part of the Federal Government, but regulations have always just been one paragraph that says that the Federal Government shall be a model employer. Thank you for sharing.

(Laughter)

So we want to add a little, you know, meat to those bones, or whatever the analogy for the vegetarians in the room should be.

(Laughter).

Okay. So how do we get from here to there? So there are really two parts of this strategy. And I think that you can see this strategy on the part of EEOC in something that was published in the Federal Register on Friday, September 13th, 2013, which is now final. This is the new applicant flow form that every federal agency will have to use. The federal agencies, for years have, collected demographic data on race and gender, right? How many people race for the Federal Government, and then we collect data when people come on to the workforce also in terms of race and gender. So you can see what are we getting in terms of recruitment? What are we doing in terms of hiring? On disability for years the Federal Government collected data on disability when someone entered the workforce. So as part of their HR package that they got, they also got something called a Standard Form 256 that was developed by a combination of Office of Personnel Management and EEOC, and they could check off whether they had a disability. And the form was in two columns. There was one called Targeted Disability, and it had a whole list of disabilities. And then another column was Reportable Disabilities, and a whole list of medical conditions. But there was no equivalent form for applicants. How many were we getting in, in terms of recruiting? So now for the first time we have an applicant flow form that includes disability. And the way that we're collecting this data, I think, also reflects the two‑pronged approach that the EEOC is taking to increase the ability for people with disabilities to just work. So the first prong is to make it clear to folks how broad the definition of "disability" is under the Americans With Disabilities Act as now amended in 2008. Because what happened under the original ADA, lots of judges just assumed that being disabled meant that you could work. You know, they were always dealing with disability benefit cases. I mean, there was one case where a guy had a heart attack. He came back to work. He was a salesperson. Suddenly he wasn't being given the good sales routes, getting less work, and then finally fired. He bring as lawsuit under the ADA, and the judge said you are not disabled. You I had a heart attack and I am not disabled. So it's that idea that disabled must mean you that can't work. Even though you are trying to bring a case under the ADA in order to work. But, you know, a lot of people who have heart attacks don't necessarily think of themselves as people with disabilities. A lot of people with arthritis or, you know, chronic respiratory diseases don't think about themselves as people with disabilities. Once they end up being discriminated against on that basis, and if they're lucky enough to go to a lawyer who knows the law, then they can be told, yeah, you've got some rights under this law. And this is especially important for people with low incomes who often do not get job‑protected time off from work. So if they have cancer, or, for example, on this list, on the applicant flow form, we allowed people to check off as a final box, and I will get to the other ones in a second, "other disability or serious health conditions, for example, diabetes, cancer, cardiovascular disease, anxiety disorder, HIV infection," and if they checked that box, then they're brought to the next screen that either let's them say ‑‑ and we ask, "You indicated that you have a serious health condition, if you are willing, please select any of the conditions that apply to you."

The first box they can check is I do not wish to specify condition. Which they don't need to. We just want to know how many people of these serious health conditions plus disabilities are applying. But if they want to they can click off cancer, cardiovascular disease, depression, anxiety disorder, right? Which in a way is an educational process for folks to see the things that are disabilities. And that if they need an accommodation while they're on the job, they have a right to it subject, of course, to the undue hardship limitation of the law. So, for example, when I go in and I apply for a job, there are a number of things that people don't know about me until I come out and say it. You don't know that I have anxiety disorder that's medicated until I tell you that you don't know that I am a lesbian until I tell you that. However, once I get on the job, especially if you are in a low‑income job that doesn't have protected time off, and then I need to go to my psychiatrist to get my medication, I've never had a problem in 25 years going to my psychiatrist because I've always been in middle‑class jobs that give me paid time off. But for someone who is low income and doesn't have that, this is key protection that can keep them protected and in the workforce. So prong number one from the EEOC is enforcing Title I of the ADA, prohibiting employment discrimination on the basis of disability in this broad coverage. There's another type of discrimination ‑‑ and here, one of the other pluses is to have people understand that there is no "us" and "them."

It's those people with disabilities, and then it's the rest of us that have medical conditions. All right? We're all in this spectrum. But if I'm coming to a job, and I am deaf, or I'm blind, or I'm using a wheelchair, or I have cerebral palsy, or if I have Autism Spectrum Disorder, I mean, any number of things that are more manifest, I then face a whole other level of discrimination in the interview stage. So in the applicant flow form, we ask specifically, "Are you deaf? Are you blind? Are you missing an arm, leg, hand, or foot? Do you have paralysis? Do you have significant disfigurement? Significant mobility impairment? Developmental disability? TBI? Dwarfism?" A whole bunch of things that would be manifest. We also ask if you have significant psychiatric disorder like bipolar or schizophrenia, or ‑‑ yeah, things that would not ‑‑ oh, epilepsy, which would not be manifest, but potentially could be more problematic in the interviews. So that we get a sense of whether these folks, how are they coming in, in terms of applicants? And in our Section 501 regulation with regard to the Federal Government engaging in affirmative action for people with disabilities, again, this group will be our target back to just the basic thing of just work. The best way to increase the demand for the supply that we're hopefully sending out into the workforce is for people in the workforce to work with people with disabilities. I will tell you, and I will close with this. If you are a manager, and you've got three people in front of you, and one of them, you know, happens to be deaf using a sign language interpreter, and there is no cost to you in hiring one of the other two people, both of whom might have disabilities, but you don't know, a lot of managers will end up thinking that there is too much trouble for the person who is deaf, or use as wheelchair, or whatever, and we have to change the calculus for that managing ‑‑ for that manager hirer person. So that's the goal for the EEOC. Thank you so much. I cannot wait to hear everyone else on this panel. You have an awesome panel! Thank you!

(Applause)

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Thank you, Commissioner Feldblum. I want to point out that Chai has with her assistant today, and the other Feldblum‑istas in the audience. But Anupa was recognized by the White House with a White House Champion of Change Award. So come on up!

(Applause)

I know that Chai is a tough act to follow. You are welcome to speak from there.

>> I will remain seated. It's easier for me to stand for five or 10 minutes. I am Vince Campbell, and actually the original invitee of this session who is the director of diversity at the CDC, and my job at the CDC is to try to get every other program at CDC to try to reach out and accommodate people with disabilities in their public health surveillance and prevention programs. When I am saying "prevention," 95% at least of the budget of the CDC is directed toward the prevention of mortality, disability, and poor health. We don't run from the word "prevention."

What we try to do is say people with disabilities constitute a risk pool for other things happening to them. So Dr. Labird is actually conducting a health equity forum at the CDC today, and it addresses among other things disability, as you can see at the bottom, I think there is a name in red, Dr. Mike Fox was a speaker here yesterday. He is representing disability in the CDC Health Equity Forum. So the guiding principle of the office of minority health is the future health of the nation will be determined to large extent by how effectively we work with communities to eliminate health disparities among those populations experiencing a disproportion burden of disease, disability, and health. Disability in that people with disabilities can experience additional impairments, and so if you have diabetes and lose a limb, you are also subject to losing your vision or having kidney damage. What we want to do is to make sure that the programs at the CDC that address diabetes, address people with disabilities and are accessible to them, and the messages are accessible. So I want to give a little background in public health. Oftentimes I find out that disability organizations and entities and people who work with people with disabilities don't understand what public health is about, and that public health certainly doesn't understand what people with disabilities are about. So in public health we deal with the health of populations in general. Our director, Tom Frieden, conceptualized a public health model that's a pyramid. It has five levels. Each level affects a larger portion of the population. What we try to do is address to the extent possible the largest segments of the population that we can. So at the top we have counseling and education, small group work, training people. Second level are clinical interventions. Again, working with individuals in small groups. Third level is long lasting protection interventions, and that would be like immunizations. At the fourth level is changing the context to make individuals default options healthy. What that means is to raise taxes on cigarettes and so on and so forth, to divert people away from those behaviors. And then the bottom level we're dealing with socioeconomic factors. We know that poverty, low education, unemployment all affect health. People with disabilities experience those conditions much more than do people without disabilities. So how does the CDC address health disparities? 2011 there was the CDC health disparities and inequality report that was issued. It had 33 social and health indicators in 22 chapters. I'm not going to go into this in great detail. But in 17 of those health indicators, disability was characterized, yes, no, disability, and then the outcome for people with disabilities on those health indicators. In many of them, people with disabilities had a poorer profile than people without disabilities. In some, such as health insurance coverage, they came out at parody or better. The bad thing is that there was no characterization of the definition used for "disability," or they were all over the place. So there was no consistent definition of disability. It was up to the investigator, and they didn't tell us how they did it. We're missing in some indicators completely. We're not in deaf records. We're not in hospital admission. We're not in hospital discharge. We don't know what happens to functional disabilities while they're in a hospital. This report will be ‑‑ there will be a companion document that will come out that says what the CDC is doing to address these disparities that are identified in that. That report is now in clearance. It should be coming out. There will be another one of these reports coming out within the next several months we hope. People with disabilities, the Office of Minority Health and Health Equity is concerned with race and ethnicity, but it also is concerned with other demographic groups. The Affordable Care Act mandated data collection and reporting on four categories, race, ethnicity, sex, primary language, and disability status the first time. That was operationalized by health ‑‑ Department of Health and Human Services by the use of six questions to be used in all population health surveys. They come off of the survey done by the Bureau of Census. Other groups HMC are concerned with are socioeconomic disadvantaged group. Those affected by isolation, and people with other than traditional sexual identities. Just a little bit of data from the CDC. I have to have numbers. So what we have here is that we can did a report in 2008 in the mortality and morbidity weekly report. And this is simply the prevalence of disability by race and ethnicity. You can see that disability is not randomly distributed in the population. The populations that are disproportionately represented high remember African‑Americans, and American Indians, and Native Americans. This next slide ‑‑ and there was overall 19‑20% prevalence of disabilities in the behavioral risk factor system this is adults 18 and older. This is the same slide, but below the bar, that's the proportion of people who have a disability who report their health to be fair or poor. And the groups here you can see are African‑Americans, Hispanics, and American Indians, native Alaskans, where you have a high prevalence of disabilities, but you also have a huge proportion of those folks indicating their health to be fair or poor. Now, this slide here is not definitive. It's self‑reported health status. Data collected over a phone. It is rather suggestive that additional work is needed to be done to identify the factors that are driving the poor health in these populations. So what are we doing? So the first two are basically what my job is. It's to collaborate and work across the agency to try to get other programs to understand the issues related to disability, their programs may not be accessible. Their messages may not be understandable. People may not be able to get into preventative services. And those sorts of things. So we're working to improve the health and the quality of life people with disabilities through mainstream public health surveillance, health promotion, prevention, and protection activities. The objectives that we've got are to improve the health surveillance of people with disabilities. If public health does not see a population in the data, that population doesn't exist. And so it's key that we be able to get disability indicators in public health, surveys. It's also key that we start working to get disability indicators in some other key data systems that are foundation of public health. We want to move disability from being an outcome only that's prevented to being viewed as a determinant of health. If you have a disability, it contributes to the likelihood that you are going to have another condition. So what we want to do is we want to get programs to include disability in the prediction side of the equation, and not just in the predicted side of the equation. We want to work to improve the participation of people with disabilities in CDC‑conducted or supported non‑research program activities. So I think that I mentioned a little further in here that we've got several programs, there is a public health emergency response grant program that goes out to 63 states, localities, territories. It's $580 million a year. We've got a Community transformation grant that's $104 million. We need to get people with disabilities in the planning of these activities, and we need them involved in the drills, and we need to get them services under these programs and not just recipients of disability‑targeted services. We need to improve our communications so that they are understandable by people who have vision problems, hearing impairments, cognitive problems, so on and so forth. There are plenty of policy and legislative supports for inclusion. I think in my humble opinion what we have is an enforcement and awareness problem. As I said the other day, we have Section 504 of the Rehab Act on the books for 40 years, but States and localities do not work to make their programs necessarily inclusive of people with disabilities in their public health programs. So tactical objectives is include disability in our surveillance programs. To have the data reported, stratified by disability status for other health outcomes, to include disability predictors, and we hope to have non‑research activities accessible. So where do we want to be in public health? We want to be routinely included as a risk population and large community‑based public initiatives, community education grants, communities putting prevention to work, public health emergency preparedness and cooperative agreements, and we want to be recognized as a part of the public in public health. Thank you.

(Applause).

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Thank you, Vince. Kim, are we good for going on? Should we pause for Congressman Langevin? Go on. Okay!

So our next speaker is Rebecca Bond, the chief of the Disability Rights Section at the U.S. Department of Justice. I do want to point out that Rebecca was hired by the assistant Attorney General for civil rights Tom Perez who I would argue was the most committed and effective Assistant Attorney General for civil rights that we have had.

(Applause)

And we're excited to see what he is going to do, and what he has already done including finalizing the rule for Section 503 at the U.S. Department of Labor. So Rebecca, welcome!

>> REBECCA BOND: Thank you so much. And thank you so much to Andy and to Kim for inviting me to come and talk with you. So I have been in this position for about eight months, as Andy said, and it's given me a great opportunity to work with different organizations, to work with some of our federal partners. I have already had the opportunity to work a little bit with Pat, and I am looking forward to working with Vince. As I look around the audience, I see a smattering of familiar faces, and I really hope that as time pass I have the opportunity to talk with more of you and to get to know more of you and about the work that you are doing. I wanted to take a couple of moments to introduce myself, and to explain you to why I was interested in joining you in this field working for the Rights of People with Disabilities. When I was 7 years old, my younger brother Jonathan was born. I think like so many big sisters I really thought that he was my baby. And after about two years it became quite clear that he had a very significant intellectual disability. Growing up with Jonathan I learned a lot of things. But one of the most important lessons was what he wanted out of life was really what we all want out of life. He wants to make connections. He want talk, but he wants to sit down and make a connection with you. He wants to run errands. He loves his favorite TV shows. He loves helping to make dinners. And that I really believe is one of the fundamental purposes of the ADA, one of the greatest things about the ADA, is that for even people who are as severely disabled as my brother is, the goal is to have full participation, to have folks like those be fully participating in society. And really, my experience with my brother informed my academic interests. I was a psychology major in school focusing on Autism. I worked with kids with intellectual disabilities. And then I came to the Department of Justice. And to the Housing and Civil Enforcement section. In that capacity, I was there for 13 years, and I got to try cases, I got to work on all sorts of different types of investigations. What I found over time listening to the stories of people who had been discriminated against on a number of bases, you know, race, sex, the house of worship that they attend and disability, and the harm to each of those people with ‑‑ was remarkably similar. All discrimination. All marginalization based on one trait alone is tremendously harmful. I have seen the harm, and I have seen the pain that people have experienced, having experienced all different types of discrimination. And so now as the chief of the Disability Rights Section I have the opportunity to focus on the rights of people with disabilities, and to build on the extremely strong foundation laid by John Wodatch. And I am glad that you mentioned him earlier. I am also fortunate to have a remarkably talented staff. One of the things that I did when I first started in this section was I posed the question to my staff: What do we want the world to look like? I think that the ADA gives us some guidance on that. The Act specifically states, and I am going to quote it, "The nation's proper goals regarding individuals with disabilities are to ensure equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self‑sufficiency for such individuals."

At the Department of Justice, we have a number of tools to make that vision a reality. We can, of course, bring enforcement actions, and I will talk you to about a couple of those in a moment. We're able to receive complaints and process complaints both systemic ‑‑ regarding systemic discrimination, but also individual complaints of, you know, some of the indignities that people face in daily lives. We are also able to do regulatory work. Through our regulatory work, we're able to develop the law. You may be somewhat aware of our rulemaking agenda. In the regulatory arena we're working on movie captioning, web accessibility, medical equipment ‑‑

(Applause).

(Laughter)

‑‑ and regulations implementing Title II and Title III of the ADA Amendments Act. Our regulatory team also engages in coordination. We also have a technical assistance unit, and a technical assistance mandate under the statute. Through our website, ADA.GOV, we're able to communicate what the law requires both of covered entities and ensures for people with disabilities. Now, how many people in this room have been to our website, www.ada.gov? Okay, pretty good, pretty good. If you have not been there yet, you should go. One of the recent statistics that I had ‑‑ and I am quite proud of this ‑‑ is the fact that while many of us in the federal workforce were spending some time cleaning out our closets and learning new hobbies during the shutdown, our website was up and running, and we received over half a million hits to our website just during the time of the shutdown alone. That was very heartening. So we have a number of priority areas, certainly more than I have time to discuss here today. I'm not sure how much time I have left. But certainly one of the things, and I think that I have strong suspicious ‑‑ three minutes, oh, golly! I think that one of the things that Andy will agree with me about is that one of the things that is most fundamental to the future of disability rights is technology. And we're really at a critical point for people with disabilities in technology. The pace of technological change is absolutely staggering. Advancing technology can open doors for many people with disabilities, and can provide the means for them to move closer to the goal of full, equal, and truly integrated access to American life. But cutting‑edge technological advances can leave people with disabilities behind. Especially if those entities that develop, manufacture, and offer technology do not make their products and services accessible on the front end. An enforcement of these laws by the Department of Justice has resulted in public entities, public accommodations, and some technology developers and manufacturers taking new approaches to technology accessibility. And I wanted to tell but a case that we ‑‑ a matter that we settled in July of this year. In July, we announced a settlement agreement with Louisiana Tech University. That was addressing the use of inaccessible technology in a University setting. The settlement resolved claims that the University violated the ADA by using a online learning product that was allegedly inaccessible to a blind student. The student was unable to access the online course content materials and homework for nearly a month into his first University quarter, at which point he was so far behind that he ended up withdrawing from the course. Under the settlement agreement, the University will adopt a number of accessibility policies, including requirements used technology, web pages, and course content that are accessible and measured by the web content accessibility guidelines which we call WCAG.

(Laughter)

I know, not necessarily the greatest acronym, but it works. So WCAG 2.0 Level AA standard. The university will create web pages and materials created since 2010 accessible. The division was able to secure over $23,000 in damages for the student. I would now like to talk to you a little bit, and I know that I don't have that much time, about some of the most transformative work that we do, our Olmstead work. Working to end our unnecessary ‑‑ our history of unnecessarily segregating people with disabilities in institutions has been and will continue to be a major enforcement priority for the section, and for the division. 23 years after the ADA, the State of Rhode Island and the City of Providence had a system that left people with disabilities no choice but to be separated from society in sheltered workshop at training placement, that we call TTP, and the vocational program at Mount Pleasant High School. So what does it mean to have no choice? Let me give you a example. Mr. Porcelli worked at a real job after school at hardware job. But could not escape the sheltered work setting where he got paid $2 an hour for work he didn't like. Because the state only offered services for places like TTP. He could not return to integrated employment, even though he asked to leave over and over. TTP and the State made no effort to help Mr. Porcelli find a job that matched his strengths and interests. TTP had no incentive to do so. The company was a licensed provider of employment services. It got paid to have Mr. Porcelli there. It also got paid by outside businesses for his work. Meanwhile, TTP report paying its workers with disabilities an average hourly wage of $1.57 per hour, with one individual making as little as 14‑cents an hour. As a result of its profits and the State support, the TTP became one of the largest segregated employment providers in the state for individuals with IDD. Stories like Mr. Porcelli's played out in decades for many area high schoolers with disabilities. That's because the vocational program was essentially a feeder for TTP, a direct pipeline. So we are happy ‑‑ I realize I got the please wrap up sign. So I will jump ahead a little bit. So we ended up bringing this case, and it actually ‑‑ we were alerted to the case by our partners in Department of Labor, their Wage and Hour Division. And we're happy to acknowledge that as a result of our settlement at this time Rhode Island has stopped providing services or funding for new participants at TTP sheltered workshop in the city of Providence has stopped providing services or funding to the in‑school sheltered workshop. And as also part of the agreement, the State will help every person at TTP find, get, keep, and succeed in real wage jobs. They will accomplish that by supporting ‑‑

(Applause).

Steven Porcelli is especially excited be now having the chance to achieve his 30‑year goal of returning to work in the community. He will have, "the opportunity to be with different people, to talk to different people, and to feel independent."

When asked what it would mean for him to work in supported employment, he respond, "It makes me feel good. It's something that I wanted to achieve for a long time. I just never thought things would change."

We believe under that agreement that things will change for the better. And as I wrap up, I turn the question to you: What do we want the world to look like? So many of the challenges that I have talked about here today you have heard about at this conference have been around for generations, and I know that many of you who are here have been working tirelessly for decades to advance the Rights of People with Disabilities. We still have a ways to go. But we are, indeed, making progress. And if we all stand together, the Department of Justice, the advocacy community, individuals with and without disabilities, service providers, and public officials, we can make this happen.

(Applause).

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Now after hearing about some of the not so good things going on in Rhode Island, we have a chance to hear from the folks that are making Rhode Island a better place, starting with Tony Antosh our Past‑ Past‑Chair. Please welcome Tony.

(Applause)

>> TONY ANTOSH: Good morning, everyone! It's my privilege to introduce Jim Langevin who represents the second Rhode Island district. The Congressman started his career in the Rhode Island House of Representatives in 1989 where he served for six years with my good friend and colleague Paul Sherlock whom my center is named after, then became the Rhode Island Secretary of State from 1995 to 2001. He has represented the second Rhode Island district now for 13 years since January of 2001. He currently serves on the House Service Committee, the House Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence. From our standpoint he is the co‑chair of the bipartisan congressional disabilities caucus. As many of you know, he has been the author of several Dear Colleague letters that have supported continued funding and funding increases for both UCEDDs and LENDs. In 2003, the Congressman was awarded the international Henry Viscardi award, which is an international recognition of people with disabilities who have been in significant leadership roles, and have had an impact upon the perception of the disability worldwide. Now, of all of the things that the Congressman has done, though, his greatest accomplishment is that he is an alumnus of Rhode Island College, which, of course, as many of you know is the best college in the country. The oldest public institution of higher ed in the state founded in 1856. A couple of weeks ago, some of the senior faculty, is that the word to use, otherwise known as the old guys were having a conversation about something. The Congressman's name came up. Dr. Victor Perfucci who was the Congressman's mentor at some level in his undergraduate days sort of looked at me and said that "Jimmy was always a smart guy."

So I am pleased to introduce to you always a smart guy, always an advocate for the things that we believe in, good friend of the network, and my Congressman. I live in his district. I vote for him each time in the election. Jim Langevin.

(Applause).

>> JIM LANGEVIN: Well, Tony, thank you very, very much. That's a true Rhode Islander. As a former Secretary of State I know a little bit about that. So I just want to thank Tony for the very, very, very kind introduction, and the award that he mentioned Tony had a little something to do with in nominating me. So I am grateful for that, and great leadership on so many other disability‑related issues. I am from Rhode Island. It was a great place to go to school. It wasn't my school of choice. The school I hoped to go to was Providence College. And I only applied to two colleges. And I got accepted to both, and I was all set to go to PC, until I went to tour the campus. And this was about 10 years before the passage of the Americans With Disabilities Act. And I was heartbroken when I found that after touring it was really not ready for me. But was thrilled when I went to Rhode Island College and they were light years ahead, and it made all of the difference in the world. Since that time, the passage of the ADA, I have been back to lecture many times at PC, and how the world has changed for every disability. But Tony has been on the frontlines in so many ways, and I am grateful for his leadership, and also the leadership of the people here on the panel, and Commissioner Feldblum, and Secretary Shiu among others here on the panel. I thank them for their leadership, the great work that they're doing, and the work that you are doing to open up doors for all people with disabilities. So I want to begin by just thanking the entire leadership team for putting this conference together at AUCD, and for inviting me to join you for just a few minutes to speak, and to say a few words. I want to recognize Julie Fodor, as well as Andy Imparato. Andy, and I, we have worked together for many years now on disability‑related issues. And I also want to recognize and thank from the great State of Rhode Island Tony Antosh. I hope you that will give them a round of applause for the work that they're doing.

(Applause).

I should say that as director of Rhode Island College, and past President of AUCD, Tony in particular has been a driving force for people with intellectual disabilities, and he does direct a center that was named after one of the biggest mentors in my life, State Representative Paul Sherlock who was the champion for people with disabilities not only in Rhode Island, but around the country. He was one of the chief architects of and leaders in the effort to de‑institutionalize how we treated people with disabilities, and transition over to our community‑based settings for people with developmental disabilities in particular. And as a son who had Down Syndrome, it was just, again, just a passionate thing for people with disabilities. I am grateful for his friendship. I am glad that he is carrying on the legacy. I know that you have heard from a great many speakers, and this great panel here today. I won't take up too much of your time. But just a few words. I want to begin by thanking each and everyone of you for attending the conference, and the work that you do day in and day out for the development of people with disabilities. It's through your collective vision, your collaboration, and your tremendous work at the state and federal levels that I know that we'll realize the future in which all Americans, regardless of their ability or disability are fully integrated, empowered, and are participating members of society. Now, as founder and co‑chair of the bipartisan disabilities caucus, I work on a regular basis to try to educate my congressional colleagues on the impact of our policy decisions on people with disabilities, as well as to raise awareness on the legislative priorities of the disability community. So I would be remiss, of course, if I didn't mention that October 31st marked the 50th anniversary of the development of disability assistance, and Bill of Rights Act which was signed into law by President John F. Kennedy back in 1963. And I don't have to tell you how much of a groundbreaking achievement this truly was, and its evolution, of course, laid the foundation later on for the University Centers of Excellence in developmental disabilities. And what great contributions these centers have made. Therefore, as a member of Congress living with a disability, co‑chair of the bipartisan disability community, and proud representative of the work being done at the Sherlock Center, I am very pleased to partner with AUCD in leading the charge over the past several years to promote the strongest possible funding for our UCEDDs and LENDs across the country. It's the right thing to do.

(Applause).

I don't have to tell you all that these centers have served as an integral resource in supporting inclusive education, early intervention strategies, care transition, service delivery, and critical research all in support of self‑determination and independence. And obviously it has not been easy, especially in these very, very difficult budgetary climates that we find ourselves in, I know that it's a struggle everyday in that struggle and in that fight with you, I promise you. However, I am going to continue to fight to make sure that you have the necessary resources to continue your work on behalf of individuals and families living with intellectual and developmental disabilities everywhere. Of course, obviously there is still so much to be accomplished on the policy front to address lingering disparities, and promote diversity in our communities. Our fight is not over. Congress, I believe, can start, and we have to work to reauthorize the Workforce Investment Act that includes provision of a stronger and more responsive version of the Rehab Act to address the needs of people with disabilities. Now, I was extremely disappointed, as I am sure that all of you were, in the House Republican version of the bill. It's not over yet. My hope that they're going to heed the call of so many of community to find a bipartisan agreement with the Senate as we continue to work on this legislation and I will be there every step of the way with you to try to make sure that that happens. We also, and I am sure that you have heard, have a substantial disability rights treaty up for ratification in the Senate.

(Applause).

Just one year ago I was so proud to be on the Senate floor with Senator Bob Dole who has been such a champion on so many issues and we were trying to urge our Senate colleagues over there to ratify the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Unfortunately as we all know, we were unsuccessful last year. But I want to, first of all, thank Secretary Kerry once again publicly for taking up that bill. He now it was going to be a tough fight, and certainly passage was not assured. Although it didn't happen, I thanked him on the Senate floor that day for bringing his leadership on the issue, and so many of our colleagues in a bipartisan effort, including Senator John McCain who was a champion on this as well, and hopefully we'll be successful. And I remain optimistic that we're going to continue to rally our Senate colleagues until we've succeeded in joining 130 other nations that have ratified this treaty which promotes respect and inclusion for all people.

(Applause)

So let's keep it going! Just in closing, let me say that I have long believed, and have long said that people with disabilities are one of our nation's greatest, untapped resources. And by fostering an environment of inclusion and empowerment, I know that we can provide the means for every individual to fulfill his or her God‑given potential as strong, valuable, and valued member of our society. At the end of the day, I believe that it is our ability, and not our disabilities, that define who we are and what we can accomplish. And I know that together we can accomplish anything. Thank you all very much!

(Applause).

Enjoy this great conference!

(Applause)

>> ANDY IMPARATO: So the Congressman is able to take a couple of questions. But before we do that, I just want to acknowledge the legislative director for Congressman Langevin, Todd Adams sitting next to Kim.

(Applause).

Todd knows well that there are not a lot of staffers that spend a lot of time focusing on disabilities, and Todd is one of them. And we're a lonely group. So it's good to have partners. But if folks have a question, we have standing mics, or if you want a mic to be brought to you if you raise your hand we'll bring one to you. Any questions for Congressman Langevin? We'll have plenty of time to ask questions for panel later. So this is just for the Congressman. I think Harold from Kentucky. Oh, no, he is signature.

(Laughter)

Well, I'll ask one if folks are feeling shy. First, I just want to thank you for your bipartisan approach. I know that you work very closely with McMorris‑Rogers, and other champions for our Community in the House. I am wondering from your perspective, where do you see the opportunities in the House given how challenging it is to move legislation, where do you see opportunities where we might be able to make progress in Congress on disability in the House?

>> JIM LANGEVIN: It's my hope that we can focus, especially on our workforce issues. We all want people to contribute their talents in whatever way they choose to do so. And so one of the areas that I focus on, although we hear about so much of the partisan divide, the only way that we're going to turn the situation around, I believe is by dotting, you know, working on an individual basis with people across the aisle on targeted issues that we all have an interest in. For me do I a lot of work in national security and cyber security, and that's always been a bipartisan issue. That's one of the reasons why I enjoy serving on international service communities and service and intelligence committees. But another area that I work with closely is development issues. And especially on trying to close our skill gaps in this country. We have obviously high unemployment rates around the country. And Rhode Island is unfortunately the fourth highest in unemployment in the nation. And that is, again, a niche area. It affects all people, but I think in particular people with disabilities, I see that as an opportunity. With the right skills, and opportunities, people are going to be able to get meaningful, gainful employment. So that's an area where I am going to continue to focus. So it affects the entire population, but in particular it's I believe an opportunity for people with disabilities to go into those areas where there is a growing need for their skills.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Great! Any other last questions? Yes? Shannon?

>> AUDIENCE MEMBER: First of all, thank you for being here with us today. Thank you for your service. I wanted to ask you briefly about the commitment to closing a loophole in the labor law, and finally putting an end to institutionalization of people with disabilities, and that waiver law that is causing for people with disabilities, and recommit, and Congress can finally close that loophole, and we can pay people with disabilities an equal wage as everyone else.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Thank you. So Congressman Langevin, Shannon is from Kentucky, and he is referring to section 14(c) in the fair labor standards act which allows people with disabilities to be paid less than minimum wage if their productive is something that is considered less than typical productive. I am sure that you are aware that there is a bill in the house that groups have been championing.

>> JIM LANGEVIN: Sure. And I am hope with you to see how we can close that gap. It hasn't seen the kind of momentum that many would like to see. It's going to take ongoing education and dialogue, and wherever possible I would like to begin using the bipartisan disability caucus to hold forums on this issue, and to bring experts in to say how we can do it, and also why it's needed. So very open‑minded on strategies of how to do that.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Great. Well, it sounds like you've got a funding success story in Rhode Island. Thanks to the leadership of the Justice Department and others who worked on that case where you have a whole generation of folks that were getting kind of trapped into those settings, and that's not going to happen anymore. So you all have a model that could maybe work for the rest of the country.

>> JIM LANGEVIN: And just on a personal comment, I applaud the intent ‑‑ I am taking away the attitude on how it's implemented. I think that we have to be aware that in many of these settings, you know, this was also a social setting for the folks with developmental disabilities, or disabilities in general when they went to work, and that is going to change. Hopefully it's an outcome for the better, but I think that we need to be on top of this. We need to make sure that it's implemented in a respectful way, the right way, and hopefully at the end of the day it will have the positive outcome and achieve its intent.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Well, again, thank you for your leadership. Thank you for what you do everyday, for AUCD and for the broader Disability Community. I know that you need to get back. But thanks for coming over here today!

(Applause)

>> JIM LANGEVIN: Thank you all!

(Applause)

>> ANDY IMPARATO: So now we're going to get to hear from our honoree from last night, Pat Shiu, the director of the office of federal contract and compliance programs at the U.S. Department of Labor which is a Presidential appointment. Congressman Langevin referred to as Secretary Shiu, and I like the sound of that maybe we can work on that. I also just wanted to acknowledge that I saw Jenny Thornberg coming in earlier. She may be having a side meeting with Bill. Is Jenny in the room? She will come back, but I wanted to acknowledge her leadership. On the U.N. Convention of the rights for people with disabilities. So, Pat, come on up!

>> PAT SHIU: Good morning. It's a pleasure for me to speak wall of you today as you close out your conference. Last night I did have the pleasure and honor of joining many of you at the awards ceremony. I want to thank you again for the very special recognition you that bestowed upon me and my colleagues for our work in improving employment opportunities for people with disabilities. I'm new to AUCD. This is not an organization that I have worked with before, and I really enjoy the opportunity to get to know so many of you. Last night was my first time seeing AUCD in action. In many ways, an award ceremony is really an ideal place to get to know an organization. I think you say a lot about who you are by who you choose to honor. And what I observed last night was a commitment to honoring those who had given years of service to this organization while uplifting young people who are bringing fresh ideas and great heart to this work. I saw an organization that appreciates the work, and the people that work behind the scenes, and understand that those efforts deserve spotlight every now and then. And I saw a commitment to internationalism and pluralism and multiculturalism that is so vital to the success of any community‑building effort. Many of you have acknowledged the work that AUCD needs to do in order to better engage community of color in your work. You are not alone in facing this challenge. I see it with women's groups, LGBT organizations, youth and senior associations, and more. The theme of this conference could easily be the theme of conferences of many organizations. But you made it your thing. And I applaud you for putting this issue front and center. And on a more personal note, let me just say that whether we go to work, whether we go to school, however we engage in society, we bring our whole self. We should be unafraid to bring our whole self in however we engage in society. And that's the focus of your conference. That's why I applaud you. As you move into that future, you will be well served by your incredible new executive director, Andy Imparato. And I want to express my sincere thanks to Andy for his friendship and for his guidance over the past few years. He has been a great champion for our work, and I'm so glad that we're going to continue to work together in his new role. I also want to express my appreciation to the AUCD Board of Directors, and all of the staff members who work so hard to put this conference together. Finally, I want to thank all of you for the work that you are doing in every State and territory of this country. To not only build bridges with the disability communities in your areas, but also to advance critical research of scholarly learning about how to improve the quality of life of the people and families who make up those communities. As a head of a civil rights' agency, I firmly believe that good data is a cornerstone of good public policy. And good public policy is the linchpin of effective enforcement. At the Department of Labor, we look at such quality of life issues through the specific lens of employment and opportunity. In particular, we have been grappling with questions of how to improve employment opportunities for almost 30 million working‑age Americans with disabilities. The question is one that I focused on long before I joined the Obama Administration. And Andy said that I spent nearly 26 years advocating on behalf of individuals with disabilities and their families in cases involving workplace discrimination, access to schools, and the right to reasonable accommodation. And what I took away from those experiences, is that work is about more than a paycheck. It's about dignity and an individual sense of self‑worth and self‑reliance. There is a special joy in waking up everyday looking forward going to work. Knowing that our contributions matter, and that through our daily labors we can sustain ourselves and our families. The Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs is a jewel in the crown of our nation's civil rights' apparatus. Along with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and the Justice Department, we stand on the frontlines of protecting workers from discrimination. Working together with my colleagues, like Chai Feldblum and Rebecca, we're trying to build a unified civil rights' agenda based on collaboration, communication, and cooperation. Our jurisdiction covers the nearly 1/4 of American workers who are employed by or seek jobs with companies that hold federal contracts and sub‑contracts. Collectively that includes about 200,000 business establishments which receive more than $500 billion in taxpayer money every year to provide goods and services and supplies to perform construction work for our government. Being a federal contractor is a privilege. It's not a right. And with that privilege comes a responsibility to safeguard workers from discrimination. Since President Obama took office, OMCPP compliance officers have reviewed 21,000 federal contractor establishments. Collectively they've employed 8.5 million workers. In the past five years, we have obtained almost $60 million in financial remedies for 90,000 workers affected by discrimination. This is pretty much backpay for low‑income workers. And all of the while we seek to make lasting relief to correct bad employment practices, to fix policies, and to create barriers to equal opportunity and to get qualified workers into good jobs. Since 2009, we have negotiated 10,000 potential job offers for workers who were denied their fair shot and employment because of unlawful discrimination. The OMCPP is also one of the last bastions of affirmative action in the Federal Government. Each year we work with thousands of government contractors to ensure that they are meeting their legal obligations to employ and to advance in employment women, minorities, people with disabilities, and protected Veterans. This has been the mandate for OMCPP for nearly half a century. Under both Democratic and Republican administrations, from one Congress to the next, we are tasked with protecting workers, promoting diversity, and enforcing the laws which require equal employment opportunity in the contracting workforce. However, when I arrived at OMCPP in September of 2009, I found an agency that was faltering in its mission. One of the first challenges that I had to confront was a set of sorely outdated regulations that had not been updated in decades. Chief among those outdated regulations were the ones that pertained to Veterans and people with disabilities. In 1973, Congress passed and President Nixon signed the Rehabilitation Act. Section 503 of that law prohibits federal contractors from discriminates on the basis of disability. It also requires employers to take affirmative action to recruit, employ, train, and promote qualified individuals with disabilities in their workforce. For nearly four decades, the framework articulating that requirement and how contractors comply remained unchanged. It was framework based on the idea that employers would simply make good‑faith efforts to comply. In reality it required federal contractors to take processed steps, but without a particular goal in mind. But good‑faith efforts alone did not significantly improve the employment of people with disabilities by federal contractors as Congress intended. And you know, and so I am not going to repeat all of this, but you know that really only one out of three people with disabilities even participate in the workforce. You know the unemployment rate among people with disabilities is twice that of those in the labor force. And so what we are really ‑‑ what we are doing with Section 503 is we are providing real accountability and metrics. There is an aspirational goal of 7% for all contractors, in every job group for those contractors that have 100 or more employees. And that's to make sure that there is no job segregation. And we are working hard with contractors to facilitate their success to ensure that they take measure, identify, and work on the absolutely critical component steps that are necessary to implement in order to successfully attain the goal: Outreach, recruitment, retention, evaluating policies. And that is what we are doing, and that's why I'm so pleased to be here today to share this with all of you. The only other thing that I wanted to mention is that right now at the Office of Management and Budget there is a voluntary self‑identification form that's being evaluated. Your comments would be particularly useful. We want to make sure, because we are asking contractors to ask people who are both applicants as well as new employees, as well as long‑term employees to actually self‑identify. We want to make sure that those forms are readable, are usable. So if you have any input, and if you could take the time to do so, we would really appreciate any comments that you could provide to OMB on that in closing, just let me say that I am very privileged to be part of this conference. I worked on issues with respect to many different bases of discrimination, and I am very happy that when I come here to this conference, I can come as my whole person. Thank you.

(Applause).

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Thank you, Director Shiu. Let's have a round of applause for all of the panelists.

(Applause).

So, again, on the theme of the conference, which is looking at inclusion in an increasingly diverse world, I would like for any of how want to answer this to talk about intersectionality. So, for example, I know that Commissioner Feldblum you have thought a lot about some of the parallels and differences between the LGBT issues and the disability issues, and then obviously there are lots of people including yourself who are in both communities. But I'm wondering from your perspective where are the opportunities ‑‑ and this is a question for all of you ‑‑ where are the opportunities when you take an enforcement approach or ending disparities approach, where are the opportunities to address those intersection issues so that people don't have to only wear one identity? I appreciate what Director Shiu said. You come as your whole self. So when you come to the EEOC, or the Department of Justice, or the CDC, and you are asked why do you think that you experienced discrimination, it's not always clear if you are one of three or four different groups. So anybody who wants to comment on that, kind of how you deal with intersectionality issues in the context of enforcement, or work on disparities.

>> CHAI FELDBLUM: So I actually think that intersectionality is key. How many people have heard about Polly Murray? You can raise your hand if you know that name? So we've got one. I mean, I'm like on a mission to get people to read her autobiography, which is not yet on Kindle. But this was a woman, and it is because of Polly Murray that we have sex in Title 7. I am absolutely convinced. It was put in on the House side by a Congressman who had been pushing for the Equal Rights Amendment for some time, and the classic thing it was put in as a joke in order to kill the bill. But the fact is that it was put in by ‑‑ I mean, there were people who were quite racist and did not like the idea that black men were going to have more rights than white women. They literally said that on the floor. But it was going to be dropped in the Senate. And Polly Murray wrote a memo. She is like the first legislative lawyer ‑‑ well, early legislative lawyer. She said, I am black and I am a woman. I get discriminated on both grounds. And you don't know which ground it is. If you don't include sex, half of people of, you know, African‑Americans are not going to be protected. So I think that what she said then is so true now as well. And people sometimes don't know that discrimination they face might actually be because they are Hispanic and a woman. There may be Hispanic men who are not treated badly, and there may be other women not treated badly, but you have a case if you are an Hispanic woman treated badly because of that intersectionality. But I definitely think that this is something that we need to be training our investigators about. I also think in terms of disability, I want to say on this applicant flow form it says at the bottom if you check any of these boxes, you can be eligible for Schedule "A" hiring in the Federal Government, which is a very important non‑competitive way of getting a job in the Federal Government. That is on that sheet of paper because of Anupa who works for me. She has been trying to get a job with the Federal Government under schedule "A," and it was impossible to figure out how to get there. Now here everyone that applies will be able to see that you check one of these boxes, and you can go through schedule "A." But the other things, again, Anupa is one of the young people with disabilities who is focusing on reducing stigma by mental illness by coming out. And that's what the gay community learned. We have to come out in order to reduce stigma. There is so much overlap between different communities, but all under what Pat Shiu said, coming as a whole person, all of who we are. But we absolutely have things to learn from each other. And we have a ways to go yet until intersectionality is really understood.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: So just a quick follow up for Chai before we move on to others. I know EEOC, and I know you that have been a driving force on this has a national enforcement plan that you've updated. Do you have shout outs in your national enforcement plan or strategy to get into some of these intersection issues?

>> CHAI FELDBLUM: Actually, where we had ‑‑ like Director Shiu we came on and found things that hadn't been updated since in this case 1996. So international enforcement plan under emerging and developing issues, we actually have ADA issues that the Courts have never gotten to because they were so busy kicking people out as not disabled. So we're going to look at things like qualification standards. And coverage of LGBT folks, and accommodations for pregnant women. So these are some emerging issues. But we also in that enforcement plan called for a multi‑year outreach and communication plan by the EEOC, and a multi‑year data and research plan. And in both of those plans, I absolutely expected to see, and if I don't see it I will be pushing for it in my usual fashion, issues about intersectionality. So, yes.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Great. Other comments on intersectionality?

>> So I came from doing civil rights' work in the housing world. And we had many different protected classes. And so one of the things that we're now focusing on disability that's become quite clear is that, you know, not only is there intersectionality within the people themselves that we're trying to protect. You know, you have somebody who is a member, a member of several different protected classes. But in terms of the enforcement models, there are similarities. So, you know, through our own work we're looking at segregation, right? And we're looking at de‑segregation. Moving people out into the world, into the community. Now this is not a new concept. This is not the first time that people have wanted to de‑segregate. And so, you know, we have models that come to us from the racial de‑segregation cases. And so we can look at segregation, and how we deal with that, and I think that it was interesting with the comment that Congressman Langevin was making about the need to stay involved in terms of de‑segregation. You can't just simply segregate and run. I think that's a lesson that we have learned from the cases that came before us, and it's one that we are sort of taking to heart now as we work on those types of cases. You know, the other thing that I would like to point out is that I am the chief of the disability rights section, but we as a division protect against discrimination based on numerous different protected classes. And we have the opportunity because we have lots of tremendous wealth of skill throughout the division to bring cases that involve different statutes, so that we can really try to get to the heart of the discrimination, and we're not limited to say, you know, if it's a ADA case, it doesn't have to be a ADA case alone it could be a ADA and Fair Housing case, or it could be a Fair Housing case and, you know, a policing case. I mean, there are lots of different opportunities for overlap. And we are certainly looking for those.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Good.

>> VINCENT CAMPBELL: I keep mentioning community grants, and these high‑profile, high‑value cooperative agreements and programs that the CDC puts out. And the importance of addressing particularly issues of people with disabilities, poverty, low income, low education, these folks who are affected disproportionately by insecurities, isolation, geographical isolation that compounds that, and I think that it's incumbent on people with disabilities, and people who represent them, and service providers to get to the table, and local and state public health departments are putting together proposals to apply for funds from CDC and other agencies for funds to address these critical issues, demand to get to the table, and to get in on the planning and not try to get on the back end and try to get fixed, try to get it baked in at the front end rather than fixing it on the back end.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Great. Pat?

>> PAT: As Asian American lawyer, there is an African‑American law school professor who I look up to. And so in my years of practice, I've seen how this kind of plays itself out. And the only thing that I can do is I can hear just a couple of scenarios you with if I might about how I have seen it play out. Because that's what we have to be on look out for. Because discrimination plays itself out in a whole bunch of bad ways. For example, representing the first openly gay cop on the Sacramento police department, where there was something written on her locker that said F'ing bitch. My co‑counsel couldn't figure out how that was sex‑based discrimination, as well as LGBT discrimination, but it is. That's a form of it. Representing a older black woman in management, the discrimination that she suffered were pay violations, but you don't separate out the fact that she was over 40, or that she was a woman, or that she was African‑American. Language is often used as a proxy for discrimination on the basis of immigration status. On the basis of national origin discrimination. I actually had one case where there was a Chinese woman who was sexually harassed because she was from Taiwan, and she was sexually harassed by her Chinese, mainland colleagues. So there were just a lot of ways that this stuff plays out, but certainly inform as national origin‑based discrimination. And then lastly, we can't forget that when people come to the table or come to work with their whole self, that sometimes the discrimination comes at the risk of denying somebody an entitlement because of a protected status. Or in the case of an African‑American woman who was entitled to leaf from her serious health condition. But it was the racism that led to the discrimination of the denial. So it just ‑‑ it's really interesting and thought provoking, and if you always have to think about it, and I think that the best way to make sure that we stay on top of this, and what we have tried to do, is to make sure that we have the people on frontlines who are looking and investigating, be the people who we serve. So they come to an understanding when they come to the table with what that looks like for them.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Thank you. Just a quick follow up of, Pat, for you. In the context of 503 implementation, I know that you are all working on a lot of those details, I get the since that sometimes you are limited by data, and by that I mean like I know Commissioner Feldblum is a big proponent for having a sub‑goal beyond the 7% goal that could focus on people with more significant disabilities including people with intellectual and developmental disabilities. I think that the sense that I had was that you all weren't able to have that sub‑goal in the final rule because you didn't have good enough data. There may be other ways in which data limits your ability to work on intersectionality. For example, if a federal contractor is not doing a good job employing women with disabilities, or women with a particular type of disability, you may not have enough data to know kind of what the percentage and the statistical metropolitan area for people in those two intersecting statuses. So I am wondering if you could talk to that. This is a group of folks that do research and could produce data, and if you can talk about what your data needs are.

>> PAT SHIU: We need data. We need a lot of data on folks with disabilities. We need a lot of data on the intersectionality issues, on the health issues. We just need the data. The more that we have a data, and I sit on the White House task for AAPI, and disaggregating data to tell the real story of what's happening to Asian Americans in the country. It's not defining what's happening to 2nd and 3rd generation Chinese and Japanese‑Americans. Data is absolutely necessary. We want it so much to get data so that we can justify a sub‑goal. We couldn't. But what we can do when we're working with employers is to make sure that they look at the whole universe of people with disabilities, and not just people with disabilities who don't have the "more significant or severe disabilities."

And that's how we hope to close that gap when we're asking contractors to engage in agreements.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Did you have something you wanted to say about data, Vince?

>> VINCENT CAMPBELL: Yeah. So we in public health have an initiative Healthy People. Healthy People 2010 and 2020. The first objective was to get a standard set of data, a standard set of disability questions in the national public health survey. We've exceeded the goal for 2020. But we still have problems. One is that the questions that we have been using, the data that I presented on disability broken out by race and ethnicity, based on two questions: Do you have any activity limitation because of a physical, mental, or emotional problem? Or do you use a device because of a physical, mental, or emotional problem? You can't break it down by type. Don't know what kind of impairment you have. Yes, no disability. That's being addressed a little bit by the adoption of the American community surveys that will be able to break those numbers down by people who have mobility limitations, vision, hearing problems, cognitive problems, community independence issues, or self‑care issues, but it's still not enough. And it's hampered at the state and local level because the survey that we're using doesn't ask the hearing question, for instance. So we have a problem in that almost the default is we can't ask the question because we use telephone survey rather than what can we do to make the survey accessible to people with hearing problems? So, I mean, it's a mind‑set that has to be checked in our area. We don't have data on national vital statistics. We don't know leading causes of death for people with disabilities. We don't know average life expectancy for people with various kinds of disabilities. So our data needs are essential, too, although we have made some progress.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: I know that Commissioner Feldblum had a comment. I want to make a suggestion for the folks on the panel, and I am imagining all of you are interested in having better data. We have an interagency committee on disability research. We have a leader at the national institute on disability and rehabilitation research who is not risk averse and who is pretty creative. I think that there may be an opportunity and there could potentially be linked to the ADA anniversary in 2015 and the 40th anniversary of IDEA in 2015 to kind of work together to close some of the data gaps, and to see where the resources are across the federal agencies to do that. That, to me, is the point of the interagency committee on disability research. I just encourage you all to come to that committee with asks, and explain to them what it would mean if we had better data. For example, in terms of really pushing employment for people with more significant disabilities with a federal contractor.

>> CHAI FELDBLUM: I'm also just so glad, Andy, that you asked this question about intersectionality and data. It made me realize that the applicant flow form could really help with that, depending on how we then collect the data, because the applicant flow form does have you check off gender. It does have you check off race. It's broken down into six categories. And then it will have the disability. So, again this is all anonymous. It's aggregate data. But that's incredibly potentially useful intersectionality data. The other thing that I would say is that I am so glad you that mentioned the American community survey because that is the one source of government data that we have right now in terms of people with disabilities and employment rates. So just to repeat somewhat of what Vince said, what that asks, and so this is run by the Census Bureau. It's the long form that the American Community Survey for disability, and this took 15 years to work out these six questions, and it asks: Is the person deaf? You know, they're asking people in your household this is not anyone in institutions. But in your household. They say anyone in this household who is deaf? Anyone who is blind? Anyone who because of a physical, mental, or emotional condition, does this person have serious difficulty concentrating, remembering, or make decisions? Does this person have serious difficulty walking or climbing stairs? Does this person have difficulty dressing or bathing? Because of a physical, mental, or emotional condition, does this person have difficulty doing errands alone such as visiting a doctor's office or shopping? Those are the six questions. Based on that the Census Bureau, it's estimated that out of the 180 million people in the U.S. between the ages of 21‑64, 18 million have disabilities based on answering those questions. And that's where you get also the bad employment rate. The employment rate for working‑age Americans is 75%. For people who answered this question, the rate is 33%. So 42% lower. But now here, again, compare it up to the applicant flow form, part of our goal in asking these questions is to see what ‑‑ and, again this is only going to be the sub‑set of people applying for the Federal Government. But the Federal Government is the biggest employer. With we get a lot of applications. How many of these folks check off, you know, met up with the American Community Survey. Hopefully it will be larger because we've included Autism Spectrum Disorder, schizophrenia, bipolar may not show up. But many other things won't show up. But I think that this will hopefully start giving us a sense of the people with more significant disabilities, as well as 20%, I mean, if you then look everyone who has cancer, kidney dysfunction, lupus, fibromyalgia, et cetera that will and much larger percentage. I will tell you that our internal goal for the EEOC pursuant to the effective order that the President issued July 2010, it was have our EEOC workforce have 20% people with disabilities. We had no data. We just estimated it up at 20% people with disabilities, given the broad range of disability under the ADA, and 5% people with targeted disabilities. And, again, we just pulled that off of the American Community Survey even though we knew that it wasn't necessarily including lots of people who we were considering severe disabilities. So I just ‑‑ I think that we are ‑‑

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Do you know where you are now in terms of those goals?

>> CHAI FELDBLUM: It has taken a year and a half to get a survey. We're trying to survey the current workforce. The survey just went out last week. Last week. But use the applicant flow form, so I figure that even if, let's say, 40% of our workforce has the broad disability, if even half of them check off the box, I mean, I think that we'll meet at 20%. I think that meeting the 5% for targeted disability, I think that we are at the last thing was 2%. We've met the 2% goal. But we're not there at 5%.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Sounds like, Vince, you had something else you wanted to say on this?

>> VINCENT CAMPBELL: On the American Community Survey questions that HHS put out, the basic idea was to have a standard set of questions across surveys so that some comparisons could be made on an equal basis. You are not limited to those six. You can ask as many as you want, and as many as you got. But the surveys in which those six questions appear now are the American Community Survey census, the American housing survey, the current population survey which is Labor, national health interview survey, the national health and nutrition examination survey, and we are hoping to get them into the community assessment public health response survey which is a quick turn‑around post‑event to get a population estimate on the impact of an event on various populations. Hopefully in 2014 including disability. The national intimate partner and sexual violence survey which I think will be excellent, and they are also in the behavioral risk factor surveillance system 5 of 6, not the hearing question. The issue remains that the American Community Survey questions in the ACS actually hit about 12% of the population. They respond positively to one or more of those questions. Those people are seriously disabled, according to the questions that are asked. I think, and it's my opinion, and I haven't got anything to back it up at this point, but National Center for Health Statistics simultaneously issues estimates using one configuration of 33 questions, but there are 32% of the population with disabilities. They can also say that about 12% of the population have disabilities. Show is in the gap? And my projection, hypothesis is that the public health action will be the people in the gap before they really are seriously disabled who have yet to accrue all of the secondary conditions and co‑morbidities and so on and so forth.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Rebecca, did you want to say anything on data? And Pat had another comment.

>> REBECCA BOND: I did. Pat mentioned the importance every data in the regulatory process. I just wanted to also mention the importance of data in the enforcement realm. You know, one of the big questions that we often ask is, you know, what does it look like when somebody is discriminating? How do we know that discrimination is happening? And when you have a process that is sort of, you know, multi‑factorial, you know, you have a job application, or think about the work that we were doing in my old section with lending discrimination, if you have somebody that's applying for a loan and gives you, you know, so many different data points, well how do you really know for any given person that they were discriminated against? How can you really tell. What makes it a lot easier is when you have aggregate data, and you can tell that, you know, if you are Hispanic, your loan is, you know, some point higher, you know, that statistically significant aggregate data is a very useful indicator of discrimination. And so without that, without the data, you can't run that type of analysis. You don't have that, that baseline to go from. And so you go back with the he said/she said, or those types of evidence ‑‑ that type of evidence, and you lack the power of being able to go to a fact finder and say, "You know, it cannot be that just because when the only difference are these applicants, and you've done the regression analysis, and the only difference east this between these pools is their race or their disability, that determines their rate of their loan."

That's incredibly powerful data. So I just throw that out there to do that type of work.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Pat? And then we are going to get to the audience.

(Laughter)

>> PAT SHIU: I am proud to say that 17% of my workforce are people with disabilities. But that was intentional. Because we thought about it. Who are we going to do outreach to. My special assistant Claudia Gordon is a person with a disability. Probably one of the most lawyers I have ever met, and most talented people. She put together a whole what we ought to be doing at the Department, what we ought to be doing at OCCP. And then we have tapped somebody in HR this is what they're supposed to focus on. It's not an extra thing. It's not a footnote. It's not a side thing. It's part of the infrastructure. I think that it's really important, and I am very pleased that we ‑‑ everything in our office is Section 508 compliant. Everything on the website. Every document. Our office space has been just renovated because it was not ADAAG compliant. And I feel that if I am going to tell contractors to walk the walk, I having to you what them.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Pat, do you know how you are doing in terms of targeted disabilities?

>> PAT SHIU: This is based on departmental data. We have a number of people in the national office. We've got about 800 employees. But we make a real effort to do that, to employ more people with targeted disabilities, absolutely.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Great. So I am going to open it up to the audience now. If you folks have a question, you can ‑‑ I think that we have runners with mics so that you can raise your hand. There is a question in the back. I think that's Stuart? Aim right? And then we'll go to Tawara.

>> AUDIENCE MEMBER: I want to commend you for your broadened focus on data because I have always been concerned about those six questions. I think that a lot of people in the system would answer no to all of those questions. And as a result. It's often difficult to get good information on important issues for people with Autism. What percentage of people with Autism have jobs? It's very hard to get this sort of data. So I just want to reinforce your focus on broadening the data pool.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Great. Thank you. Did you want to say something?

>> CHAI FELDBLUM: You know in the applicant flow form we say developmental disability, for example, cerebral palsy, Autism Spectrum Disorder, and we did fight very hard to have that full term. Now, hour hope, however, is that we will now also be getting the same data from folks who are currently in the federal workforce. Because right now the standard form 256 which is given to everyone when they come on does not have something that clear about Autism Spectrum Disorder. So you will see that in the preamble, in the September 13th document, it notes that we work with the office of personnel management in developing this, and there is like a general statement of they are hoping to work with us to conform their standard form 256. But that take press sure. So I would just reinforce that if you folks would like to see this data, you should be communicating that. And, Vince, I'm glad that you noted all of the other surveys that use the American Community Survey because a number of people have been concerned that that doesn't report the full number, and we also negotiated extensively with Office of Management and Budget, and they were particularly interested in after a few years of this comparing the 12% figure from ACS to what sort of figure are we getting from the applicant. You know, if it's 15%, then it sort of indicates maybe we need to change ACS. If it's not, you know, so all of this is in the ongoing data development effort.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Great. Thank you. At that para?

>> TAWARA GOODE: I want to thank the panel for just excellent presentation. A couple of comments.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Please introduce yourself.

>> TAWARA GOODE: I am Tawara Goode with Georgetown University UCEDD. As I listen to the issues of data collection, there are a couple of things that I think that we need to really consider. Some of this is we're looking at it at the federal level, but we should also be looking at that time within the context of our own program. So there are true issues with training staff on how to collect racial and ethnic data. And I think that that would be at the federal level as well. People feel uncomfortable doing this. So that's on the staff part. The other part is explaining to people who will be giving this data why you are collecting it. People are very suspicious. The level of detail on the form you that just described in terms of if I am going to share all of this information what will happen to it? So that's another area that we have to be aware of as we're looking at that. And lastly, there are other barriers within organizations that there is a perception that legally you can't ask these questions. You can't ask people about their race and ethnicity. So I think that this needs to be part of the conversation as we're talking about expanding our capacity for data collection.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Great. Great comment any feedback from the panel?

>> CHAI FELDBLUM: It's absolutely right. That's one of the biggest issues that we though deal with Section 503. There was this perception you that can't ask people before you offer them a job whether they have a disability. Well, you can, if it's in furtherance of affirmative action. But there was a widespread understanding of that it's absolutely voluntary, and also people didn't know that OMCPP has been doing this for 40 years with race and sex. So it's important to lay that foundation. But what we're finding out is what we need. We need more granular data. We need more disaggregated data. Because it doesn't tell the more complexed and nuanced situations that people face in the workplace. For example, you know, Asian Americans with disabilities. The way that is perceived in the Asian Community really varies depending on what part of the Asian Community you are from. So I love to see maybe that form even disaggregate the race issue with respect to Asians.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: I think Chai was going to go next, and then go ahead, Vince.

>> VINCENT CAMPBELL: On the other side of that, the American Community Survey being in surveys, that's great. The Affordable Care Act actually took it another step. And it was to ‑‑ so having the questions and surveys can demonstrates disparities, and depending on the granularity of the other data, you can look at some epidemiological issues of relationships. But the other side are people with disabilities proportionately represented in public health and healthcare programs? And that part didn't happen. So I am hoping that we get around to that, and trying to determine the proportion of people with disabilities. Or people with disabilities participating in healthcare and public health programs proportionately to people without disabilities.

>> CHAI FELDBLUM: Thank you so much for asking and making the comments and those questions because they are so key. So two things. One is for years the Federal Government has been asking questions about race and gender on this applicant flow form. And people do actually check those off. We just have Asian, and not disaggregated within, but we do check those off. But disability condition, we're going to see. I mean, we say that the next questions address disability and serious health conditions. Your response will ensure that our outreach and recruitment policies are reaching a wide range of individuals with physical or mental conditions. We say that. And then we have, do you have any of the following? We list all of these things including that last box that's the catch‑all. We then say if you did not select one of the options above, please indicate why. And then there are two boxes. One, none of the conditions listed above apply to me. The other box, do I not wish to answer questions regarding disability/serious health conditions. Now, right underneath that we have what I call if you have indicated you have one of these, you could be eligible for Schedule "A" so that there is a potential reason to check it. But I think that we are going to absolutely be finding that people don't want to fill this out this is clearly anonymous. I mean, that's made clear that we use this for aggregate data each so. I will be curious what the response is rate is from the EEOC survey. I got it last week. I filled it out. You know, now anxiety disorder. But it will be interesting to see.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: It will also be interesting to look at how the response rates vary by age, by race, I mean, different categories of folks may be more or less comfortable checking them off.

>> CHAI FELDBLUM: Do I not believe the applicant flow form includes a question about age. So that would be interesting. But we would be able to see by gender and race potentially. But here is the other flip of this. Really what we need to be getting to is to reduce the stigma of disability so that people do feel fine about asking ‑‑ I mean, answering this so this is a combination track of both collecting data and educating folks. I mean, I am going to include any of the long list of all of the medical conditions. Really was a OPM push because they've been collecting it on the standard form 256, and once you have data the idea that you might let it go is scary!

(Laughter)

So we do have the entire list of, you know, alcoholism, depression, diabetes, et cetera. The first one there is I do not wish to specify my condition. So we're going to see how many people check that off. But ultimately I would want people to be able to feel that they can self‑identify for whatever they have. But let me tell you, we're not there yet as a society, in terms of people feeling that there won't be discrimination once they check off.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: So there was a question or comment up front.

>> AUDIENCE MEMBER: Hi. My name is Joe, and I am from Oregon and I came with Kim from OSU UCEDD. That being said, I am not speaking for the UCEDD, but I am speaking from an individual advocate's perspective. So that being said, I am a person with cerebral palsy, and I got my bachelor's degree from University of Oregon. And my point is that I would like you guys when you are looking at hiring people with disabilities with diplomas and stuff, just remember that we've been through but we still have to make in that going on. With the postsecondary education system. I would love like that the financial barrier, too is just having, addressing, and taking over various other avenues, and just developing strategies on how to make those resources more, like, just make awareness for the resources that are available for not only the city areas, but also the rural areas of the State as well. That's my two cents and stuff. Thank you.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: And thank you. Anybody want to comment on the panel?

>> I would say that it reflects the importance that we need to be firing on all cylinders. It's not enough that something could get through school. It's they can't get hired, or if they get hired and they don't have transportation or means to get to work, you know, sort of each piece we have to be involved in. And one of the cases that we're in litigation right now in my office is a case against a law school admissions counsel where we're challenging their practice of denying ‑‑ the systemic practice of denying certain accommodations. And then for flagging test scores of people who are receive certain accommodations. So I talked a little bit earlier about the Louisiana Tech case, and I think that it's really important that people get accommodations when they're in school, but then people don't have, you know, the LSATs and serves as a barrier to entering the legal profession. And we've talked a lot about employment, and that's the next stage of the process. So I agree. I think that highlights the need for us to be really focused just all aspects of life.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: So I think there is a question over here. But I want to ‑‑ I don't mean to pick on Rebecca, but I want to flag something that we flagged for Attorney General Holder a couple of times right after he took office. He took it seriously, and I think that he take these issues very seriously. But the Department of Justice at the beginning of this administration was the second worst federal agency in terms of their representation of people with disabilities, particularly targeted disabilities in the DoJ workforce. The worst agency was the State Department. Hopefully under Secretary Kerry and Judy Human that's changing. But I am just wondering, Rebecca, I assumed that you were aware of that but I know that there is a task force working on it but have we made progress at DoJ?

>> REBECCA BOND: I think that we're in the same position that Pat is in. We need to be able to walk the walk if we're going to talk the talk. And so it certainly is something that the Department of Justice as a whole is working on. Our office in particular is not, you know, we actually have a fair amount on our plates. And ‑‑

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Although you probably have better representation in your office in terms of disabilities.

>> REBECCA BOND: I know. I think that ‑‑ yes. We have very good representation in our office. I don't have the figures off the top of my head. Within my own office, certainly the hiring freeze there are limitations on bringing anybody on board. But I think that it is something that is a focus of the Department.

>> CHAI FELDBLUM: I can tell you that when the EEOC issues, and right now they should be issues a notice of proposed rulemaking under Section 501 this April, when we will set forth our aspirations for federal agencies to involve all disabilities and targeted disabilities, I am sure that we'll hear back from agencies as to whether they think that they can meet those. But, again, that's point of putting it into regulation. It's still just a goal in regulation, but affirmative action applies to the Federal Government, and we need to start creating some real accountability, and that's what Section 501 plans to do. Thank you.

>> AUDIENCE MEMBER: Hello. My name is Susan, and I am from the University of Vermont, the UCEDD there. I am also representing a new 501(c)(3), the association for successful parenting. Last year a wonderful, very thorough report came out from the National Council on Disability called "Rocking the Cradle: Ensuring the Rights of Parents with Disabilities and Their Children."

And that report identified a whole slew of things that needed to be accomplished. Among them they identified a lot of the data places where we needed to be collecting information. The data on prevalence of parents with disabilities has not been collected since 1994, 1995. That really needs to be something in the American Community Survey, or any survey that can capture that data. Because we've got to know where we're starting from. And the second thing is that the child protection services don't have to collect any data on disability in the parents. So there is no way to see whether the factor of having a disability is involved in the decision relating to permanence for children. And in that was required in the data collection, we'd have something to go with. So I'm hoping that that's something that can be done about. I'm not quite sure through what agency. Thank you.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Thank you for those comments. Rebecca, I don't know if discrimination against parents is part of what you all have forged under the ADA, but maybe you can start in terms of response.

>> REBECCA BOND: It actually is. And, Susan, I would tell you that as I was talking through some of the work that we're doing earlier, we are best at doing enforcement when we have good cases, when we have good facts, when we have specific instances of discrimination to focus on. And those can oftentimes, you know, when we have a good case, I mean, those can have two effects, right? But you really need the story. But to the extent that you are seeing instances where people are being discriminated against in that manner, we are very, very interested in hearing about that, and in hear being specific instances. And so I would love it if you would contact us and let us know if you are seeing those.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Rebecca, one area that's in this question that I would encourage you all to look at is the discrimination that happens against parents when they're trying to adopt. I'll just tell one story. One of my bipolar mentors is a guy named Bob Borston who was President Clinton's top foreign speech writer, and then counsel to Secretary Ruben at the Department of Treasury, and then in charge of freedom of explosion globally for Google, but because he has a bipolar diagnosis, he has trouble adopting a child. So that probably isn't a hard one in terms of finding good cases, and it could affect that whole ‑‑

>> REBECCA BOND: I think that the stories, you know, sort of in my ‑‑ in the job that I have, I have traveled around, you know, you talk to a lot of people, and you hear a lot of stories. And certainly I think that the most heart‑breaking ones are the ones about, you know, how discrimination against people with disabilities affects their ability to bond with their children, to spend time with their children, and to even have children. In terms of our desire to really look at, you know, fundamental rights, you know, sort of people being able to live their lives just like everyone else, that's an area that we're very interested in getting involved in. So just certainly if there are instances, cases that you hear about, please do not hesitate to contact us.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Great. Other questions or comments from the audience? Okay. I am going to ask another question. I appreciate you all. We're doing good on time. I appreciate you hanging in there with us. I hope that I am not being too hard on anyone. My next question, I've heard some people say that the ADA is good for people like Andy Imparato who have ivy league credentials and good skills on paper. But it really has not helped people with intellectual disabilities very much. It really has not helped people from low‑income populations or low‑education attainment. And that's part of why we have not seen any movement in the employment numbers. I am just wondering if any of you would comment on that perception about the ADA and to the extent that there is some element of truth in it, what are you all doing in your various roles to try to address that?

I would love to take that, because I've often felt like the ADA is a necessary but not sufficient condition for really changing the workplace. It's a necessary condition in the sense that we have to have established disability as a civil right. You know, not charity. But a civil right. We have to reinforce the fact that equality just mean treating everyone the same. When everyone is not the same to begin with. Equality means treating people as equals. With equal dignity and respect. That's equality. But equality is equity, and equality of sameness, it's hard to wrap their minds around. But it's a necessary condition. It establish as civil right. It establishes the right to get an accommodation that will enable you to perform the job, but the job that is toking performed is the same level expected of anyone else. The same quantitative standards, the same qualitative standard. The employer gets to set those standards. Every person in the workplace is expected to meet those standards. A person with a disability also expected to meet those standards. But with an accommodation if necessary. So just because you've done things always one way done mean that you are allowed to continue to do that as an employer. Okay? That is very helpful for lots of people with disabilities, whether they have ivy league educations or not. Because it gives them that ability to get that accommodation. But it is not sufficient because if you have a situation where someone with a disability is not going to be able to perform that job to that level, even with an accommodation that person won't be qualified. But there are lots of people with disabilities that can be performing various jobs at the quantitative and qualitative production level that is required, but a lot of those folks are stuffed in sub‑minimum wage jobs. But they are absolutely performing the job. So once you, in fact, get rid of that allowance to have that sub‑minimum wage, then the ADA I think will help. But the third, again, not sufficient is there are some things in terms of either supported employment that's not required under the ADA, that's not required as an accommodation, some of this supported employment, and that's additional legislative, you know, fix that is needed. But finally, in addition, the idea that people with disabilities should not just be in minimum wage. Even if we get sub‑minimum, but to minimum. Again, my referring back to Bob Williams who talked about curb cuts for the middle‑class. We need curb cuts for the middle‑class for people with disabilities with the assumption that people with disabilities can have careers. Again, different types of disabilities, different types of careers, but it's a rhetoric of expectation. Again, ADA is the necessary but not sufficient condition. It's absolute essential, but I would be the first to say that we need to do more.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: And a quick follow up. I know that when Paul Miller was a Commissioner, it was a priority for him to have some high‑profile litigation involving employees with intellectual disabilities because he was concerned that that population may not benefit, and he thought that some high‑profile litigation could help. Is that something that you all are still kind of on the look out for?

>> CHAI FELDBLUM: Well, I know that Anupa is working on the document about all of the litigation that we did last year. Because we had how many cases about? 40‑50? We brought just last year on the ADA. But we've been thinking about ways to make it more user‑friendly, and I actually do think that perhaps looking at different types of disabilities into the classes category, but also types of jobs, and we had not been thinking in terms of people with intellectual disabilities, but I think that we will take that as a friendly amendment for the document that she working on right now.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Good. Thank you. Other comments about populations that may not have benefited much.

>> REBECCA BOND: I think that are sit. A good example. We now have case studies that we're able to, you know, we are involved in the process, and moving people from sheltered workshop into real wage jobs. And so we're seeing what's happening to people as they make that transition. And the reports that I have been hearing, I think, you know, we will just come up with a more complete way to tell this story, but the reports that I have been hearing have been that this has been transformative. I mean, there are instances where, you know, people were working in the sheltered workshop, segregated settings earning, you know, close to nothing, and really in unpleasant conditions. And then they have a job at an office where they're earning a real‑wage job, and, you know, I was just reading a report recently where it's like different people. I mean, you are not dealing with the same person. I mean, the circumstances are so different. And, you know, the people's view of themselves is so different. It's almost like you are dealing with different individuals. And so, you know, those are some stories that are pulled directly from our enforcement efforts. But I think this they can serve as models for how people can be successfully, and people with intellectual and developmental disabilities successfully integrated into real‑wage jobs.

>> PAT SHIU: This is where I think the Section 501 Rule has tremendous impact. Millions and millions people. What this Section 503 Rule does is set as aspirational goal for contractors to hire 7% of people with disability as. 409 just in their organization, but in every EEO‑1 job category of which there are 10 that go from low‑level jobs to the highest level jobs. We did that because we wanted to ensure that there wasn't going to be job segregation. So that's really important because what that requires is that contractors think about what they really need in a person to do a particular job which means that they have to look at their job applications. And that's what we've encouraged them to do. Look at your job applications, and figure out what are the really essential functions of those jobs? What might be in your job description that might cause someone to self‑select out? For example, traveling. How much travel is absolutely necessary. If someone needs to travel with a attendant, they might self‑select out thinking that travel was so necessary that they can't do it once or twice. We are encouraging contractors to look at their job descriptions through the eyes of a person with a disability. A range of disabilities. Get rid of those components that really tend to have an adverse impact. The other thing, though is attitude, right? And I really liked your comment. I have worked with major contractors, international contractors, this Section 503 rule is not going to affect them. They're going way beyond this. They have started using people with intellectual disabilities, with Autism and other things, for specific jobs with their company. Because they are open to the concept that there are a lot of different people who can do different kinds of jobs. And not one set kind of person. That's the kind of creativity and ingenuity that we're encouraging other contractors who are feeling intimidated by this, trying to have the regulated community, people that are the real success stories, talking to the people who are coming up to speed to facilitate their success this is not coming from just the regulator. We're also working with Cornell University in terms of them identifying specific things that contractors can do to achieve success. And one of the easy ones is internships. Just have internships where you have folks with disabilities. First of all, you should do it anyway, because it's a great thing to do. We do it in our office just to keep things fresh, bring in new blood, new ideas. But you also bring in a whole cadre of people of all stripes and colors who have so much to offer. And it's good not just for the person who comes in, but it's good for the entire staff to see what a really diverse workplace looks like and how it can be successful.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: So I was going to call on Kim, but she just left the room. So I am going to go to you all to a lightening round of responses. If somebody could remind Kim that we're moving to her quickly. So this is a lightening round. I would like each of you to say one thing that we can do as a network that would help you to do your mission vis‑a‑vis people with disabilities from diverse cultural backgrounds, starting with Chai. So this is homework for AUCD.

>> CHAI FELDBLUM: Pressure us to get better data on people with disabilities, and work with us to let us know what data that you are collecting that we can use.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Great!

>> VINCENT CAMPBELL: Pressure us to enforce Section 503 of the rehab act of '73. That means that ‑‑

>> ANDY IMPARATO: 503 or 504.

>> VINCENT CAMPBELL: I'm sorry, 504 of the Rehab Act which mandates federal agencies, the recipient of federal funding at state and federal levels to make their programs non‑discriminatory, and non‑discriminatory means accessible.

>> REBECCA BOND: Please share stories with us. Let us know what you are seeing out there. We're based here in Washington, D.C. You are all around the country. Please let us know if there are things that you think that we should get involved with.

>> PAT SHIU: If you can do the research that helps us build a better database, because I do think that you have to be somewhat unafraid to take that on, that would be a tremendous accomplishment. But I think that you need to talk to the people on the Hill. I mean, I think that you need to educate people in Congress about what you see he, always tell us, but I think that we have a pretty good idea. But they're the ones that dole out the money, and they're the ones that can make things happen. And the more that we can help the Congressmen who obviously are great champions, with real evidence, real stories, and make it come alive for people in a very personal way, I think that that would be helpful.

>> ANDY IMPARATO: Great. Well, that's a great transition. So I am going to turn it over to our Conference Chair Leslie to officially close the conference. And then we're going to turn it over to our rock star Kim who is going to tell us what we need to know before we go to the Hill.

So please join me in thanking this amazing panel!

(Applause)

>> LESLIE COHEN: Thank you to everyone! I know that this has been a great morning and a great closing panel. We've brought together another aspect of promoting inclusion in an increasingly diverse world. I hope that you all have enjoyed the conference, that you have made new friends, learned new things, and are energized to bring this great information and great ideas back to your own center. I want to remind everyone that on your conference app on by e‑mail when you get home there will and conference evaluation. Please, please, please fill it out. Your feedback is crucial to ensure that this conference meets the needs of network. So we want to hear from you about what topics for next year will work, and Olivia Raynor will be your Conference Chair next year, and I know that she wants everyone's input on what they would like to see next year. As everyone begins, you know, their journey home, I know that many of you are going to stay this afternoon and do Hill visits, and Kim's going to come up in just a minute and tell you about that. So sit right there. But for the rest of you, I hope that you have safe travels. I want to remind you that of two upcoming events. The first is the 2014 disability policy seminar which is in D.C., April 7th through 9th. AUCD along with five other disability organizations and others in the Community planned this fabulous seminar. It's always a great time for trainees to learn about national policy and advocacy. I believe it's at the Grand Hyatt. The website is already opened. There are links from the AUCD website. So it's not too early to register or make hotel reservations. And lastly but not least, the 2014 AUCD conference is November 9‑12th right here. We hope to see all of you back next year. Thank you! And the conference is now officially closed!

(Applause)

Kim?

>> KIM: Thank you, Leslie. And thank you to those of how are staying to do Hill visits, raise your hand if you are ready to go to the Hill! Woo‑hoo!

(Applause)

This is only the second year that we've done Hill visits in associated with the annual meeting. And the reason is, is that there were so many new members of Congress during this election of 2010 that we really felt that it was important for all of you to make the new connections with the new members, and for those of how have been so good about meeting with your members of Congress, keeping those connections and keeping those relationships. So we developed a packet for you. So on your way out, please make sure you that pick up a packet that has talking points. The main purpose of the Hill visit today is for you to just talk about what you are doing. Talk about the research, the data collections, the evidence‑based practices, the training that you are doing so that our members of Congress can use some of that information to do a better job developing policies. The only other thing that I want ‑‑ so we have actually talking points in here about how to talk about UCEDDs and LENDs and what you are doing. But there is also a talking point here about the combating, and relationship to the LEND program because the Combating Autism Act will expire in September, September 30th, this coming year. So a year from now. If we do not get that re‑authorized. The only other separate issue that we want you to talk about is Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. The CRPD, or the disability treaty. If we can't convince 67 Senators to vote yes for the CRPD, then Senator Reid will not put it on the Senate floor. If it's not voted on this year, we truly fear we won't get another chance at this. Not only that, but, you know, it's kind of a unifying vote. And we need a unifying vote. We need to get this disability community together so that we can have more successes in the future on employment and on disability rights and on a lot of other issues that need to happen. So I really thank you for contacting your members of Congress and for making these Hill visits. So we wanted to make it as easy as possible with these talking points. And also there is a feedback form because we would love to hear about your visits after you get home. E‑mail us, call us, however, Tweet us, we don't care. We would love to hear about it. So grab some stickers, grab the fact sheets, grab one of us if you don't know where you are going. Any questions? All right, go get 'em!

(Applause)