

FOIA MARKER

**This is not a textual record. This is used as an
administrative marker by the William J. Clinton
Presidential Library Staff.**

Collection/Record Group: Clinton Presidential Records
Subgroup/Office of Origin: Domestic Policy Council
Series/Staff Member: Diana Fortuna
Subseries:

OA/ID Number: 12025
FolderID:

Folder Title:
NDPR [National Disability Prevention and Rehabilitation] 7/13 Meeting [2]

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
S	97	2	11	1

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

001. list	Thursday Meeting; RE: Personally Identifiable Information [partial] (1 page)	03/30/0000	b(6)
-----------	---	------------	------

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Domestic Policy Council
Diana Fortuna
OA/Box Number: 12025

FOLDER TITLE:

NDPR [National Disability Prevention and Rehabilitation] 7/13 Meeting [2]

2007-0143-F

db4508

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

* Mon meeting

Cab Affs/PL - conf calls COS's - agree what we're asking them to do

AGENDA

Meeting of Work Group Convenors
National Disability Policy Review

March 30, 1995

Convenors:

Not for mty's sake
But as steering comm
When also to review

1. Finish Guiding Principles
2. Notice of meeting with Doug Ross
3. Discussion of where the policy review is heading
4. Timing
5. How to use the time of the full group in the next 2-3 months

each agency
what it's doing - targeted goal

DDC → Reps: what doing D?

use 9 as ex -

JH: What one D got done in this area - full gp
(re went 5 flavor)

JH: Not just poverty

Get more precise convenors

* CDC?

Promote

Interagency collaboration

LS: Index of programs: ask - RS: NIH - W+m: why in or out

A² review? Disab^{comm} part of process

All 504 offices meetings - too peripheral

SD: Budget process → pass thru ^{this} panel

Data can incomplete / confusing

5th Main review people not involved - give chg to them - ^{should be doing more} doing more than

BW Neg any major Admin inst contain strong D component

RS Just lens

BW Not must excel

As President Clinton has stated, "Having a disability does not diminish one's right to participate in all aspects of mainstream society." In the United States, it is estimated that:

One in five Americans (43 million) experiences a disability;

One in ten Americans (25 million) is temporarily disabled at any given time;

Nearly one in three Americans over age 65 (11.2 Million) has a disability; and,

African Americans, Hispanic Americans, Native Americans ^{Asian} and low income Americans are more likely to have a disability.

Everyday in our country persons with disabilities are exceeding the expectations which our society has set for them. In doing so, individuals with disabilities are redefining what it means to be a fully participating member of the American community.

Indeed, Americans with disabilities and their families often are in the vanguard of those calling for a New Covenant with their government. They no longer want to be taken care of by anyone, least of all government. Instead, they expect government at every level to work alongside them to strengthen policies and programs which increase their personal and economic independence while removing barriers which continue to infringe upon their rights and abilities to lead responsible, productive lives.

Accordingly, President Clinton has directed his Administration to take the lead in "craft(ing) policies of inclusion, independence and empowerment that will inspire positive changes in this country and in nations around the world". The purpose of this comprehensive Policy Review, therefore, is to carry out the President's charge by:

- o Analyzing how Federal policies and programs currently affect Americans with disabilities and their families; and,

- o Recommending ways to craft a more coherent and consistent set of policies which will result in the greater inclusion, independence and empowerment of all people with disabilities in our nation.

The principles that guide this analysis and inform its recommendations must be rooted in the same ideals that underpin the rights and responsibilities of all Americans. We, therefore, believe it is in the National interest that federal policies, programs, benefits and activities affecting individuals with disabilities be designed and implemented to:

- o End discrimination against Americans with disabilities of all ages, genders, ethnic backgrounds and income levels in education,

employment, housing, public accommodations, transportation, communication, recreation, institutionalization, health services, voting, access to public services and other areas through the full enforcement of all civil rights laws and the Constitution.

- o Foster equal opportunity, independence and the full participation and economic self-sufficiency of every member of the public, including persons with disabilities, in all programs and activities of the Federal Government.

- o Take effective steps to remedy the links and inequities based upon disability, minority status, and poverty in our country.

- o Create universal access to the National Information Infrastructure and other vital emerging technologies.

- o Affirm and support the efforts of families with children with disabilities to raise their sons and daughters at home and to include them in every facet of family and community life.

- o Maximize the ability and opportunity of all individuals, regardless of the level of their disability or age, to live in the community as full, participating members of their families.

- o Assure that assistance or services provided to people with disabilities is carried out in a manner consistent with their strengths, resources, priorities, concerns, and abilities.

- o Afford States and local governments flexibility in delivering community services, provided that people with disabilities and their families have a lead role in designing, overseeing and evaluating those services which affects them most.

- o Stimulate public-private partnerships which demonstrate and disseminate new ideas, knowledge and practices that promote the inclusion of all people with disabilities in their homes, in public schools, in the workplace and in all aspects of community life.

- o Make it pay for such individuals to work by creating incentives rather than disincentives to work and to pursue careers.

Our Nation's greatness rests with its people's potential to make the most of their lives and thereby shape the future of our country. Americans with disabilities represent an enormous reservoir of such potential. To tap this potential and power, we must heed the President's urgent call to action:

"We must not rest until America has a national disability policy based on three simple creeds: inclusion, not exclusion; independence, not dependence; and empowerment, not paternalism." Bill Clinton, 1992

Where we are going:

Less bold results:

- o Sensitize federal cabinet agencies
- o Help clients make their way through complex system

Bolder results:

- o Major policy changes

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
--------------------------	---------------	------	-------------

001. list	Thursday Meeting; RE: Personally Identifiable Information [partial] (1 page)	03/30/0000	b(6)
-----------	---	------------	------

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Domestic Policy Council
Diana Fortuna
OA/Box Number: 12025

FOLDER TITLE:

NDPR [National Disability Prevention and Rehabilitation] 7/13 Meeting [2]

2007-0143-F
db4508

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Thursday, March 30, 211, OEOB, 6:00 p.m.

staff contact: Diana Fortuna, 456-5570

Ruth Katz

Mary Harahan

Susan Daniels

Judy Heumann

Howard Moses

Connie Garner

Joyce Brown-Moore

Liz Savage

Bob Williams

Kate Warren

[001]

(b)(6)

Judy Feder

(has a pass)

DRAFT

OUTLINE

**REPORT TO NATIONAL DISABILITY POLICY REVIEW PANEL
FROM THE EMPLOYMENT WORKGROUP**

**I. REVIEW AND ANALYSIS OF CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS
OF ADULTS WITH DISABILITIES**

See "Current Status" Statistics Paper

ANALYSIS

- Approximately _____m. age 16 to 64 have a work disability
(National sources report from 9.5 m. to 17.4 m.)
- Diversity - onset, type of disability, race, ethnicity, etc
- Despite income supports, the majority of people with disabilities live in poverty
- Efforts to employ people with disabilities are disjointed, many times uncoordinated with mainstream employment and training programs and do not meet the needs of employers in hiring/keeping people with disabilities on the job
- Most people with disabilities work a low and minimum wage jobs, so work doesn't pay enough to cover disability related costs and insurance. (expensive mental health medication, on-going therapy, communication devices, adaptive equipment, personal assistance, accommodation needs, etc.)
- ETC.

*** Need help from group members (maybe PCEPD, NIDRR and DOL) to support the following statements under Causes of the Problem -- do we have studies, surveys, etc to support statements submitted by group members as causes of)**

Causes of the Problem

People with disabilities experience --

- societal belief that they cannot work, therefore they are not expected to work and are
- society, employers and other Federal agencies tend to dismiss people with disabilities from the world of work
- architectural, communication and attitudinal barriers
- limited accessible housing
- very limited accessible and available transportation
- limited access to work-study programs, vocational training and transition services
- limited rehabilitation services (lack of resources)
- limited support services such as personal assistance services and assistive technology
- worry about potential episodes of poor health leading to job termination
- relative security of public benefits compared to work
- lack of access to essential health insurance except via public benefits programs

- lack of knowledge of rights to benefits and services and basic civil rights protections
- limited knowledge/skills/abilities in self-advocacy

Employers report the following:

- increased costs for accommodations, health insurance
- liability for safety of the employee with a disability and co-workers
- discomfort in interacting with people with disabilities in the workplace by employers and co-workers
- confusion re. conflicting employment laws and requirements eg. Family Medical Leave Act, ADA, Occupational Safety and Health Administration,
- dearth of available people with disabilities who are qualified to fill vacancies (i.e. skill shortages)

II. REVIEW AND ANALYSIS CURRENT FEDERAL POLICY AND PROGRAMS WITH EMPLOYMENT RELATED RESPONSIBILITIES

ADA National Goals

Federal Programs -- Purpose and Eligibility

Federal Programs -- Budget, Services and Outcomes Chart

Description of other Systems (State, Public, Private)

ANALYSIS

Statement of National Policy Goals in ADA:

The findings section of the ADA: ". . . the Nation's proper goals regarding individuals with disabilities are to assure equality of opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self sufficiency for such individuals. These principles provide a touchstone against which all public policy for people with disabilities should be examined for consistency and compatibility.

- National goals of employment (i.e. independence and economic self-sufficiency) yet vast majority of Federal dollars spent are on income supports and health care (i.e. dependency).
- Amount of Federal dollars spent is staggering yet the outcome for the population that the programs are designed to benefit is minimal and leaves people unemployed or underemployed, dependent and in poverty.
- Goals and purposes of Federal programs are conflicting and send conflicting messages to consumers. Purposes include education, employment, health, housing, income maintenance, rights and advocacy, social services, vocational rehabilitation, IRS, veterans services, and planning.
- As many as 50 Federal laws either define disability or refer to a definition of disability. Others refer to people with disabilities with no definition. (Conwal, Inc. Feb. 1995)

-Federal cash benefit and services system send conflicting messages and do not provide seamless services -- that is, shouldn't we determine you inappropriate for rehabilitation before you become eligible for cash benefits?

-Federal systems also work in direct conflict with or fail to link with State workers compensation, employment and services systems creating gaps and cliffs in contrast to seamless services.

-Confusion with a myriad of Federal, State, public and private programs and who is responsible for what -- i.e. what is the current mix of programs and their focus.

-Disjointed, uncoordinated efforts in Federal/State systems and programs

-Federal programs have conflicting policy goals and work at cross purposes in terms of national policy

-Duplicate services in some cases yet in other cases services are piecemeal with huge gaps in basic support needs depending on the system and/or the State

-People feel trapped with a set of conflicting messages from public programs, so much so that for many PWD, to pursue employment is an irrational decision. Irrational because:

- *State and Federal systems require people with disabilities to demonstrate that they are unable to work in order to gain access to essential services and supports (eg. health insurance, personal assistance, cash benefits). If the person begins to work they risk total loss of essential services and supports.

- *The message sent by the Federal safety net programs (SSI/SSDI) makes no common sense and is confusing to the consumer. First we require the consumer to prove that they are totally unable to work in order to obtain survival benefits. After they prove to us that they are unable to work because of the disability, we offer them services to help them go to work and we tell them that they are in danger of losing all supports when they go to work. And we wonder why so few take us up on our offer.

-Work does not pay for people with disabilities because it presents unacceptable risks to life, to health, and to basic survival. (eg. it is life threatening to be without on-going medical treatment/drug therapy for people with certain disabilities)

-Too often private insurance is inaccessible because of pre-existing condition rules, spending caps and/or exclusions.

-Most people with disabilities work a low and minimum wage jobs, so work doesn't pay enough to cover disability related costs and insurance. (expensive mental health medication, on-going therapy, communication devices, adaptive equipment, daily personal assistance, excessive accommodation needs)

-ETC.

DRAFT

- FINDING 1: Despite a range of State and Federal programs and service systems, unemployment and underemployment of people with disabilities has been a persistent problem over a long period of time.
- FINDING 2: Employers are not hiring people with disabilities in sufficient numbers. Employers express the need for more TA and report major conflicts between the ADA, the FMLA, and OSHA requirements.
- FINDING 3: Despite Federal efforts to enforce anti-discrimination statutes, people with disabilities continue to face discrimination in employment.
- FINDING 4: Too frequently, people with disabilities are unaware of their rights, how to exercise them and how to advocate for themselves, and/or how to access public education, training and employment programs
- FINDING 5: Health insurance is a essential indispensable vital for people with disabilities to pursue employment.
- FINDING 6: For millions of people with disabilities, pursuing employment is an irrational act. In effect, work does not pay for most people with disabilities.
- FINDING 7: People with disabilities have not been sufficiently served in mainstream education, training and employment programs.
- FINDING 8: In the past, Federal (and State) employment systems for people with disabilities have paid for services and not outcomes.

III. CONCORDANCE (i.e. compatibility, unity) OF DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT POLICY WITH OVERALL NATIONAL EMPLOYMENT POLICY

***Need help from DOL here, please.**

National employment policy has a goal of full employment.
(Our national goal is full employment. Full employment is 6% ? unemployment)

Do we want to set a national employment goal for people with disabilities = ____% unemployment?

The Federal government provides training, job placement, employment services and unemployment benefits to the unemployed/underemployed in an effort to address basic needs and to achieve national employment goals.

- FINDING 9: The Federal government has no specific national policy goals for employment/unemployment rates of people with disabilities.
- FINDING 10: Federal programs and policies send conflicting messages to people with disabilities about employment.
- FINDING 11: Data collection on people with disabilities served in mainstream employment and training programs is poor and reporting and analysis is almost non-existent.

IV. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

1. Despite a range of State and Federal programs and service systems, unemployment and underemployment of people with disabilities has been a persistent problem over a long period of time.
2. Employers are not hiring people with disabilities in sufficient numbers. Employers express the need for more TA and report major conflicts between the ADA, the FMLA, and OSHA requirements.
3. Despite Federal efforts to enforce anti-discrimination statutes, people with disabilities continue to face discrimination in employment.
4. Too frequently, people with disabilities are unaware of their rights, how to exercise them and how to advocate for themselves, and/or how to access public education, training and employment programs.
5. Health insurance is a essential (indispensable vital) to enabling people with disabilities to pursue employment.
6. For millions of people with disabilities, pursuing employment is an irrational act. In effect, work does not pay for most people with disabilities.
7. People with disabilities have not been sufficiently served in mainstream education, training and employment programs.
8. In the past, Federal (and State) employment systems for people with disabilities have paid for services and not outcomes.
9. The Federal government has no specific national policy goals on employment of people with disabilities.
10. Federal programs and policies send conflicting messages to people with disabilities about employment.
11. Data collection on people with disabilities served in mainstream employment and training programs is poor and reporting and analysis is almost non-existent.
- 12.

V. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING FEDERAL EFFORT

NOTE: The workgroup charter states that recommendations should include the following: work incentives, income support policy, consistency of Federal approach, pre-employment and employment programs, enforcement of anti-discrimination laws, education and re-employment programs.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

TO: Convenors of the Work Groups, National Disability
Policy Review

FR: Diana Fortuna

DATE: March 29, 1995

We have scheduled a meeting with Doug Ross of Labor next Thursday April 6 at 3 p.m. in Room 211 OEOP to discuss the skills training grant in the Middle Class Bill of Rights. The goal is to ensure that Labor considers up front how to include people with disabilities in the program. Also attending will be NEC and OMB staff and Bill Galston of DPC. Currently Judy Heumann is scheduled to attend, and Susan Daniels plans to send a representative, but any of you are welcome to attend. (Call Elisabeth Cohen at 456-5571 if you want to come.)

I think it would be appropriate to have some concrete ideas to share with Labor at that time. Can I count on Judy Heumann to put something together? Do we want to handle this differently? Are there other issues we want to raise with Doug Ross and that group at that time? Please call me with your reactions.

cc: Lisa Fairhall

Work Plan

This draft Work Plan proposes two parallel tracks for work during the next three months. On the "Policy Track," work groups will meet and address the issues outlined below. At the same time, the "Consultation Track" will engage in outreach and coordination with the advocacy community, Congressional staff, and the Presidential advisory committees.

I. POLICY TRACK

A thorough review of all aspects of disability policy is an ambitious undertaking. Review Team members and those commenting from outside the Review have agreed that it is sensible to conduct the work in phases, initially focusing on a few discrete issues to make the work more manageable. To this end, the Review Team, at its November 30 meeting, formed five work groups:

1) Guiding Principles, 2) Accommodations, 3) Children's Issues, 4) Employment of Working-Age Adults and 5) School-to-Work Transitions.

1. *Guiding Principles* -- There was significant agreement that the Review would benefit from the early development of a set of principles articulating the values that would guide the Review. This statement of principles will not predetermine the policies to be developed through the Review, but instead guide Review Team members and staff in their work. It might eventually become the preamble to the Review's final report, subject to continual modification along the way.

This work group has convened in December to begin drafting an initial statement. The principles it develops should draw not only on Administration policy and statements and Presidential speeches, but on policies incorporated in recent legislation in this area. When the full Review Team meets on December 21, a draft of this statement will be discussed and reviewed.

Convenor: Bob Williams, Commissioner, Administration on Developmental Disabilities, Department of Health and Human Services.

2. *Accommodations* -- This work group will draw on the review process already in place through the *Federal Disability Accommodations Working Group*. Formed in August 1994 by the Domestic Policy Council, this group has begun to examine how the federal government can be a model of making reasonable accommodations that will benefit its customers, job applicants, employees, and the general public.

The work of this group should lead to short-term achievable

administrative recommendations that help demonstrate the Administration's commitment in this area.

Convenor: Deval Patrick, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice

3. *Childhood* -- This subgroup will examine educational, income benefit, and service programs available for children, from birth to age 18. Their work is particularly timely given the formation of the Childhood Disability Commission that will look at the SSI children's program. The group will focus on developing an administration policy that will anticipate and respond to the findings of the Commission and other actors. In addition, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is up for reauthorization this year and will certainly raise important policy issues.

Convenor: David Ellwood, Assistant Secretary, Planning and Evaluation, Department of Health and Human Services.

4. *School-to-Work Transition* -- This subgroup will explore issues related to the transition to adulthood from education programs that serve people until they are 18 to 21 years of age. "Transitions" planning involves helping people to find employment, further schooling, independent or assisted living arrangements, and other activities that maximize their independence and potential.

Convenor: Judy Heumann, Assistant Secretary, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education.

5. *Employment of Working Age Adults* -- All participants in this process have consistently agreed that employment must be a centerpiece of the Review. This subgroup will focus on the problems associated with the chronic unemployment and underemployment of persons with disabilities and review policy options for helping people enter -- and remain -- in the workforce.

Convenor: Susan Daniels, Associate Commissioner for the Office of Disability, Social Security Administration.

These groups will meet and eventually develop action steps in concert with the values and commitments identified in the *Guiding Principles* document. Additional work groups will be formed as appropriate throughout the process based on the findings of these initial working groups.

II. CONSULTATION TRACK

We would like to proceed on several fronts externally as the policy groups begin their work.

A. Presidential Committees

Each Presidential committee has designated a representative to participate on the Review Team, and we anticipate these committees will be integrally involved in the Review. We look forward to working with the Committees on shared policy concerns. In particular, we expect to coordinate with them in gathering public input on these policy questions, holding public hearings and conducting ongoing outreach efforts.

B. Advocacy Organizations

Each of the five groups referred to in the Policy Track discussion should meet with a wide range of organizations representing the interests of people with disabilities to give them the opportunity to provide information and input into their work. Each work group convenor will host a meeting with the advocacy community in order to update interested groups on the substance of the Review as it relates to that particular issue.

C. Legislative Bodies

We will also meet with legislative staff from both chambers and both parties to keep them fully apprised of the work of the Review.

III. AN ON-GOING PROCESS

This document is a working draft that we anticipate will undergo periodic change throughout the Review. It is an on-going process in which its planning and direction can be modified in response to the finding of various work groups and input received from interested parties.

TIMETABLE

A possible timetable would be as follows:

November 30	Issue groups formed
December 21	<u>Guiding Principles:</u> Draft discussed with full Review Team
Early January	Initial work products available for

review

Guiding Principles: Draft statement and plan for public comment

Other Subgroups: Draft scope of work and timetable for each subgroup

Second week January

Second meeting of the Review Team to review progress of issue groups and discuss draft of Guiding Principles. Overall scope of work and timetable for the entire Review to be discussed.

Meeting with advocacy groups and the five work group convenors.

Early February

Initial background papers completed. Key policy questions identified.

Review Team meets to determine what policy options each subgroup should pursue and how.

file copy saved as a:/126wrkpl.

Janet Looney 57767

Connie
Tech/elig.
raise awareness / upfront
↳ prog / structure
Incentives

SSA pop overlay w
VR + non-VR

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

- 14-25

Transition - Commerce, STW Int.

Juv Justice / Ident players
Add CDC?
ctr for Indep Living, AmeriCorps ^{app to lon}

Last mdy,
Finalized def. ; 4-5 cont. data elements
Eli3 @ Mike Ward + Lisa F → setup a call
more defensive now
Core time to cook
↳ OSE; better focused on 5 ^{key} factors

AE can't help w/ b's on Fed
Wt message hasn't in story
Career convenors
Fri d.m.

En on Accom: GSA
Trg people on software not
access is blind
* NPR (called CR let wh)
Baynor

* Inventory	VR mand Cor T-dog
Big Group:	Did Rivin: back to db 10 vs 20 yr phase out Rep P

↳ Deval's representation	Volunteer to help w/ Accom	voc reh, migr, sp E, pop. partn don't mk polit sense
-----------------------------	----------------------------------	--

show & tell - why try to
to do it right

* Invite Fernando - gld Shaker)
Gold Carol

Susan D

Agenda

1. Inventory/profile of fed prog (not perfect, ^{but I know fair and} ~~educate~~ ^{educate all members})
 2. WBS - all? only some?
 3. Agencies
 4. Overall process
- Odd/Even

PRELIMINARY WORK PLAN Discussion Draft Only

National Disability Policy Review

January 18, 1995 -- Draft # 3

Outcome?

Background

In response to initial memoranda suggesting a National Disability Policy Review, the Domestic Policy Council received comments and input on the Review's proposed agenda and work plan. We have met with all the Departmental designees, first in small groups and twice as a full team. We have consulted key advocates in the disability community, Congressional staffers, the heads of three presidential advisory committees in the disability field, and other experts. In addition, we have made a presentation on the Review to the full membership of the President's Committee on Mental Retardation, reached out to the Administration's appointees with disabilities, and begun to obtain background policy papers.

Oral and written responses have emphasized that such a review is important, overdue, and should involve significant input from individuals with disabilities and their advocates. The comments also stressed the need to be realistic in setting goals and to focus on some shorter-term achievable objectives while simultaneously engaging in a long-term policy process.

On November 30th, the Review Team met to develop a proposed work plan for the first three months of the Review. On December 21, the Team met to discuss a set of Guiding Principles and additional progress to date. Based on the agreements reached at this meeting, we have revised our original draft of the work plan. The following pages outline a rewritten version highlighting the conclusions of both meetings and laying out the issue groups formed and specific assignments.

Short

Long

Bkgd Papers

Overall scope of work

Timetable

(Quadrant that big gap
is too mumble
for 'real' work)

More wk gps? - Elig?
(Find child one)

The work of this group should lead to short-term achievable administrative recommendations that help demonstrate the Administration's commitment in this area.

Convenor: Deval Patrick, Assistant Attorney General, Civil Rights Division, Department of Justice

3. *Childhood* -- This work group will examine educational, income benefit, and service programs available for children, from birth to age 18. Their work is particularly timely given the formation of the Childhood Disability Commission that will look at the SSI children's program. The group will focus on developing an administration policy that will anticipate and respond to the findings of the Commission and other actors. In addition, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) is up for reauthorization this year and will certainly raise important policy issues.

Convenor: Judy Feder, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation, Department of Health and Human Services.

4. *School-to-Work Transition* -- This work group will explore issues related to the transition to adulthood from education programs that serve people until they are 18 to 21 years of age. "Transitions" planning involves helping people to find employment, further schooling, independent or assisted living arrangements, and other activities that maximize their independence and potential.

Convenor: Judy Heumann, Assistant Secretary, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education.

5. *Employment of Working Age Adults* -- All participants in this process have consistently agreed that employment must be a centerpiece of the Review. This work group will focus on the problems associated with the chronic unemployment and underemployment of persons with disabilities and review policy options for helping people enter -- and remain -- in the workforce.

Convenor: Susan Daniels, Associate Commissioner for the Office of Disability, Social Security Administration.

These groups are currently meeting and will eventually develop action steps in concert with the values and commitments identified in the *Guiding Principles* document. Additional work groups will be formed as appropriate throughout the process based on the findings of these initial working groups.

Early February

AE - yes
STW?
Initial background papers completed.
Key policy questions identified.

✓ Meeting with advocacy groups and the five work group convenors.

✓ Guiding Principles: Discuss draft statement and options for obtaining public input.

February 22

✓ Third meeting of the Review Team to review progress of issue groups and discuss final draft of Guiding Principles. Overall scope of work and timetable for the entire Review to be discussed.

March

X Review Team meets to begin to outline options for reforming disability policy and identify next steps for each work group.

file copy saved as a:/126wrkpl.

~~In an effort~~ to make sure that the Disability Policy Review is moving forward, I have attempted to sketch out some deadlines and meeting agendas for the coming weeks.

April 8: GP, agenda out to NDPR

May 9: Two+ agencies to present how they consider needs of PWD in both targeted and general programs (NOT as an employer): Educ, HHS, Agric?

(sketch/principles/guidance?)

late May: Accommodations group present to big group; two agencies present

Convenors/Steering comm half-day on adult employment ideas

mid-June: Adult Employment group present to big group; two agencies present

how many agencies are there?

CR ideas re gps & real life programs-- convenors didn't love

Work Groups

Agencies

Richard / Lisa

① What was said

of Inventory

② Mats ^{agenda} on Thursday

APRIL

SU	M	T	W	TH	F	SA
16	17	18	19 AE	20	21	22
23	24	25	26	27	28	29
30	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8	9 ^{NDPR} 3	10	11	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31	1	2	3
4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11	12	13	14	15	16	17
18	19	20	21	22	23	24
25	26	27	28	29	30	1

MAY

JUNE

Small
gp
AE

AE to
big
gp

JULY

AUGUST

SEPT

SU	M	T	W	TH	F	SA
2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9	10	11	12	13	14	15
16	17	18	19	20	21	22
23	24	25	26 ADA 5 th	27	28	29
30	31	1	2	3	4	5
6	7	8	9	10	11	12
13	14	15	16	17	18	19
20	21	22	23	24	25	26
27	28	29	30	31	1	2
3	4	5	6	7	8	9
10	11	12	13	14	15	16

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20540-4000
TELEPHONE: (202) 754-6000
FACSIMILE: (202) 754-6000

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20540-4000
TELEPHONE: (202) 754-6000
FACSIMILE: (202) 754-6000

SUSAN K. HATTAN, STAFF DIRECTOR
VICE CHIEF OF MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR AND CHIEF COUNSEL

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND
HUMAN RESOURCES

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-6300

March 15, 1995

Memorandum

To: Interested Parties

From: Pat Morrissey

Re: Suggested provisions for inclusion in Job Training Consolidation Act (S. 143)

Background

Senator Kassebaum introduced S. 143, the Job Training Consolidation Act, as a "place holder" bill January 4, 1995. It would consolidate several federal programs: multiple programs under the Job Training Partnership Act (Titles IIA, IIC, Title III -- Job Corps) the Carl Perkins Vocational and Applied Technical Education Act, and Title I of the Rehabilitation Act, as well as seven (7) other statutes (i.e., federal employment and training programs for food stamp recipients, adult education participants, homeless persons, refugees, eligible recipients of the JOBS program, Older Americans Program participants, and workers affected by the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act). Senator Kassebaum's staff are currently developing the first draft of the actual legislation.

I have discussed the legislation with Senator Frist. He has asked me to share the following list of provisions with you and obtain your reaction. If there is broad support for these provisions within the disability community, he intends to share them with Senator Kassebaum and suggest that the provisions be included in her bill, S.143.

Details of Senator Frist's recommendations for inclusion in S. 143

Recommendations for general provisions

1. **Predictable funding for one-stop centers.** In order to insure that a one-stop center does not exhaust funds prematurely, require the state to specify how service funds would be allocated on a per capita basis yearly.
2. **First-come first served.** To level the playing field, to simplify the system, to remove incentives for creaming, and to make advocates and eligible recipients (economically disadvantaged, dislocated workers, individuals with disabilities, welfare recipients, migrant and older workers) engage the new system, require one-stop centers to assist individuals, including those with disabilities, on a first-come first-served basis.
3. **Give priority to individuals whose needs have not been fully met in the previous year.** Require that at the beginning of any service year a one-stop center give priority to those individuals, including those with disabilities, whose needs were not fully met in the preceding year.
4. **Maintenance of a listing of certified vendors and programs.** To ensure an individual's access to acceptable programs and vendors require one-stop centers to maintain a list of such entities. This list should include entities that provide vocational rehabilitation services to individuals with disabilities.
5. **Access to mediation.** Require the state to provide access to mediation in order for individuals, including individuals with disabilities, to have a mechanism to resolve disputes with one-stop centers.
6. **Federal outcome standards.** Require that federal outcome standards at a minimum include such things as the number of individuals assisted, number of individuals who obtained employment, number of individuals employed who are receiving income at intervals above a base standard (e.g., the minimum wage), number individuals employed who have benefits. Require that data on all individuals served be reported in the aggregate and by sub-population (e.g., economically disadvantaged, dislocated workers, individuals with disabilities, welfare recipients, migrant and older workers).

Monty

* Mike Smith
* Frost

4-5

May hrs - jk w/ hse 5/9

Historic rationale for PTB - Braden

call speed * NCD end - report out soon

5/11 #16 - Family resp schools / teachers
Families pos exp in SE

→ s-w assessments - ky - zero report model
innov approaches to fdg

wkd w/ Silverstein

staff line brfg

7/26 - ADA - Steve Bartlett

Reant PAMI - MH reauth

→ 3 yr simple extension - don't want to draw attention

* Micaela - Gnt

* DOE/L - 6 pilots STW - where
* Stan - cc memo
signing

Do by Manlog
Next yr No

Mediation - all yfcs
Keep off AF + focus on

BS: M don't want to
level playing field

PM: Never had w/
parents

1621 / 2 people in room

Kids - ex
- m2
ss

AE VR

STW -

ACC -

TAB Trg - Dep Comm of Rehab
- big picture

NDPR

Shall work State Plan provisions - * ?

Line item for VR → excess cost - max per cap, AE

Very could FCFS - creaming

elim reasons bureaucracy use for not serving

Choice - Bobby S spent a lot of time on this in 92 month

(Restoration sneging)

3yr renewal - Do at
school change

Part B of - flexibility
to use prevention

Ch 6 + Part B

San Geron - Discipline - ESEA and it

strengthened → supports - 75 day snap for gun

IDEA: T/A - draft bill - if agree, in First - consensus GR

Put tech, adm + ? in same RM → Wash → Gorton

intervention ^{during} 45 days

Parental option -

Define deadly threat

* Calif? Conflict Resolution
emot by (disabled)

Where
Put \$ in IDEA for conf. res.

*McAuley - Bates***Recommendations disability-specific provisions***DER; 6 pilots STW*

1. **Presumption of disability.** Require that an individual be considered disabled if the individual offers evidence of a disability (e.g., through documentation of eligibility for a state or federal disability program, in the form of medical information, or through the person's physical presence).
2. **Presumption of employability.** Require that an individual with a disability be considered to be employable.
3. **Access to appropriate degrees of individualized assistance.** Require that an individual with disability has access to the same type and amount of services that a one-stop center offers to other individuals, unless an individual with disability requests and needs additional or different services to achieve an employment goal. Require that access to additional or different services include access to individuals and entities that have expertise and certification or accreditation in vocational rehabilitation. Specify that if an individual with a disability request it, the individual would participate in the development an individualized employment assistance plan to achieve an employment goal. [It is assumed that such an opportunity would be requested most frequently when an individual requests and needs additional or different services connected to long-term planning.]
4. **Funds to be expended on an individual with a disability.** Specify an Individual with a disability would first have access to services up to the per capita funding limit adopted by the state for a one-stop center (see #1 under recommendations for general provisions). If the cost of services for an individual's needs exceed the per capita amount for an individual served by a one-stop center, then funds from Title I of the Rehabilitation Act could be accessed.
5. **Choice.** In selecting a vendor or program in pursuit of an employment goal, the legislation should specify that an individual with a disability may select any vendor on the approved list maintained by a one-stop center.
6. **Retain an Amended Title I of the Rehabilitation Act.** Amend Title I of the Rehabilitation Act to simplify requirements and to make it consistent with Kassebaum legislation [if it includes Senator Frist's Provisions]. [If this were done there would be no need to sunset it]. Specify a line item authorization of appropriations that would be used exclusively to meet the job training-related needs of individuals with disabilities.

NANCY LONDON KASSEBAUM, KANSAS, CHAIRMAN

JAMES M. JEFFORDS, VERMONT
DAN COATS, INDIANA
JUDD GREGG, NEW HAMPSHIRE
BILL FRIST, TENNESSEE
MIKE DEWINE, OHIO
JOHN ASHCROFT, MISSOURI
SPENCER ABRAHAM, MICHIGAN
SLADE GORTON, WASHINGTON

EDWARD M. KENNEDY, MASSACHUSETTS
CLAIBORNE PELL, RHODE ISLAND
CHRISTOPHER J. DODD, CONNECTICUT
PAUL SIMON, ILLINOIS
TOM HARKIN, IOWA
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, MARYLAND
PAUL WELLSTONE, MINNESOTA

SUSAN K. HATTAN, STAFF DIRECTOR
NICK LITTLEFIELD, MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR AND CHIEF COUNSEL

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND
HUMAN RESOURCES

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-6300

Time Table and Agenda for The Subcommittee on Disability Policy Bill Frist, Chairman

February 24, 1995

Time Table

1. **Job training.** March-April, 1995. Assist in crafting the provisions related to vocational rehabilitation in Senator Kassebaum's Job Training Consolidation Act.
2. **IDEA, simple extension.** March, 1995. Introduce a simple one-year extension of IDEA, Parts C through H, so they do not expire on October 1, 1995.
3. **IDEA, informational hearings.** May, 1995. Hold two-days of informational hearings on the education of students with disabilities [see details below].
4. **IDEA, staff-level briefings.** June, 1995. Hold four days of briefings by interest groups, experts, and federal officials on issues that should be addressed in a reauthorization.
5. **Americans with Disabilities Act.** July 26, 1995. Hold a hearing on the positive effects of the ADA on individuals with disabilities, their families, and communities.
6. **IDEA, reauthorization bill.** Fall, 1995. Introduce a reauthorization bill.
7. **IDEA, reauthorization hearings.** Fall, 1995. Two days of hearings on the reauthorization bill.
8. **IDEA, markup.** Fall, 1995. At this point, with several new Members, we anticipate both Subcommittee and Full Committee markups.
9. **IDEA, floor action.** By Thanksgiving, 1995.

Background on Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

Part B of IDEA authorizes funding for State Education Agencies (SEAs) to assist states to educate children and youth (3 through 21) [\$2.683 billion in FY 95. Another \$315.6 million was appropriated for serving infants and toddlers with disabilities (Part H of the Act)]. The federal government provides approximately 8 percent of the funding for the state special education program for students with disabilities between 3 and 21 years of age and states and local communities provide the remainder of the funds.

There are also 14 discretionary programs (Parts C through G of the Act), totally about \$250 million in FY 95, that are funded through the Act, over which the Department of Education maintains direct control. These programs fund personnel training, research, demonstration projects, special categorical programs (e.g., for students who are deaf-blind, severely disabled, or seriously emotionally disturbed), parent training programs, early childhood programs among other programs. Part I of the Act, enacted last year (Senator Harkin's Support for Families of Children with Disabilities Act) has received no funding.

Part B of the Act, the state grant program, is permanently authorized. It is considered a civil rights law. Parts C through H of the Act expire on October 1, 1995. Part I expires on October 1, 1997. In order to receive an appropriation for FY 96, any program due to expire on October 1, 1995, must have been reported out of the Committee by May 15, 1995.

How Part B Operates. Eighty percent of a state's special education federal grant is dispersed to local education agencies (LEAs). The amount a state receives is based on the number of children, up to 12 percent of the school population, who have one of 13 disabilities and have individualized education programs (IEPs). The amount an LEA receives is calculated on the same basis. As long as a state and its LEAs provide a free appropriate public education to all eligible children with disabilities, according to conditions specified in Part B of IDEA and its implementing regulations, they may spend the federal dollars any way they choose for these children.

Plans Related to IDEA

Proceed with a simple one-year extension of parts C through H of IDEA immediately to take the time pressure off the Subcommittee (This is acceptable to Senator Kassebaum's staff and the interest groups.).

Because several Members of the Subcommittee are new to the area of disability policy, hold a series of informational hearings (two or three days) on how students with disabilities are being educated.

Hold three or four staff-level briefings on specific reauthorization issues.

Proposed topics

Informational hearings. First two weeks in May hold Subcommittee information hearings on the following themes and questions:

1. **Promoting learning.** What helps children with disabilities learn? This panel would look at instruction, learning styles, teacher qualifications, setting, supports (e.g., assistive technology, aides), and other factors.
2. **Measuring progress.** How should the educational progress of students with disabilities be measured and should the approach change as students mature? This panel would look at the limits of test scores as indicators of progress, the participation of students with disabilities in statewide assessment programs, and how to focus assessment on credible outcome measures that are appropriate for a student's age and disability.
3. **Helping teachers.** What does a teacher need to be effective when working with students with disabilities? This panel would comment on the needs of both special and general education personnel involved with the education of children with disabilities.
4. **Characteristics and consequences of effective service delivery.** What are the components of early intervention and early childhood programs that enhance a child's overall development and the family's ability to support that development in preparation for school? What transition strategies for students with disabilities in high school increase the potential for successful outcomes in work and community integration?
5. **Family-responsive schools.** What are the characteristics of school systems that are maximally responsive to students with disabilities and their families?
6. **Funding.** What approaches to funding special education appear to have demonstrable benefits for students with disabilities?

A separate witness panel would address each question. On each panel, we would seek a parent of a child with a disability or a person with a disability, a direct service professional, an administrator, and a national-picture expert. We would select witnesses who together would provide a snap shot, from multiple perspectives, about special education services for students with disabilities of the full age range, with varied disabilities, and from diverse geographic, socioeconomic, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds. Emphasis on each panel will be given to what works and how to market it.

Staff-level briefings. The staff level briefings would occur in June. Various federal officials, national experts, representatives from disability and educational organizations would be asked to advise on these questions and issues related to reauthorization of IDEA:

1. **IDEA review.** What was the need for legislation; what is the legislative history, relevant research on benefits and outcomes; what is the overall vision of the law for children with disabilities and their families?
2. **Funding formula.** What would be the effects of changing the Part B funding formula to states?
3. **Eligibility criteria.** What would be the effects of changing eligibility criteria for special education services?
4. **Discipline.** If and how discipline policy regarding students with disabilities should be addressed in federal law.
5. **Program consolidation.** If and how the 14 discretionary programs should be consolidated.
6. **Administrative requirements.** How can administrative requirements be clarified and simplified (e.g., in local and state applications for funds)?
7. **Mediation.** The effects of mandating that school systems offer mediation to parents as the first step in resolving disputes.
8. **Pooling funds.** The effects of allowing school districts to pool federal special education dollars with other educational funds when serving students with disabilities.
9. **Personnel training funds.** How to determine the personnel training priorities that federal dollars should support.
10. **Services for minorities.** What outreach strategies work and can they be replicated to better meet the needs of students with disabilities and their families from minority backgrounds?
11. **Negotiated rule making.** How can rule making by the Executive Branch be made to be more responsive to entities affected by such rules.
12. **Placement vs. services.** How might school districts be encouraged to allow service needs rather than placement options affect how children with disabilities are served?
13. **School reform and model schools.** What are examples of and trends in reform? Are there evaluations of these reforms? What do they indicate?

What can be done to increase the opportunities for students with disabilities to participate in school reform initiatives and school-to-work programs?

What model school district level programs are available that demonstrate exemplary practices in the education of children with disabilities? What policy implications do these models suggest that would encourage their broader implementation?

14. **Medicaid as a funding source for related services.** Under what conditions are Medicaid dollars being used to pay for related services and other supports.
15. **Part H (the infants and toddlers program) and Preschool Program.** How are they working?
16. **Best practices connected to serving low and high incidence populations.** What are the support, professional development, and technical assistance needs for providing effective services for students with low incidence disabilities? What regular and special education strategies, inservice and preservice approaches, and policy guidelines have been effective in addressing the needs of students with high incidence disabilities?

Subcommittee on Disability Policy contact:

Pat Morrissey
Staff Director
422 Dirksen
Washington, D.C. 20510

(PH) 202-224-7139

March 22, 1995

Memorandum

To: Interested Parties
From: Pat Morrissey

Re: Suggested provisions for inclusion in Job Training Consolidation Act (S. 143)

Background

Senator Kassebaum introduced S. 143, the Job Training Consolidation Act, as a "place holder" bill January 4, 1995. It would consolidate several federal programs: multiple programs under the Job Training Partnership Act (Titles IIA, IIC, Title III -- Job Corps) the Carl Perkins Vocational and Applied Technical Education Act, and Title I of the Rehabilitation Act, as well as 7 other statutes (i.e., employment and training for food stamp recipients, adult education participants, homeless persons, refugees, eligible recipients of the JOBS program, Older Americans Program participants, and workers affected by the Trade Adjustment Assistance Act). Senator Kassebaum's staff is currently developing the first draft of the actual legislation.

I have discussed the legislation with Senator Frist. He has asked me to share the following list of provisions with you and obtain your reaction. If there is bipartisan support for these provisions, he intends to share them with Senator Kassebaum and suggest that the provisions be included in her bill, S.143.

Details of Senator Frist's Recommendations

Recommendations for general provisions

1. **Predictable funding for one-stop centers.** In order to insure that a one-stop center does not exhaust funds prematurely, the legislation should require state plans to specify how service funds would be allocated on a per capita basis yearly.
2. **First-come first-served.** To level the playing field, to simplify the system, to remove incentives for creaming, and to make advocates and eligible recipients (economically disadvantaged, dislocated workers, individuals with disabilities, welfare recipients, migrant and older workers) engage the new system, require one-stop centers to assist individuals, including those with disabilities, on a first-come first-served basis.
3. **Give priority to individuals whose needs have not been fully met in the previous year.** Require that at the beginning of any service year a one-stop center give priority to those individuals, including those with disabilities, whose needs were not fully met in the preceding year.
4. **Maintenance of a listing of certified vendors and programs.** To ensure an individual's access to acceptable programs and vendors, require one-stop centers to maintain a list of such entities. This list should include entities that provide vocational rehabilitation services to individuals with disabilities.
5. **Access to mediation.** Require the state to provide access to mediation in order for individuals, including individuals with disabilities, to have a mechanism to resolve disputes with one-stop centers.
6. **Federal outcome standards.** Require that outcome standards at a minimum include such things as the number of individuals assisted, number of individuals who obtained employment, number of individuals employed who are receiving income at intervals above a base standard (e.g., the minimum wage), number individuals employed who have benefits. Require that data on all individuals served be reported in the aggregate and by sub-population (e.g., economically disadvantaged, dislocated workers, individuals with disabilities, welfare recipients, migrant and older workers).

Notes:
retention - exp to track
sampling

Recommendations for disability-specific provisions

1. **Presumption of disability.** Require that an individual be considered disabled if the individual offers evidence of a disability (e.g., through documentation of eligibility for a state or federal disability program, in the form of medical information, or through the person's physical presence).
2. **Presumption of employability.** Require that an individual with a disability be considered employable.
3. **Access to appropriate degrees of individualized assistance.** Require that an individual with disability has access to the same type and amount of services that a one-stop center offers to other individuals, unless an individual with disability requests and needs additional or different services to achieve an employment goal. Require that access to additional or different services include access to individuals and entities which have expertise and certification or accreditation in vocational rehabilitation. Specify that if an individual with a disability requests it, the individual would participate in the development of an individualized employment assistance plan to achieve an employment goal. [It is assumed that such an opportunity would be requested most frequently when an individual requests and needs additional or different services connected to long-term planning.]
4. **Funds to be expended on an individual with a disability.** Specify an individual with a disability would first have access to services up to the per capita limit adopted by a state for a one-stop center (see #1 under recommendations for general provisions). If the cost of services for an individual's needs exceed the per capita amount for an individual served by a one-stop center, then funds from Title I of the Rehabilitation Act could be accessed.
5. **Choice.** In selecting a vendor or program in pursuit of an employment goal, specify that an individual with disability may select any vendor on the approved list maintained by a one-stop center.
6. **Retain an Amended Title I of the Rehabilitation Act.** Specify a line item authorization of appropriations that would be used exclusively to meet the job training-related needs of individuals with disabilities. Incorporate state plan provisions from Title I of the Rehabilitation Act that provide guidance on how to assist individuals with disabilities in a job training context.

SEN. JIM COOPER, R-TN
SEN. JIM COOPER, R-TN
SEN. JIM COOPER, R-TN
SEN. JIM COOPER, R-TN
SEN. JIM COOPER, R-TN
SEN. JIM COOPER, R-TN
SEN. JIM COOPER, R-TN
SEN. JIM COOPER, R-TN
SEN. JIM COOPER, R-TN
SEN. JIM COOPER, R-TN

SEN. JIM COOPER, R-TN
SEN. JIM COOPER, R-TN
SEN. JIM COOPER, R-TN
SEN. JIM COOPER, R-TN
SEN. JIM COOPER, R-TN
SEN. JIM COOPER, R-TN
SEN. JIM COOPER, R-TN
SEN. JIM COOPER, R-TN
SEN. JIM COOPER, R-TN
SEN. JIM COOPER, R-TN

SUSAN K. HATTAN, STAFF DIRECTOR
NICK L. FIELD, MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR AND CHIEF COUNSEL

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND
HUMAN RESOURCES

WASHINGTON, DC 20510-5300

Time Table and Agenda for the Subcommittee on Disability Policy Bill Frist, Chairman

February 24, 1995

Time Table

1. Job training. March-April, 1995. Assist in crafting the provisions related to vocational rehabilitation in Senator Kassebaum's Job Training Consolidation Act.
2. IDEA, simple extension. March, ^{right after recess "after"} 1995. Introduce a simple one-year extension of IDEA, Parts C through H, so they do not expire on October 1, 1995.
3. IDEA, informational hearings. May, 1995. Hold two-days of informational hearings on the education of students with disabilities [see details below].
4. IDEA, staff-level briefings. June, 1995. Hold four days of briefings by interest groups, experts, and federal officials on issues that should be addressed in a reauthorization.
5. Americans with Disabilities Act. July 26, 1995. Hold a hearing on the positive effects of the ADA on individuals with disabilities, their families, and communities.
6. IDEA, reauthorization bill. Fall, 1995. Introduce a reauthorization bill.
7. IDEA, reauthorization hearings. Fall, 1995. Two days of hearings on the reauthorization bill.
8. IDEA, markup. Fall, 1995. At this point, with several new Members, we anticipate both Subcommittee and Full Committee markups.
9. IDEA, floor action. By Thanksgiving, 1995.

Background on Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)
Part B of IDEA authorizes funding for State Education Agencies (SEAs) to assist states to educate children and youth (3 through

21) [\$2.683 billion in FY 95. Another \$315.6 million was appropriated for serving infants and toddlers with disabilities (Part H of the Act)]. The federal government provides approximately 8 percent of the funding for the state special education program for students with disabilities between 3 and 21 years of age and states and local communities provide the remainder of the funds.

There are also 14 discretionary programs (Parts C through G of the Act), totally about \$250 million in FY 95, that are funded through the Act, over which the Department of Education maintains direct control. These programs fund personnel training, research, demonstration projects, special categorical programs (e.g., for students who are deaf-blind, severely disabled, or seriously emotionally disturbed), parent training programs, early childhood programs among other programs. Part I of the Act, enacted last year (Senator Harkin's Support for Families of Children with Disabilities Act) has received no funding.

Part B of the Act, the state grant program, is permanently authorized. It is considered a civil rights law. Parts C through H of the Act expire on October 1, 1995. Part I expires on October 1, 1997. In order to receive an appropriation for FY 96, any program due to expire on October 1, 1995, must have been reported out of the Committee by May 15, 1995.

How Part B Operates. Eighty percent of a state's special education federal grant is dispersed to local education agencies (LEAs). The amount a state receives is based on the number of children, up to 12 percent of the school population, who have one of 13 disabilities and have individualized education programs (IEPs). The amount an LEA receives is calculated on the same basis. As long as a state and its LEAs provide a free appropriate public education to all eligible children with disabilities, according to conditions specified in Part B of IDEA and its implementing regulations, they may spend the federal dollars any way they choose for these children.

Plans Related to IDEA

- Proceed with a simple one-year extension of parts C through H of IDEA immediately to take the time pressure off the Subcommittee (This is acceptable to Senator Kassebaum's staff and the interest groups.).
- Because several Members of the Subcommittee are new to the area of disability policy, hold a series of informational hearings (two or three days) on how students with disabilities are being educated.
- Hold three or four staff-level briefings on specific reauthorization issues.

Proposed topics

Informational hearings. First two weeks in May hold Subcommittee information hearings on the following themes and questions:

1. **Promoting learning.** What helps children with disabilities learn? This panel would look at instruction, learning styles, teacher qualifications, setting, supports (e.g., assistive technology, aides), and other factors.
2. **Measuring progress.** How should the educational progress of students with disabilities be measured and should the approach change as students mature? This panel would look at the limits of test scores as indicators of progress, the participation of students with disabilities in statewide assessment programs, and how to focus assessment on credible outcome measures that are appropriate for a student's age and disability.
3. **Helping teachers.** What does a teacher need to be effective when working with students with disabilities? This panel would comment on the needs of both special and general education personnel involved with the education of children with disabilities.
4. **Characteristics and consequences of effective service delivery.** What are the components of early intervention and early childhood programs that enhance a child's overall development and the family's ability to support that development in preparation for school? What transition strategies for students with disabilities in high school increase the potential for successful outcomes in work and community integration?
5. **Family-responsive schools.** What are the characteristics of school systems that are maximumly responsive to students with disabilities and their families?
6. **Funding.** What approaches to funding special education appear to have demonstrable benefits for students with disabilities?

A separate witness panel would address each question. On each panel, we would seek a parent of a child with a disability or a person with a disability, a direct service professional, an administrator, and a national-picture expert. We would select witnesses who together would provide a snap shot, from multiple perspectives, about special education services for students with disabilities of the full age range, with varied disabilities, and from diverse geographic, socioeconomic, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds. Emphasis on each panel will be given to what works and how to market it.

Staff-level briefings. The staff level briefings would occur in June. Various federal officials, national experts, representatives from disability and educational organizations would be asked to advise on these questions and issues related to reauthorization of IDEA:

1. **IDEA review:** What was the need for legislation; what is the legislative history, relevant research on benefits and outcomes; what is the overall vision of the law for children with disabilities and their families?
2. **Funding formula.** What would be the effects of changing the Part B funding formula to states?
3. **Eligibility criteria.** What would be the effects of changing eligibility criteria for special education services?
4. **Discipline.** If and how discipline policy regarding students with disabilities should be addressed in federal law.
5. **Program consolidation.** If and how the 14 discretionary programs should be consolidated.
6. **Administrative requirements.** How can administrative requirements be clarified and simplified (e.g., in local and state applications for funds)?
7. **Mediation.** The effects of mandating that school systems offer mediation to parents as the first step in resolving disputes.
8. **Pooling funds.** The effects of allowing school districts to pool federal special education dollars with other educational funds when serving students with disabilities.
9. **Personnel training funds.** How to determine the personnel training priorities that federal dollars should support.
10. **Services for minorities.** What outreach strategies work and can they be replicated to better meet the needs of students with disabilities and their families from minority backgrounds?
11. **Negotiated rule making.** How can rule making by the Executive Branch be made to be more responsive to entities affected by such rules.
12. **Placement vs. services.** How might school districts be encouraged to allow service needs rather than placement options affect how children with disabilities are served?

13. **School reform and model schools.** What are examples of and trends in reform? Are there evaluations of these reforms? What do they indicate?

What can be done to increase the opportunities for students with disabilities to participate in school reform initiatives and school-to-work programs?

What model school district level programs are available that demonstrate exemplary practices in the education of children with disabilities? What policy implications do these models suggest that would encourage their broader implementation?

14. **Medicaid as a funding source for related services.** Under what conditions are Medicaid dollars being used to pay for related services and other supports.
15. **Part H (the infants and toddlers program) and Preschool Program.** How are they working?
16. **Best practices connected to serving low and high incidence populations.** What are the support, professional development, and technical assistance needs for providing effective services for students with low incidence disabilities? What regular and special education strategies, inservice and preservice approaches, and policy guidelines have been effective in addressing the needs of students with high incidence disabilities?

Moses, Schweden

Kassbaum - repeat TTH, by
sep fdg stream?

Morrissey -

18% set aside VR - current prop.

First come, first serve - up to level of funding for all
incl PWD

1WRP → only when elig for 18%

Wt a focus on most sev disabled as now.

↳ split w/in advocs

Assumes sup- greater admin efficiency ~ 20% Svcs
only 10% today

Think state match?

OR by w/for dissection among 4 progs - 37%

Earnings - elig based on UE, but not in VR program

House staff - strictly enforced order of selection

Morrissey's influence unclear w/K.

H: Sep dis by - st match? elig? (UE)

Goodling - only (states been thru VR recently)

Sally Lovejoy: (UE plat, Hans Smeder also; Sally L

Integr w/ 1-stop shopping system

Strongly enforced order of selection

Non-US
target

Subs just

below SD/CAT

~~SD/CAT~~ Page
15,000 SSA

openab

6:00 to work

↳ really only

those who

work enough

to lose benefit

NDPRT guiding principles 2/21/95

DRAFT for DISCUSSION

I. PROCESS:

balance long term v. short term needs

How is this effort related to other activities ie. National Academy of Social Insurance; Commission on Childhood Disability?

NPR

Roll out strategy/ Next Steps

Audience

Intent/Purpose

(dianne and lynn will do this part)

II. PRINCIPLES: Consensus on the following

1. A context is needed, which may be set out in a preamble. This should succinctly describe the following:

the history and evolving nature of the disability movement; identify the numbers of individuals with disabilities and the % of America's families this represents; that disability is a part of life and that at some point or another most families are likely to utilize the protections and services specific to individuals with disabilities as well as the unpredictable nature of the onset of disability; the need to reevaluate policy to measure its alignment with best thinking- does this policy encourage independence, inclusion and empowerment?

[This may be accomplished by pulling from the original draft document]

2. Document must lead off with a strong explicit statement on the necessity and appropriateness of the federal government's role.

There will need to be some discussion regarding the concept of the shared responsibility of the local and state governments to enforce and develop appropriate disability policy.

Bullet #6: Great concern over possible misinterpretation of this concept. There is not necessarily a link between local flexibility and consumer-driven service design and delivery. Self empowerment might be viewed as inconsistent with federal role and that is not the intent here. How to encourage consumer

driven services as a quid pro quo. We must make clear that there is a role for states.

3. Need a clear statement on adults living in the community.
the Right to live in the community and to access an array of services that will facilitate this.

suggested: Individuals with disabilities have the right to

- 1) live in communities
- 2) have their legal and civil rights protected
- 3) exercise choice

4. Q: Listing laws & services?
Bullet #1 Remove naming specific laws- it is seen as too limiting

Bullet # 2 Add examples to needed services and supports such as: housing, transportation, health care personal assistant services

5. Need to infuse policy for persons with disabilities as a forethought rather than an afterthought. Policy must be inclusive by design...every policy should be looked at in regard to the implications it has for persons with disabilities (bullet #8 reworked will address this.) Or is a new bullet needed which states "all generic programs must take issues concerning persons with disabilities and thier families into consideraation so that 2 systems are not perpetuated

III. ISSUES: The following are some concerns that were identified. There may or may not have been consensus in these areas.

- Focus and tone is based on a need based, care taking model
- Addresses public sector only - What about role of private sector
- Haven't addressed the benefits to the community
- Frame in economic context eg."we can ill afford to promote dependence..."

IV. WORD CHANGES non-substantive changes (done deal)
Opening paragraph: 4th line: add recreation to economic, social etc. Add the word gender to line 6.

- 1st bullet: substitute the work fair with full
- 2nd bullet: delete the word and, insert the word by
- 8th bullet: delete the word eligible and move this up to closer to the top
- 5th bullet : delete "65 and over" and add across the life span.

February 22, 1995, room 248 OEGB, 2:00 - 3:30 p.m.
National Disability Policy Review

attendees

DENNIS DUFFY (VA) review team designee;

RON GLASER (TREAS) regularly attends meetings for designee Scott Gould;

PAUL MILLER (EEOC) has been active in guiding principles group since EEOC joined the review team in December;

ANDY IMPARATO (EEOC) regularly attends meetings for Paul M.;

GIL CASELLAS(EEOC) EEOC Chairman, has not attended past meetings;

PEGGY MASTROIANNI (EEOC) has not attended meetings in the past;

CAROLYN COLVIN (SSA) review team designee;

SUSAN DANIELS (SSA) review team designee and convenor of the employment work group;

GARY BLUMENTHAL (President's Committee on Mental Retardation) has been participating in the review since PCMR joined the team in December; his mother died two weeks ago so he has been out of town;

JEFF LEVI (Office of National AIDS Policy) attends all meetings for designee Patsy Fleming;

JOE MEADE (USDA) recently wrote to you explaining that designee Jim Lyons has asked him to assume team membership on the review. His letter expressed enthusiasm and this will be his first meeting;

MIKE WINTER (TRANS) attending today's meeting for designee Frank Kreusi;

DON TRILLING (TRANS) attending today's meeting for and has attended meetings for Kreusi in the past;

MANUEL OLIVEREZ(DEFENSE) attending today's meeting for designee Fred Pang;

MICHAEL GRANT (OPM) review team designee but may not be able to attend today's meeting;

MARILYN THORNTON (OPM) has attended past review meetings with and for designee Michael Grant;

SPEED DAVIS (National Council on Disability) has been participating in the review since NCD joined the

team in December;

ELIZABETH SAVAGE (JUSTICE) attends all meetings for designee Deval Patrick who only attended the first two meetings. While Deval Patrick is convening the accommodations work group, Liz Savage attends all review meetings and is basically "acting convenor". Liz attended the 2/16 meeting with advocates to discuss guiding principles;

BOB WILLIAMS (HHS) review team designee and convenor of the guiding principles work group; attended both the 2/16 and 2/21 advocates meetings to discuss guiding principles;

KATE WARREN (HHS) attends all meetings with Bob Williams and has been active assistant in the guiding principles development process; Kate attended the 2/16 and the 2/21 meetings with advocates;

JUDY FEDER (HHS) has assumed David Ellwood's role as team designee and convenor of the children's work group; Judy attended the 2/21 meeting with advocates;

RUTH KATZ (HHS) has attended meetings with Judy Feder in the past and will give today's presentation of the progress of the children's work group; Ruth attended the 2/21 meeting with advocates;

BONNIE MILSTEIN (HUD) attending today's meeting for designee Roberta Achtenberg;

DIANE COOK-LEE (HUD) attending today's meeting for Roberta Achtenberg;

JUDY HEUMANN (EDUC) review team designee and convenor of the school-to-work group. Judy attended the 2/21 meeting with advocates.

CONNIE GARNER(EDUC) regularly attends meetings with Judy Heumann;

HOWARD MOSES (EDUC) regularly attends meetings with or for Judy Heumann;

CAROLYN GUNNEY (COMMERCE) regularly attends meetings for Larry Parks. Larry replaced Gloria Gutierrez as the team designee; however, Carolyn attends most meetings.

JOSEPHINE NIEVES (LABOR) new review team member replacing Bernard Anderson who did not attend many meetings.

National Disability Policy Review
Guiding Principles
D R A F T

DRAFT

The fundamental role of governments in respect to individuals with disabilities should be to assure the right of such persons to enjoy full inclusion and integration in the educational, economic, political, social, and cultural mainstream of American society. In practical terms, therefore, governments must assure that people with disabilities of all ages, ethnic backgrounds, and income levels have the equal opportunity to exercise their full rights and responsibilities to live as independently as possible; to enjoy self-determination; to make choices; and, to be productive throughout their lives. It is, therefore, in the nation's interest that public policies, programs, benefits, and activities affecting such individuals be designed and implemented to:

- o End discrimination against Americans with disabilities and strengthen our nation's communities and economy by providing strong, effective, and fair enforcement of the Americans with Disabilities Act, Title V of the Rehabilitation Act, the Fair Housing Act Amendments, and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.
- o Strengthen the capacities of such persons and assure that needed services and supports are provided in a coordinated fashion which maximizes their control over their own lives and futures in the mainstream of American life.
- o Assure that any assistance provided to such a person is carried out in an individualized manner, consistent with the unique strengths, resources, priorities, concerns, choices, abilities, and capabilities of that individual.
- o Support the efforts of families with children with disabilities to raise their sons and daughters at home and to include them in every facet of family and community life.
- o Assist individuals with disabilities of all ages, including those 65 and older, to play valued roles as participating members of their families and communities.
- o Expand the ability and flexibility of states and local governments to work directly with people with disabilities and their families to fashion more effective and responsive solutions to the challenges we face as a nation.
- o Improve access to the assistance, technology, and supports that enable these individuals to have greater control over their lives and contribute more fully to their home, family, school, work, and community life.
- o Assure that all current and future programs and activities are designed and implemented to meet the needs of those eligible members of the public who have disabilities.
- o Make it pay for such citizens to work by creating incentives rather than disincentives to work and to pursue careers.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

NATIONAL DISABILITY POLICY REVIEW

Meeting of the Review Team

February 22, 1995

Room 248, Old Executive Office Building

AGENDA

Welcome and Introduction Carol H. Rasco and Alice Rivlin

Review of Guiding Principles Bob Williams, Diana Fortuna and
Draft and Advocacy Groups' Lynn Margherio
Comments

Update on Work Group Efforts:

o	Adult Employment	Susan Daniels
o	School-to-Work	Judy Heumann
o	Accommodations	Liz Savage
o	Childhood	Judy Feder/ Ruth Katz

Status of Program Inventory Lisa Fairhall and Richard Green

NDPRT
2/22/95

Guiding Principles Discussion

The comments and suggestions below were generated by representatives of the disability advocacy community in response to the draft of the Guiding Principles (1/8/95). The responses outlined represent a synthesis of input from approximately 30 individuals participating in two meetings held within the past week. Our goal today is to review and discuss this input. It is our expectation that this afternoon's discussion will result in consensus of the full Policy Review Team leading to a final document.

I. PRINCIPLES: Consensus on the following:

1. A context is needed, which may be set out in a preamble. This should succinctly describe the following:

the history and evolving nature of the disability movement; identify the numbers of individuals with disabilities and the % of America's families this represents; that disability is a part of life and that at some point or another most families are likely to utilize the protections and services specific to individuals with disabilities as well as the unpredictable nature of the onset of disability; the need to reevaluate policy to measure its alignment with best thinking- does this policy encourage independence, inclusion and empowerment?

[This may be accomplished by pulling from the original draft document]

2. Document must lead off with a strong explicit statement on the necessity and appropriateness of the federal government's role.

There will need to be some discussion regarding the concept of the shared responsibility of the local and state governments to enforce and develop appropriate disability policy.

Bullet #6: Great concern over possible misinterpretation of this concept. There is not necessarily a link between local flexibility and consumer-driven service design and delivery. Self empowerment might be viewed as inconsistent with federal role and that is not the intent here. How to encourage consumer driven services as a quid pro quo. We must make clear that there is a role for states.

3. Need a clear statement on adults living in the community.
the Right to live in the community and to access an array of

services that will facilitate this.

"right to live @ home" -
MA program
Feder/Herman

suggested: Individuals with disabilities have the right to

- 1) live in communities
- 2) have their legal and civil rights protected
- 3) exercise choice

4. Q: Listing laws & services? *emph disincentives to comm servs*
Bullet #1 Remove naming specific laws- it is seen as too limiting *expanding choice*

Bullet # 2 Add examples to needed services and supports such as: housing, transportation, health care personal assistant services

5. Need to infuse policy for persons with disabilities as a forethought rather than an afterthought. Policy must be inclusive by design...every policy should be looked at in regard to the implications it has for persons with disabilities (bullet #8 reworked will address this.) Or is a new bullet needed which states "all generic programs must take issues concerning persons with disabilities and thier families into consideraation so that 2 systems are not perpetuated"

* Next big hoop
JH Ed Legislation - we've done it
(Sect 504 Regs, 7)

II. ISSUES: The following are some concerns that were identified. There may or may not have been consensus in these areas.

- Focus and tone is based on a need based, care taking model
- Addresses public sector only - What about role of private sector
- Haven't addressed the benefits to the community
- Frame in economic context eg. "we can ill afford to promote dependence..."

III. WORD CHANGES non-substantive changes (done deal)

Opening paragraph: 4th line: add recreation to economic, social etc. Add the word gender to line 6.

- 1st bullet: substitute the work fair with full
2nd bullet: delete the word and, insert the word by
8th bullet: delete the word eligible and move this up to closer to the top
5th bullet : delete "65 and over" and add across the life span.

**ATTENDANCE LIST FOR NATIONAL DISABILITY POLICY REVIEW MEETINGS
WITH ADVOCACY GROUPS TO DISCUSS THE GUIDING PRINCIPLES DRAFT**

Thursday, February 16, 1995

PATRISHA WRIGHT, DISABILITY RIGHTS EDUCATION & DEFENSE FUND
PAUL MARCHAND, THE ARC
KATHERINE NEAS, NATIONAL EASTER SEALS SOCIETY
PATRICIA SMITH, NATIONAL PARENT NETWORK ON DISABILITIES
DR. SYLVIA WALKER, SOCIO-ECONOMIC POLICY STUDIES, HOWARD UNIV.
KIMBERLEY A. TURNER, SOCIO-ECONOMIC POLICY STUDIES, HOWARD UNIV.
CHRISTINA METZLER, AMERICAN OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY ASSOC.
PETER W. THOMAS, AAPMR, ASIA, ACRM, ASOTAPA, ACA, NARRTC, NOD
RONALD DRACH, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS
TONY YOUNG, AMERICAN REHABILITATION ASSOCIATION
DAVID FIELDS, AMERICAN REHABILITATION ASSOCIATION
BRENDA BATTAT, SELF-HELP FOR HARD OF HEARING PEOPLE
MAUREEN MCCLOSKEY, PARALYZED VETERANS OF AMERICA
SUSAN HARRIS, NATIONAL MULTIPLE SCLEROSIS SOCIETY

Tuesday, February 21, 1995

JANET O'KEEFE, AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION
JOSEPH ROGERS, NATIONAL MENTAL HEALTH CONSUMER SELF-HELP CLEARING
HOUSE
BOB BOHLMAN, NAMI
STEPHANIE THOMAS, ADAPT
JUDI CHAMBERLIN, CENTER FOR PSYCH REHAB
JULIA BELL, NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES
COUNCILS
ALAN DINSMORE, AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR BLIND
CHRISTOPHER BUTTON, UNITED CEREBRAL PALSY ASSOCIATIONS
JIM GASHEL, NATIONAL FEDERATION OF THE BLIND
ORAL MILLER, AMERICAN COUNCIL OF THE BLIND
WILLIAM WANAMAKER, PROJECT ACCESSABILITY
JUSTIN DART, JUSTICE FOR ALL
STEVEN M. EIDELMAN, KENNEDY FOUNDATION
JOSEPH MANES, BAZELON CENTER FOR MENTAL HEALTH LAW
DR. FRED FAY, DISABILITY RIGHTS VOTER EDUCATION (SPEAKER PHONE)

ADVOCATE GROUPS' CONCERNS OVER PROCESS:

- o Audience for Guiding Principles document: Hill, agency heads, ourselves, general audience, disability advocacy community?
- o Relationship to National Performance Review/Rego2
- o Balancing long term and short term agendas
- o How can principles be translated into action in agencies?
- o Rollout strategy/next steps

**February 22, 1995, room 248 OEOB, 2:00 - 3:30 p.m.
National Disability Policy Review**

attendees

DENNIS DUFFY (VA) review team designee;

RON GLASER (TREAS) regularly attends meetings for designee Scott Gould;

PAUL MILLER (EEOC) has been active in guiding principles group since EEOC joined the review team in December;

ANDY IMPARATO (EEOC) regularly attends meetings for Paul M.;

GIL CASELLAS (EEOC) EEOC Chairman, has not attended past meetings;

PEGGY MASTROIANNI (EEOC) has not attended meetings in the past;

CAROLYN COLVIN (SSA) review team designee;

SUSAN DANIELS (SSA) review team designee and convenor of the employment work group;

GARY BLUMENTHAL (President's Committee on Mental Retardation) has been participating in the review since PCMR joined the team in December; his mother died two weeks ago so he has been out of town;

JEFF LEVI (Office of National AIDS Policy) attends all meetings for designee Patsy Fleming;

JOE MEADE (USDA) recently wrote to you explaining that designee Jim Lyons has asked him to assume team membership on the review. His letter expressed enthusiasm and this will be his first meeting;

MIKE WINTER (TRANS) attending today's meeting for designee Frank Kreusi;

DON TRILLING (TRANS) attending today's meeting for and has attended meetings for Kreusi in the past;

MANUEL OLIVEREZ (DEFENSE) attending today's meeting for designee Fred Pang;

MICHAEL GRANT (OPM) review team designee but may not be able to attend today's meeting;

MARILYN THORNTON (OPM) has attended past review meetings with and for designee Michael Grant;

SPEED DAVIS (National Council on Disability) has been participating in the review since NCD joined the

team in December;

ELIZABETH SAVAGE (JUSTICE) attends all meetings for designee Deval Patrick who only attended the first two meetings. While Deval Patrick is convening the accommodations work group, Liz Savage attends all review meetings and is basically "acting convenor". Liz attended the 2/16 meeting with advocates to discuss guiding principles;

BOB WILLIAMS (HHS) review team designee and convenor of the guiding principles work group; attended both the 2/16 and 2/21 advocates meetings to discuss guiding principles;

KATE WARREN (HHS) attends all meetings with Bob Williams and has been active assistant in the guiding principles development process; Kate attended the 2/16 and the 2/21 meetings with advocates;

JUDY FEDER (HHS) has assumed David Ellwood's role as team designee and convenor of the children's work group; Judy attended the 2/21 meeting with advocates;

RUTH KATZ (HHS) has attended meetings with Judy Feder in the past and will give today's presentation of the progress of the children's work group; Ruth attended the 2/21 meeting with advocates;

BONNIE MILSTEIN (HUD) attending today's meeting for designee Roberta Achtenberg;

DIANE COOK-LEE (HUD) attending today's meeting for Roberta Achtenberg;

JUDY HEUMANN (EDUC) review team designee and convenor of the school-to-work group. Judy attended the 2/21 meeting with advocates.

CONNIE GARNER(EDUC) regularly attends meetings with Judy Heumann;

HOWARD MOSES (EDUC) regularly attends meetings with or for Judy Heumann;

CAROLYN GUNNEY (COMMERCE) regularly attends meetings for Larry Parks. Larry replaced Gloria Gutierrez as the team designee; however, Carolyn attends most meetings.

JOSEPHINE NIEVES (LABOR) new review team member replacing Bernard Anderson who did not attend many meetings.

Goal → Duplication
inefficiency | 3/16/95 NDPR

Gary Bhumenthal

~~NDPR~~ self-criticism
~~General Record~~ Doc (DDE)

if a doc for big gp-
changes in writing
in advance

NDPR reach out to

ED on PCMR
1974 last time
9/95 - 30th anniv
1996

NCSL, NASBO, NACo
etc.

MA (Endy lining)
Spec Ed

→ renew now + redo Mass

Emmie Shriver bugged JFK
OK - st legis - Kansas

PCMR - Bringing in those w/ control w/ goal
st sch. superint

Aug - 3 day Academy

Here's what you're doing - MSB vs HCBW.

contract w/ consultant

→ easier to do self-criticism

HCBW cookie - another —

published

Legislative - Andy

2/7

→ ask his advice on all visits - Carol + Dole?

1. Hacker - Bobby Silverstein - can ask his advice on legis strategy (JB, SH, CR not w/ her)
2. Disability Subcomm - Pat Morrissey - Sen Frst minority Amer Rehab Assoc. - gd
3. Hoyer - ?? Silverstein Hacker of House friends w/ Coelho, who
4. Owens - Maria Cipriotti - Owens' wife doesn't get along w/ people Caus re more minorities - OK all else - ???
5. Goodling - Sally Lovejoy - Regent gd gets along well
6. Dole - Alexander Vachon he's prickly NOT effective, arrog / yank chain (Bobby can help on getting to Dole + make w/ involve early, or he'll be mad)

Kassebaum	Wendy Kramer - gd - ^{sent} uncomfortable	} history on disab.
Hatch	Chris Iverson - ^{abit} problematic - abortion	
McCain	Drew Batac - NCD - deep some very strong	
Domenici	sign - very conservative	

House - Bobby ^{few} left

Liz Savage

→ Sensitize agencies

→ What plans

3/17/95

→ Sheryl Mills

- WH tour

- major problems

Violating 504 - ALO, interps, sponsoring conf at inacc.
- public docs re alt forms
- closed copy

65A contract - rent/borrow
(for WH wouldn't make sense)

Meeting after next

504 → major grantees - how to ^{not} make burdensome

□□□

10 sections

Disab Rts - ADA, Coord 504

Hsg - Fair Hsg

Educ -

Spec Litg - crappa - not persons

5th anniv - Cabinet assignments
per Judy H's memo

ate: 03/27/95 Time: 10:10

Justices Let Stand Social Security Disability Ruling for Toe-Typer

WASHINGTON (AP) The Supreme Court today let stand a ruling that cut off Social Security disability benefits to a quadriplegic Wyoming man because he earned \$350 a month by typing with his toes.

The court, without comment, turned down Paul E. Spragens' argument that federal rules unfairly allow the blind to earn more money than other disabled people can earn and still receive Social Security benefits.

Spragens, a Sheridan, Wyo., resident, suffers from a deformity of the joints that left him with no use of his arms and limited use of his legs. He uses a motorized wheelchair and works as a freelance book indexer, typing with his toes.

He began receiving Social Security disability benefits in 1976 after his father died.

In 1988, government officials decided Spragens no longer was eligible for benefits because his 1986 earnings averaged \$349.26 a month.

Under federal regulations, disabled people who were not blind became ineligible for Social Security benefits in 1986 if they earned more than \$300 a month. For the blind, the earning limit was \$650 a month. Both limits have been raised since then.

Government officials also demanded that Spragens return \$19,930 in benefits he received between 1986 and 1989.

Spragens challenged the decision in federal court, and a judge ruled that the policy violated his constitutional right to equal protection. But the 10th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals reversed that ruling and reinstated the benefit cutoff.

"It is reasonable to conclude that blind persons are in a less favorable position than others who, though suffering from disabilities, nonetheless still have their eyesight," the appeals court said.

In the appeal acted on today, Spragens' lawyers said the policy "gives all disabled persons other than the blind a financial incentive not to work." Other disabled people suffer the same high unemployment rate as the blind, his lawyers argued.

They added that the 1990 Americans With Disabilities Act requires a heightened standard of review for legal classifications based on disability.

Justice Department lawyers urged the high court to reject Spragens' appeal. They said Congress reasonably could decide that the blind suffer greater financial hardships than other disabled people.

Spragens could have sought a waiver of the requirement that he repay the \$19,930, government lawyers added.

The case is Spragens vs. Shalala, 94-1102.

APNP-03-27-95 1015EST

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

20-Jul-1995 07:40pm

TO: fortuna_d
TO: judy_heumann
TO: arosewater

FROM: Bob Williams

SUBJECT: Some Thoughts on Future Directions

As I indicated to you in my e mail the other night,, I want to share the following thoughts and recommendations. I hope they will prove useful to you, Carol and others in the coming days and weeks ahead as we all try to "salvage" and more crisply defining a Federal role in fostering the greater independence and inclusion of Americans with disabilities.

It is increasingly clear to all concerned that if relatively small discretionary disability programs like those in ADD and OSERS (as well as SAMHSA, MCH, etc) are to have any chance of surviving in this climate that a series of things must happen: First, the larger question of whether there will be a Department of Education must resolve itself. The thinking is that if Education were to go away, some of the programs administered by OSERS might come to HHS. On the other hand, if Ed were to remain intact, ADD might be shifted over there.

The second set of considerations which needs working through relates to how best to reconfigure and repackage various "like programs" (e.g., the five Federal P&A programs) along functional lines. Also, several small (or zeroed out) pots of R&D money would need to be combined into an Federal Investment and Innovation Fund like the one being envisioned for Child Welfare programs in ACF/HHS.

I recently met with folks from the ARC, UCP, AAUAP, CDDC, NADDC, NAPAS and the Epilepsy Foundation. They were in general agreement with the approach and want to work through these issues more and volunteered to help develop an options paper outlining various structural and organizational reforms. I also have discussed it with Judy and will be meeting with Ann Rosewater tomorrow to get her advice and insights as well.

Practically speaking, this approach would probably lead the Administration to advocate for and take the following kind of actions:

-- Clearly articulate and identify how the President's investment initiatives in education, Head Start, child care, etc, benefit children with disabilities and their families and therefore how proposed cuts in these same efforts hit such children and families among the hardest hardest (This is of course the point made at Tuesday's meeting and I feel strongly it is one which the

President and others need to speak to forcefully in order to promote and foster an united front by the poverty and disability communities).

-- Seek legislation allowing and encouraging States to consolidate their DD Councils with other federally mandated disability related councils (e.g., Part H, independent living, special education, etc). Allow States to "modify the mission" of such Consolidated Disability Councils, provided minimum assurances are met. Rationale: This would permit States to "do more with less" and also promote greater coordination, collaboration and cohesiveness within the disability community. POSSIBLE FALL OUT TO THIS MIGHT INCLUDE SOME BICKERING BY SOME DISABILITY SPECIFIC GROUPS ABOUT LOSING THEIR "SMALL PIECE OF THE PIE". HOWEVER, THESE GROUPS CAN AND MUST BE CONVINCED THAT THE ONLY WAY TO POSSIBLY TO SURVIVE IS TO COME TOGETHER.

-- Seek legislation allowing States greater flexibility in combining and using the five separate Federal Protection and Advocacy funding streams administered by ADD, CMHS/PHS as well as RSA and NIDRR in OSERS, provided minimum assurances are met. Rationale: Again, this would permit States to "do more with less" and also promote greater coordination, collaboration and cohesiveness within the disability community. THERE SHOULD BE NO FALL OUT HERE SINCE THE SAME AGENCY IN EACH STATE TYPICALLY HOUSES THE FIVE PROTECTION AND ADVOCACY PROGRAMS ANYHOW.

-- Combine UAP core funding with the funding MCH has traditionally targeted at UAPs. Rationale: MCH is now funding personnel prep and service delivery projects in over thirty UAPs. Additionally, MCH funds several other exemplary service delivery projects aimed at children with disabilities and those at risk of becoming disabled. The fear is that whatever is left of such funds will be rolled into the block grant and therefore might or might not be used to benefit children with disabilities or to maintain and strengthen the thirty years of infrastructure and community service experience that UAPs offer.

-- Consider and develop ways to invest Head Start and Child Care Bureau funding in maintaining and tapping into the UAP technical assistance infrastructure that is already in place in every State and Territory. Rationale: Building on existing infrastructures of every kind is both a sound investment and a basic priority of the Clinton Administration.

again I hope you find these comments and recommendations of use.
Thanks!

E X E C U T I V E O F F I C E O F T H E P R E S I D E N T

21-Jul-1995 12:26pm

TO: FORTUNA_D

FROM: Ann Rosewater

SUBJECT: Re: RE: Some Thoughts on Future Directions

Thanks for your ideas in response to Bob's. Its good to be part of this conversation. Bob and I are meeting right now and so we thought it would be best just to quickly get back to you with some possible next steps.

It seems to us that there is considerable power in the disability issue and a significant response to the House Appropriations Committee action. But the power comes particularly in responding to the breadth of the attack (ie changes in entitlements as well as the HHS and Education discretionary program cuts).

So our suggestion is that we get together the small group you mentioned, building on the disability review, and identify the information and an approach to outreach which would elevate this to some priority. Let us know how we can best work together on this. Timing, of course, is critical.

Bob will follow up with responses to your queries.

Thank you.

E X E C U T I V E O F F I C E O F T H E P R E S I D E N T

21-Jul-1995 02:59pm

TO: Diana M. Fortuna

FROM: Jeremy D. Benami
 Domestic Policy Council

SUBJECT: RE: What the hell does this mean?

i have no idea what that says. i rarely understand what she is
trying to say.

E X E C U T I V E O F F I C E O F T H E P R E S I D E N T

21-Jul-1995 11:01am

TO: (See Below)

FROM: Larry R. Matlack
 Office of Mgmt and Budget, HRD

SUBJECT: L/HHS/ED Mark-up

Beth Rossman checked in.

Nothing major has happened. Lots of abortion debate which is consuming the morning. Nancy-Ann alerted.

Amendments adopted:

- o \$500 K to National Council on Disability (Hoyer).
- o \$3.5 M to ED Title III-A.

That's all she had to report.

Distribution:

TO: Kenneth S. Apfel
TO: Barry White

CC: Keith J. Fontenot
CC: Lisa B. Fairhall
CC: Janet L. Himler
CC: Deborah F. Kramer

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

AGENDA

National Disability Policy Review
Thursday, July 13th
1:00 - 2:30 p.m.

- I. Welcome and Introductions -- Carol H. Rasco
- II. Presentation on Agency Best Practices: Department of Defense Computer/ Electronic Accommodations Program (CAP) -- *Gina's bosses;*
Claiborne D. Haughton, Principal Director for Equal Opportunity,
Department of Defense
Dinah Cohen, Director of CAP, Department of Defense
- III. Presentation of Preliminary Findings and Policy Directions by Work Group on School-to-Work Transition --
Judy Heumann, Assistant Secretary, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education
- IV. Discussion of School-To-Work Transition Findings and Policy Directions by Group
- V. Closing

* Thank Haughton

* Kate Warren

* More muscle on other agencies dealing w/STW (JH)

~~CR on DA+A~~

* JH: House approps; no \$ for pers prep, tech assist.

~~CC CR on DA+A~~

* Conveners before Sept

* Brg gp Sept

Annotated Agenda for Carol H. Rasco

AGENDA
National Disability Policy Review
Thursday, July 13th
1:00 - 2:30 p.m.

- I. Welcome and Introductions -- Carol H. Rasco
(Diana Fortuna is prepared to do this presentation if you like.)

10/1/10
Welcome. It is wonderful to see all of you again. I know there are a number of people here today who are new to the group. Let's begin by going around the room and introducing ourselves. (...Introductions...)

Today, we will begin with another "agency best practices" presentation. Last month, the Departments of Education and Agriculture discussed some approaches to accommodations for people with disabilities. Today, the Department of Defense is here to discuss their Computer/ Electronic Accommodation Program (CAP). I have had the pleasure of visiting CAP and have witnessed the success it has had in making Defense operations accessible to people with disabilities.

After the Department of Defense presents, we will continue with the presentation that was scheduled for our last meeting: findings and policy directions of the School-to-Work Transition work group.

We are looking for everyone's reaction today on the direction the work group is taking both in terms of findings and recommendations. We want to make sure that the group is not overlooking any important factors as they progress in their work.

*Judy
Clat [Claiborne Haughton from DOD], if you'd like to begin...*

- 10/1/20
II. Presentation on Agency Best Practices:
Department of Defense Computer/ Electronic Accommodations Program (CAP) --
Claiborne D. Haughton, Principal Director for Equal Opportunity,
Department of Defense
Dinah Cohen, Director of CAP, Department of Defense

- 1:40
III. Presentation of Preliminary Findings and Policy Directions by Work Group on
School-to-Work Transition --
Judy Heumann, Assistant Secretary, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative
Services, Department of Education

- 2:10
IV. Discussion of School-To-Work Transition Findings and Policy Directions by Group

- 2:15
V. Closing [Carol: The Children's Work Group will be ready for a September presentation; not clear if any other group will have a presentation before then.]

Carol—

OMB has a number of questions/concerns of an analytical nature about the draft, that we need to work through at a later date. They won't raise them here.

They also had enough questions (as did I) about the policy ~~options~~ options/ recommendations section that we only let them distribute the headings (p. 16), and said Judy could talk through them orally. (This is consistent with what we did with Adult Employment last time.)

Diana

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

AGENDA

National Disability Policy Review
Thursday, July 13th
1:00 - 2:30 p.m.

- I. Welcome and Introductions -- Carol H. Rasco
- II. Presentation on Agency Best Practices: Department of Defense Computer/ Electronic Accommodations Program (CAP) --
Claiborne D. Haughton, Principal Director for Equal Opportunity,
Department of Defense
Dinah Cohen, Director of CAP, Department of Defense
- III. Presentation of Preliminary Findings and Policy Directions by Work Group on School-to-Work Transition --
Judy Heumann, Assistant Secretary, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education
- IV. Discussion of School-To-Work Transition Findings and Policy Directions by Group
- V. Closing

National Disability Policy Review Team Meeting
July 13th, 1-2:30 p.m., Room 476, OEOB

SIGN IN

Name	Agency
Marci Whittemore	PCMR
RICHARD GREEN	OMB
Janet Looney	OMB
Beverly M. Mullen	Committee for Purchase
Ruth Katz	HHS/ASPE
Bonnie Milstein	HUD
Andy Imparato	EEOC
Jorge Ponce	Treasury
IRA LASTER JR	US DOT
PAUL HIPPOCRATUS	PCPD
Mike WARD	OSERS - OSEP
Hugh Berry	OSERS - OSEP
Dinah Cohen	DOD - CAP
Judy Mullen	DOD
Susan Daniels	SSA
Michael Winter	DOT
Paul Steven Miller	EEOC
Speed Jacobs	NCD
Gary Glunzthal	PCMR
Thomas C. Ludwig	OPM
Kate Starn	HHS/ADD
Joe Meade	Dept. of Ag.
Kem Appel	OMB
Judy Helman	Dept. of Ed.
Kennie Garner	Dept. of Ed OSERS
Bob Williams	HHS/ADD
Kristin Zimmerman	Dept. of Ed. OSERS

[illegible]

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

25-May-1995 09:59am

TO: Carol H. Rasco

FROM: Diana M. Fortuna
Domestic Policy Council

SUBJECT: Follow-up to convenors meeting

At the meeting with the convenors two weeks ago, you had given me some questions and instructions. Here is a note following up:

1. You had mentioned a family resource center in Kentucky during the presentation by the children's group on case studies on how to coordinate services. I think you had wanted to follow up by having me forward the name and address of the Kentucky group to the work group staffers (Robyn Stone and Ruth Katz of HHS). ←

2. You also wanted to set up a meeting with the Dept. of Labor on a prevention issue that Judy Heumann raised. My notes are a bit vague here, but I can follow up with Judy if you don't remember this issue. } ←

3. You asked whether the VA is part of the Adult Employment work group -- the answer is yes, Dennis Duffy of the VA has been very active. ✓

4. You had a question about an organization called the Transition Institute of Illinois. My intern Tali is following up. ✓

5. Part of the draft by the school to work transition group mentioned the "White House domestic policy office" and an interagency council on disability programs, and seemed to be promising some kind of future involvement on our part. I think this has been dropped. ←
No,

6. You mentioned that the federal accommodations work group was announced at the 4th ADA anniversary, and reinforced how important it is that they have some product by the 5th. I have spoken to Liz Savage about this twice recently. She says she will get it going, but I am still not confident and need to push more. She made it sound like Reno mentioned the group at the 4th more in passing rather than made a formal announcement -- which made me worry that she views this as less urgent than she should. But I told her what your recollection was, and that seemed to light more of a fire under her.

feedback on
For long documents or any, send time?
Another mtg?

*Feder wants mtg

*Julie - mtg w/Chater
on 4 pillars - CR
(who else?)

National Disability Policy Review
Meeting of Work Group Convenors
May 9, 1995
3:30 - 5:00 p.m.

AGENDA

I. Overview of Meeting Agenda (3:30-3:40)

Diana will outline the plan for next full team meeting on May 31:

- o Presentations of findings by work groups on Adult Employment and School-to-Work Transition
- o 5 minutes of best practices at beginning and end of meeting; goal is to promote interagency collaboration

*DOT reg review may have PWD angle
*JH → EK - useful to tell advocs we're open/meeting → DFine - JDart mtg means/end

II. Reports from work groups:

- o Each convenor will give a 5-minute overview of their work group's progress to date, including a statement about when findings and recommendations will be ready to present to the full team
- o 5 minutes of discussion by convenors as to whether work group is going in the right direction

Access Bd - curb
IDEA / reg review
JH
- can affect great job
EK didn't know
JH does a mass fax
EK; will give

A. Children: Judy Feder 2-3 months - gp will decide
Decision: Do we agree that working to coordinate services better is where the groups should focus? (3:40-3:50)

Denise: re: IDEA?

We will interrupt the agenda around this time because Elaine Kamarck will stop by the meeting. We will briefly discuss the impact of NPR/Rego2 on disability issues, and the relationship of the NPR review to the disability policy review. (3:50 - 4:00)

*Name/address
K Y Fam RC
from CR to RK

JH: end of May - near completed

B. School to Work: Judy Heumann (4:00-4:10)

C. Accommodations: Liz Savage (4:10-4:20)

D. Adult Employment: Susan Daniels
Decision: Are the group's emerging "New Covenant" options heading in the right direction? What steps must we take to ensure a good outcome? (4:20-4:40)

RECS for demo - consort braille/capt'y - BSA contract
when she returns
Fed guidelines
contingent
sh an ADA - will update

Bob W:
Do on demo
basis for
hc coverage
SD: wa did
RS: 1-1 product
JK: but....

III. Short-term issues (including children's SSI, changes to vocational rehabilitation, reauthorization of IDEA, response on ADA backlash)

IV. Next Steps

Timing

- 1- Return to work
- 2- Revitalizing ET
- 3- ADA
- 4- Data
- 5- Fed model see
- 6- bus @ Partner

CR: BSA
Rel. w/WR
w/HCR

DRE model
Same as Seiz's
JP)
*DOL old
play a role
teaching out to bus
on one

I hope

are Hispanic, African American and/or have low socioeconomic status have more difficulty achieving positive post school outcomes.

- Coordination among federal programs and agencies is lacking. Policy planning and program implementation among federal agencies are disjointed and fall short of intended goals when conflicting with other initiatives.
- Consumers, professionals and agencies are not adequately informed or are misinformed about programs serving youth with disabilities. For example, SSA work incentives are not understood and many fear loss of financial and health benefits if they choose to work full time.
- Information among federal agencies is not shared well. Fragmented programs utilizing narrow terminology and short focused goals contribute to poor communication and lack of data exchange regarding youth with disabilities.
- Inadequate implementation, reporting and monitoring of inclusion standards is evident among generic programs serving broad populations. The critical needs of youth with disabilities requires additional supports and accommodations which, historically, have not been provided in generic programs. Hence, youth and others with disabilities are often excluded.

Feedback during the last meeting indicated that policy recommendations also need further refinement so that specific strategies among federal agencies will demonstrate a framework for change. This framework focuses on commitment and coordination of a clear national disability policy led by the White House Domestic Policy Office and supported by an interagency council on disability programs. Also, recommendations for program design, personnel preparation, technical assistance, funds targeting unmet needs, ensured participation of youth in generic employment and training programs and massive dissemination of effective transition strategies will be developed further. By describing specific interagency activities, it is hoped that the work group's vision for policy recommendations will be clarified. The next School To Work Transition Work Group meeting is on May 9. It is anticipated that a final product with clear policy recommendations will be completed by May 31, 1995.

// what is this all about?

When I'm back remind me to set up w/ Labor on this issue Judy's discussing.

5/8/95
DRAFT

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

- FINDING 1:** People with disabilities are significantly less employed than people without disabilities and have been over many years; and, when people with disabilities do work they are disproportionately adversely affected by changes in the economy and the labor force.
- FINDING 2:** Many people with disabilities who are not working, can work with appropriate accommodations and supports, and want to work.
- FINDING 3:** People with disabilities report the following reasons as to why they are not employed: lack of health care; employment discrimination, lack of support services; and loss of income from working.
- FINDING 4:** While employers report many positive experiences with their employees with disabilities, they continue to encounter significant barriers to employing people with disabilities.
- FINDING 5:** People with disabilities are a vastly diverse group with a myriad of employment related needs.
- New**
FINDING 6: Too frequently, youth with disabilities do not move toward independence during their years of transition from school to the adult world.
- FINDING 7:** The excessive unemployment and underemployment status of people with disabilities has not been considered a significant factor in the Nation's overall economic policy and in mainstream employment services programs.
- FINDING 8:** The federal government has played, and continues to play a crucial role in the lives of people with disabilities.
- New**
FINDING 9: When people with disabilities go to work and leave the income maintenance rolls it is good for PWDs, good for the economy and greatly impacts the Federal budget.
- FINDING 10:** Expenditures for income maintenance (SSI and SSDI) for people with disabilities have doubled in the last 10 years are likely to more than double again in the next 10 years.
- Revised**
FINDING 11: Mainstream employment and training programs are not funded as the primary vehicle for providing employment and training services for people with disabilities and thus may have limited ability to

5/8/95
DRAFT

impact the high rates of unemployment for this group.

Revised

FINDING 12: Targeted vocational training and rehabilitation/return-to-work programs for people with disabilities do not have the resources to serve all individuals who seek services; and, confusion exists between mainstream programs and targeted programs regarding their roles in the delivery of services.

FINDING 13: In disability related programs the decision-makers are service providers and program administrators, not customers.

Revised

FINDING 14: For millions of Americans with disabilities, pursuing employment is an irrational act: because, Federal income maintenance programs operate in conflict with Federal employment and training programs; the two sets of programs work at cross-purposes in terms of providing incentives for employment; and, work does not pay enough to overcome the loss of in-kind benefits such as critical health care and subsidized housing, and/or cash benefits.

FINDING 15: The structure, regulations, and administration of Federal employment programs for people with disabilities focus on process, not outcomes.

FINDING 16: Despite federal efforts to enforce anti-discrimination statutes, people with disabilities continue to face discrimination in employment and related areas such as housing, education and transportation.

FINDING 17: Data collection, reporting, linking and analysis of statistics about people with disabilities is inadequate in both population-based surveys and administrative data sets.

New

FINDING 18: The Federal government could do more to promote the hiring of persons with disabilities using special hiring programs, state-of-the-art technology, applications and other resources; one tool is the OPM reinvention laboratory known as Project ABLE (Able Beneficiaries' Link to Employers).

Hold --

FINDING 19: Early Intervention

FINDING 20

FINDING 21

Veterans

Economic Impact of RTW

Is VA involved w/ this group?

National Disability Policy Review
Meeting of Work Group Convenors
May 9, 1995
3:30 - 5:00 p.m.

AGENDA

I. Overview of Meeting Agenda (3:30-3:40)

Diana will outline the plan for next full team meeting on May 31:

- o Presentations of findings by work groups on Adult Employment and School-to-Work Transition
- o 5 minutes of best practices at beginning and end of meeting; goal is to promote interagency collaboration

II. Reports from work groups:

- o Each convenor will give a 5-minute overview of their work group's progress to date, including a statement about when findings and recommendations will be ready to present to the full team
- o 5 minutes of discussion by convenors as to whether work group is going in the right direction

A. Children: Judy Feder

Decision: Do we agree that working to coordinate services better is where the groups should focus? (3:40-3:50)

We will interrupt the agenda around this time because Elaine Kamarck will stop by the meeting. We will briefly discuss the impact of NPR/Rego2 on disability issues, and the relationship of the NPR review to the disability policy review. (3:50 - 4:00)

B. School to Work: Judy Heumann (4:00-4:10)

C. Accommodations: Liz Savage (4:10-4:20)

D. Adult Employment: Susan Daniels

Decision: Are the group's emerging "New Covenant" options heading in the right direction? What steps must we take to ensure a good outcome? (4:20-4:40)

III. Short-term issues (including children's SSI, changes to vocational rehabilitation, reauthorization of IDEA, response on ADA backlash)

IV. Next Steps

ADA celebration as

Janet Reno called for this
group the day before '94 ADA celebration