



TARC NEWSLETTER

Oklahoma's leading information source on issues impacting the lives of people with developmental disabilities and their families

July 2009

CONTENTS

Oklahoma is OK.....1&2

Ongoing Oklahoma
Analysis2-7

Oklahoma Analysis
Summary8

The Year of the
Community.....8

Disability by the
Numbers.....9

An Advocate's
Observations.....10

Autism News Roundup.....11

Calendar of Events.....12

OKLAHOMA IS "OK"? – An Ongoing Analysis

By: TARC Executive Director, John F. Gajda

The seventh edition of the *State of the States in Developmental Disabilities* study is the latest in a series of publications by David Braddock that looks at public spending, revenues, and programmatic trends of intellectual and developmental disability programs and services within the United States. Each book in the series is an update on spending and service delivery data. On the state level, the data collected in this publication can be used to monitor the evolution of the disability services system within the state and compare that evolution to what is occurring in other states across the U.S.

Periodically I have used this publication to analyze the state of service delivery for people with developmental disabilities in Oklahoma relative to other states. Looking at how we measure up to other states over several years is one way to evaluate the success of our efforts to advocate for improved services in Oklahoma and more objectively gauge the longer term direction of the service delivery system in this state.

I recently received this latest seventh edition of the *State of the States in Developmental Disabilities* so it is time to again check out how Oklahoma is doing. This update includes data through fiscal year 2006.

For my updated report I reprinted my review of key data items I had included in reviews published in past editions of the TARC Newsletter over the years. I limited the information I included in this article to items that I could compare across several years.

My analysis of the new data for 2004 - 2006 was added in a column next to the comparable data published in the three previous editions of this book that I had analyzed in past years so that the long range trends could be more clearly depicted.

Again this year I graded each category discussed by assigning a grade of A if Oklahoma was one of the top states, E if it was one of the lowest states, an average grade of C if it was among the middle most states and a grade of B or D if it was just above or below the average in each category. I included the grade

"OK" continued on pg 2



TARC is committed to ensuring a high quality of life for Oklahomans with developmental disabilities through education, empowerment, support and advocacy. For additional information about TARC or to volunteer, contact us at:

16 East 16th Street, Suite 405, Tulsa, Oklahoma 74119-4447

www.ddadvocacy.net tarc@ddadvocacy.net 918-582-8272/800-688-8272 918-582-3628(Fax)

Continued from pg 1

I assigned in the past three reviews as well as the new grade reflecting the updated data.

How satisfied was I with Oklahoma's performance? Once again I assigned a satisfaction score to each category, using the smiley face symbols of 😊, 😐, ☹️. Their values should be self evident.

One caution should be noted. Unfortunately it takes time to collect and publish data. Conditions certainly have changed since 2006, the year from which the data reported in this book was collected, and current conditions in Oklahoma and all other states have continued to evolve since then. But, adding this updating data to that reported in the three previous editions of this reference book gives a good picture of the direction the Oklahoma service system is taking in the 21st century.

OVERALL SPENDING

2000	2002	2004	2006
Between FY 1996 and FY 2000, Oklahoma's absolute spending in both state and federal funds on MR/DD services increased . <i>Grade: Passed</i>	Between FY 2000 and FY 2002, Oklahoma's absolute spending in both state and federal funds on MR/DD services increased . <i>Grade: Passed</i>	Between FY 2002 and FY 2004, Oklahoma's absolute spending in both state and federal funds on MR/DD services decreased . <i>Grade: Failed</i>	Between FY 2004 and FY 2006, Oklahoma's absolute spending in both state and federal funds on MR/DD services decreased . <i>Grade: Failed</i>

☹️ **State spending is decreasing**

Although it is difficult to compare state spending levels between states on an absolute dollar basis, we can all agree that it is not good for the spending levels within any state to be going down. In 2004 – 2006 spending in Oklahoma decreased.

CHANGE IN FISCAL EFFORT

2000	2002	2004	2006
Between 1996 and 2000, overall MR/DD spending increased from \$4.14 to \$4.61 for each \$1,000 in personal income of state citizens and Oklahoma state ranking for fiscal effort increased to 16th among other states. <i>Grade: C</i>	Between 2000 and 2002, overall MR/DD spending increased to \$4.98 for each \$1,000 in personal income of state citizens and Oklahoma's state ranking for fiscal effort went from 16th to 13th among other states. <i>Grade: B</i>	Between 2002 and 2004, overall MR/DD spending decreased from \$4.98 to \$4.38 for each \$1,000 in personal income of state citizens and Oklahoma's state ranking for fiscal effort dropped to 27th among other states. <i>Grade: C</i>	Between 2004 and 2006, overall MR/DD spending decreased from \$4.38 to \$4.03 for each \$1,000 in personal income of state citizens. This was an 8% decrease, one of the largest drops among states. Oklahoma's state ranking for fiscal effort dropped to 29th among other states. <i>Grade: C</i>

☹️ **State fiscal effort is decreasing**

One way of comparing spending levels in different states and evaluating the relative commitment by a state to funding services is to evaluate spending based on the personal income level in the state. Relative to growth in state income, funding levels have decreased (as have absolute funding levels) between 2004 and 2006. Based on this measure, Oklahoma's commitment to funding services is not increasing to the extent it is in other states. Fiscal effort has in fact decreased to below 1996 levels.

“OK” continued on pg 3

NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS AND SIZE OF RESIDENTIAL SETTINGS SUPPORTED

2000	2002	2004	2006
<p>5,698 individuals with developmental disabilities were served by the state of Oklahoma in out-of-home residential settings. Of those, 42% resided in residences of six or fewer people. The majority, 54%, resided in residences with 16 or more individuals. Based on the percentage of individuals served in small settings of six or fewer individuals, Oklahoma ranks 46th among all states.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Grade: E</i></p>	<p>5,888 individuals with developmental disabilities were served by the state of Oklahoma in out-of-home residential settings. Of those, 44% resided in residences of six or fewer people. The majority, 51%, resided in residences with 16 or more individuals. Based on the percentage of individuals served in small settings of six or fewer individuals, Oklahoma ranks 43rd among all states.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Grade: D</i></p>	<p>5,451 individuals with developmental disabilities were served by the state of Oklahoma in out-of-home residential settings. Of those, 49.8% resided in residences of six or fewer people. A small majority, 50.2%, resided in residences with 16 or more individuals. Based on the percentage of individuals served in small settings of six or fewer individuals, Oklahoma ranks 46th among all states.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Grade: E</i></p>	<p>6,195 individuals with developmental disabilities were served by the state of Oklahoma in out-of-home residential settings. Of those, 50.0% resided in residences of six or fewer people. A smaller number, 45%, lived in residences with 16 or more individuals. Based on the percentage of individuals served in small settings of six or fewer individuals, Oklahoma ranks 47th among all states.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Grade: E</i></p>

 **Total people served is increasing**

Oklahoma is gradually increasing the number of individuals served in residential settings while the commitment to small residences of six or less, relative to the effort of other states, is not improving.

STATE COMMITMENT TO PLACEMENTS IN COMMUNITY SETTINGS

2000	2002	2004	2006
<p>Oklahoma placed 78 people in community placements of 15 or fewer people for each 100,000 citizens in the general population. This ranks Oklahoma 41st among all states.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Grade: D</i></p>	<p>Oklahoma placed 82 people in community placements of 15 or fewer people for each 100,000 citizens in the general population. This ranks Oklahoma 42nd among all states.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Grade: D</i></p>	<p>Oklahoma placed 84 people in community placements of 15 or fewer people for each 100,000 citizens in the general population. This ranks Oklahoma 44th among all states.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Grade: D</i></p>	<p>Oklahoma placed 88 people in community placements of 6* or fewer people for each 100,000 citizens in the general population. This ranks Oklahoma 37th among all states.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Grade: D</i></p> <p><i>*prior reports used a 15 or less rather than the 6 or less standard used in this edition.</i></p>

 **State effort ranking low**

Comparing the number of placements to the general population of a state is a good way to adjust for differences between large and small states. Oklahoma’s commitment to community placements does not compare favorably to the efforts of other states.

“OK” continued on pg. 4

CHANGE IN PUBLIC INSTITUTION CENSUS


2000	2002	2004	2006
<p>Between 1977 and 2000, the number of people living in public MR/DD institutions in Oklahoma decreased by 81% from 2,158 to 407. Only six other states have had a larger percentage reduction in institutional census. In FY 2000, Oklahoma placed 12 individuals in public institutions per 100,000 citizens in the general population. The national average is 17.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Grade: B</i></p>	<p>Between 2000 and 2002, the number of people living in public MR/DD institutions in Oklahoma increased by 3% from 407 to 421. Only two other states increased their institutional census in this time period. In FY 2002, Oklahoma placed 12.1 individuals in public institutions per 100,000 citizens in the general population. The national average is 15.4.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Grade: C</i></p>	<p>Between 2002 and 2004, the number of people living in public MR/DD institutions in Oklahoma increased from 421 to 422. (In 2003 it had actually decreased to 416.) Two other states increased their institutional census in this time period although nationally, the average census decrease in states was 7%. In FY 2004, Oklahoma placed 12 individuals in public institutions per 100,000 citizens in the general population. The national average is 14.1.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Grade: C</i></p>	<p>Between 2004 and 2006, the number of people living in public MR/DD institutions in Oklahoma decreased from 422 to 384. This was a 9% decrease while nationally the average census decrease in states was 7%. In FY 2006, Oklahoma placed 10.9 individuals in public institutions per 100,000 citizens in the general population. The national average is 12.9.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Grade: C</i></p>

 **Reliance on Public Institutions Decreasing**

Oklahoma followed the national trend toward decrease utilization of state operated institutions. The utilization rate per 100,000 citizens placed Oklahoma 26th among all other states and the placement rate is now below the national average. In 2006 ten states and the District of Columbia did not serve any people in public institutions.

STATE INSTITUTION DAILY COSTS

2000	2002	2004	2006
<p>Between 1996 and 2000, the daily cost of care in state MR/DD institutions in Oklahoma increased, in inflation adjusted dollars, by 22% from \$286.22 to \$386.25 per day. The national average in 2000 was \$320.66</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Grade: Pass</i></p>	<p>Between 2000 and 2002, the daily cost of care in state MR/DD institutions in Oklahoma decreased slightly, in inflation adjusted dollars, by 6% from \$386 to \$384 per day. The national average increased to \$369 per day.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Grade: Pass</i></p>	<p>Between 2002 and 2004, the daily cost of care in state MR/DD institutions in Oklahoma decreased slightly, in inflation adjusted dollars, by 6% from \$384 to \$380 per day. The national average decreased to \$365 per day.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Grade: Pass</i></p>	<p>Between 2004 and 2006, the daily cost of care in state MR/DD institutions in Oklahoma increased from \$380 to \$468 per day. In inflation adjusted dollars this was a 10% increase. The national average increased 5% to \$469 per day.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Grade: Pass</i></p>


 **Rate increasing but now at national average**

It is hard to grade spending levels because as long as Oklahoma continues to provide services in state institutions, we need to provide adequate care. The spending commitment to those in institutions in Oklahoma has increased but is now at the national average rate rather than above it.

“OK” continued on pg 5

PEOPLE WITH DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES IN NURSING FACILITIES


2000	2002	2004	2006
<p>Between FY 1996 and 2000, the number of residents with developmental disabilities in nursing facilities in Oklahoma increased 33% from 912 to 1,210. This was the largest percentage increase among all states in the nation. Oklahoma had 36 placements of people with developmental disabilities in nursing facilities for every 100,000 citizens in the general population. This was the highest rate for any state.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Grade: E</i></p>	<p>Between FY 2000 and 2002, the number of residents with developmental disabilities in nursing facilities in Oklahoma decreased 17% from 1,210 to 1009. Oklahoma had 29 placements of people with developmental disabilities in nursing facilities for every 100,000 citizens in the general population. There are now only two states that have a higher utilization rate.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Grade: E</i></p>	<p>Between FY 2002 and 2004, the number of residents with developmental disabilities in nursing facilities in Oklahoma decreased 31% from 1,009 to 692. Oklahoma had 20 placements of people with developmental disabilities in nursing facilities for every 100,000 citizens in the general population. There are now only seven states that have an equal or higher utilization rate.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Grade: D (for effort)</i></p>	<p>Between FY 2004 and 2006, the number of residents with developmental disabilities in nursing facilities in Oklahoma increased 19% from 692 to 821. Oklahoma had 23.3 placements of people with developmental disabilities in nursing facilities for every 100,000 citizens in the general population. There are now only six states that have an equal or higher utilization rate.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Grade: E</i></p>

 **Utilization of nursing homes going up**

In Oklahoma we have always had a high utilization rate for nursing facilities among all populations, not just people with developmental disabilities. The utilization rate for people with developmental disabilities is moving in the wrong direction – up. The average state has a utilization rate of 11.4, which compared to Oklahoma’s 23.3 per 100,000 of general population. The percentage increase in nursing home placements was higher than the overall increase in out-of-home residential placements during the period.

HOME AND COMMUNITY BASED SERVICES (HCBS) WAIVER

2000	2002	2004	2006
<p>Oklahoma served 3,276 people in the HCBS waiver program. The state spent \$32.62 in federal dollars for HCBS services for every citizen in the general population. This ranks Oklahoma 16th among all states. Federal waiver spending accounted for 43% of total spending on MR/DD service in Oklahoma.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Grade: B</i></p>	<p>Oklahoma served 4,198 people in the HCBS waiver program. The state spent \$64 in federal dollars for HCBS services for every citizen in the general population. This ranks Oklahoma 18th among all states. Federal waiver spending accounted for 51% of total spending on MR/DD service in Oklahoma.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Grade: B</i></p>	<p>Oklahoma served 4,267 people in the HCBS waiver program. The state spent \$61 in federal dollars for HCBS services for every citizen in the general population. This ranks Oklahoma 24th among all states. Federal waiver spending accounted for 51% of total spending on MR/DD service in Oklahoma.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Grade: C</i></p>	<p>Oklahoma served 4,838 people in the HCBS waiver program. The state spent \$65 in federal dollars for HCBS services for every citizen in the general population. This ranks Oklahoma 28th among all states. Federal waiver spending remained at 51% of total spending on MR/DD service in Oklahoma.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Grade: C</i></p>

 **More people are being served by the HCBS waiver.**

The number of people served in the HCBS waiver increased while the fiscal effort, relative to other states, has decreased, lowering Oklahoma’s fiscal effort ranking (spending based on population size) from 24th to 28th in comparison to other states. While the Oklahoma program is serving more people, other states have shown greater improvements.

“OK” continued on pg 6

FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAMS

2000	2002	2004	2006
<p>Oklahoma is one of only 19 states that have a cash subsidy program to support families. The program served 997 families and spent \$2,690,199. In the same year Oklahoma spent another \$20,826,303 on other family support programs. In all family support programs Oklahoma served 1,990 families and spent an average of \$11,817 per family. Oklahoma served 59 families per 100,000 citizens. Based on this factor, Oklahoma ranked 35th among all states for fiscal effort. Based on spending levels, per family served however, only two states spent more per family in their family support programs.</p> <p><i>Grade (funds spent): A</i> <i>Grade (number served): C</i></p>	<p>Oklahoma is now one of only 21 states that have a cash subsidy program to support families. The program served 1,551 families and spent \$4,000,658. In the same year Oklahoma spent another \$42,376,789 on other family support programs. In all family support programs Oklahoma served 3,228 families and spent an average of \$14,367 per family. Oklahoma served 92 families per 100,000 citizens. Based on this factor, Oklahoma ranked 33rd among all states for fiscal effort. Based on spending levels per family served, however, Oklahoma spent more per family in their family support programs than any other state.</p> <p><i>Grade (funds spent): A</i> <i>Grade (number served): C</i></p>	<p>Oklahoma is now one of only 22 states that have a cash subsidy program to support families. The program served 1,735 families and spent \$4,195,150. In the same year Oklahoma spent another \$40,250,543 on other family support programs. In all family support programs Oklahoma served 3,617 families and spent an average of \$12,288 per family. Oklahoma served 103 families per 100,000 citizens. Based on this factor, Oklahoma ranked 28th among all states for fiscal effort. Based on spending levels per family served, however, Oklahoma ranks fifth among all states.</p> <p><i>Grade (funds spent): A</i> <i>Grade (number served): C</i></p>	<p>Oklahoma is now one of only 23 states that have a cash subsidy program to support families. The program served 2,077 families and spent \$4,972,075. In the same year Oklahoma spent another \$38,710,603 on other family support programs. In all family support programs Oklahoma served 4,615 families and spent an average of \$9,465 per family. Oklahoma served 131 families per 100,000 citizens. Based on this factor, Oklahoma ranked 23rd among all states for fiscal effort. Based on spending levels per family served, however, Oklahoma ranks 12th among all states.</p> <p><i>Grade (funds spent): A</i> <i>Grade (number served): C</i></p>

 **Relative spending level high but number served low**

The cash subsidy program remains one of the highpoints of family support in Oklahoma. In all family support programs, based on the size of the state’s population, Oklahoma still does not serve as many people as many other states. While the number of families served has increased, overall funding has decreased, reducing the average spent per family.

CAREGIVERS AGED 60+

2000	2002	2004	2006
<p>An estimated 8,728 individuals with developmental disabilities live in households with caregivers older than 60 years of age.</p>	<p>An estimated 9,065 individuals with developmental disabilities live in households with caregivers older than 60 years of age.</p>	<p>An estimated 9,088 individuals with developmental disabilities live in households with caregivers older than 60 years of age.</p>	<p>An estimated 9,115 individuals with developmental disabilities live in households with caregivers older than 60 years of age.</p>

 **More individuals in households with older caregivers**

In Oklahoma the number of individuals with developmental disabilities living in households with caregivers older than 60 years of age increased as the average age of the population of the state has increased. This continues to be a potential significant factor impacting the future need for services

“OK” continued on pg 7

STATE EFFORT FOR SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT PROGRAM


2000	2002	2004	2006
<p>There were 48 people served and \$3.85 spent per citizen in the general population. There were 20 states that served more people, adjusted for state population, but only 10 states that spent more money per citizen in the general population for employment programs provided by the primary MR/DD agency.</p> <p><i>Grade (funds spent) : B</i> <i>Grade (# served) : C</i></p>	<p>There were 76 people served and \$4.60 spent for every citizen in the general population. There were five states that served more people, adjusted for state population, and only six states that spent more money per citizen in the general population for employment programs provided by the primary MR/DD agency.</p> <p><i>Grade (funds spent) : A</i> <i>Grade (# served) : A</i></p>	<p>There were 79 people served and \$5.70 spent for every citizen in the general population. There were six states that served more people, adjusted for state population, and only five states that spent more money per citizen in the general population for employment programs provided by the primary MR/DD agency.</p> <p><i>Grade (funds spent) : A</i> <i>Grade (# served) : A</i></p>	<p>There were 86 people served and \$6.63 spent for every citizen in the general population. There were six states that served more people, adjusted for state population, and only four states that spent more money per citizen in the general population for employment programs provided by the primary MR/DD agency.</p> <p><i>Grade (funds spent) : A</i> <i>Grade (# served) : A</i></p>

 **Spending and people served increased**

Relative to our state population Oklahoma has continued a strong commitment to serving people in supported employment programs in comparison to other states.

COMMITMENT TO SUPPORTED EMPLOYMENT

2000	2002	2004	2006
<p>DDSD provided support employment services to 1,630 individuals. Of those receiving employment services, 46% were served in supported or competitive employment. In all states only 23% of participants worked in supported or competitive employment. Nationwide there were only two states that had a higher percentage of employment program participants served by the state MR/DD agency in supported or competitive employment.</p> <p><i>Grade: A</i></p>	<p>DDSD, provided supported employment services to 2,641 individuals. Of those receiving employment services, 59% of all participants were served in supported or competitive employment. In all states only 24% of participants worked in supported or competitive employment. There now is no other state that has a higher percentage of employment program participants served by the state MR/DD agency in supported or competitive employment.</p> <p><i>Grade: A</i></p>	<p>DDSD, provided supported employment services to 2,778 individuals. Of those receiving employment services, 71% of all participants were served in supported or competitive employment. In all states on average only 24% of participants worked in supported or competitive employment. There now is no other state that has a higher percentage of employment program participants served by the state MR/DD agency in supported or competitive employment.</p> <p><i>Grade: A</i></p>	<p>DDSD, provided supported employment services to 3,029 individuals. Of those receiving employment services, 86% of all participants were served in supported or competitive employment. In all states on average only 21% of participants worked in supported or competitive employment. There now is no other state that has a higher percentage of employment program participants served by the state MR/DD agency in supported or competitive employment.</p> <p><i>Grade: A</i></p>

 **We're #1 in supported/competitive employment**

Oklahoma's strong commitment to serving people in supported and competitive employment settings continues and relative to other states the commitment has increased.

"OK" continued on pg 8

Summary

Based on the data reported in this publication, Oklahoma's system of services for people with developmental disabilities still has many reasons to be proud:

- More people are being served in the HCBS Waiver.
- The dependence on large public institutions is decreasing
- Relative to the size of our population, Oklahoma spends more on family support per family served than all but 11 other states and is one of a minority of states that provide a family cash subsidy.
- Oklahoma is committed to supported and competitive employment and leads the nation in this area.

Between 2004 and 2006, however, there are some trends that should be of concern to all advocates for people with developmental disabilities:

- Overall funding for services decreased.
- Number of individuals served in nursing facilities is increasing and the utilization rate is increasing.
- An increase in the individuals served in HCBS waiver services was achieved despite an overall decrease in waiver spending by decreasing the average cost of care of each person served. This was achieved by focusing on the in-home support waiver rather than out of home placement.
- Relative to the state population, the commitment to funding programs for people with developmental disabilities has decreased compared to other states.
- Relative to other states Oklahoma still serves too many individuals in settings with a large number of residents.

The key factor driving many of these trends in Oklahoma and throughout the nation continues to be a lack of growth in funding and outright reductions. While most states experienced funding challenges in this time period, Oklahomans with developmental disabilities appear to have been more severely impacted than in most other states. This data does not reflect more challenging funding problems experienced by Oklahoma since FY 2006.

Is Oklahoma making the grade? Compared to where the state was in 2006, I would have to say "no". If this was a student report card, I would have to send it home with the following note added: "Student is not working up to their ability." Oklahoma has done better and needs to restore some of the gains achieved in past years and move beyond past milestones rather than fall further behind. Certainly, this data illustrates how important ongoing advocacy is for people with disabilities. When budgets get tight, they loose. Looking at future budget projections guarantees that advocates can never let their guard down.

The Year of the Community

On the tenth anniversary of the Supreme Court's landmark decision in *Olmstead v. L.C.*, President Obama launched "The Year of the Community" for HHS and HUD to work together to improve opportunities for people with disabilities to live in the community. Following-up on the White House announcement HHS Secretary Kathleen Sebelius announced the formation of an HHS Coordinating Council, to be led by the Office on Disability, to address policies that prevent people with disabilities from living in the community. See:

<http://www.hhs.gov/news/press/2009pres/06/20090622a.html>.

HUD Secretary Shaun Donovan announced that HUD will fund 4,000 Section 8 Housing Choice vouchers targeted to non-elderly persons with disabilities, 1,000 of

which will be reserved for individuals transitioning from ICF/MRs, nursing homes, and other institutions. See: <http://www.hud.gov/news/release.cfm?content=pr09-095.cfm>.

Secretary Donovan's statement was accompanied by a Proposed Notice of Funding Availability. See: <http://edocket.access.gpo.gov/2009/pdf/E9-14651.pdf>.



*Help TARC
by becoming a
member today.*

TARC
helps families

Call 1-800-688-TARC or visit
www.ddadvocacy.net
to become a member of TARC.

Disability By the Numbers

The July 26th Anniversary of the ADA is an appropriate time to look at the numbers that remind us of the presence of people with disabilities in our country.

Population Distribution

- 41.2 million

Number of people who have some level of disability. They represent 15 percent of the civilian noninstitutionalized population 5 and older.

By age :

- 6 percent of children 5 to 15 have disabilities.
- 12 percent of people 16 to 64 have disabilities.
- 41 percent of adults 65 and older have disabilities.

- 15%

Percentage of females with a disability, compared with 14 percent of males.

Source: 2007 American Community Survey <<http://factfinder.census.gov>>

Using or Needing Assistance

- 11 million

Number of disabled people 6 and older who need personal assistance with everyday activities. This group amounts to 4 percent of people in this age category. These activities include such tasks as getting around inside the home, taking a bath or shower, preparing meals and performing light housework.

- 3.3 million

Number of people 15 and older who use a wheelchair. Another 10.2 million use an ambulatory aid such as a cane, crutches or walker.

Specific Disabilities

- 1.8 million

Number of people 15 and older who report being unable to see printed words at all or were blind.

- 1 million

Number of people 15 and older who reported deafness or being unable to hear conversations at all.

- 2.5 million

Number of people 15 and older who have some difficulty having their speech understood by others. Of this number, 431,000 were unable to have their speech understood at all.

- 16.1 million

Number of people with limitations in cognitive functioning, or who have a mental or emotional illness that interferes with daily activities, including those with Alzheimer's disease and mental retardation. This group comprises 7 percent of the population 15 and older. This included 8.4 million with one or more problems that interfere with daily activities, such as frequently being depressed or anxious, trouble

getting along with others, trouble concentrating and trouble coping with stress.

On the Job

- 13.3 million

Number of 16- to 64-year-olds who reported a medical condition that makes it difficult to find a job or remain employed. They comprise 7 percent of the population this age.

- 46%

Percentage of people 21 to 64 having some type of disability who were employed in the past year. The rate ranged from 75 percent of those with a nonsevere disability to 31 percent with a severe disability. For those without a disability, the employment rate is 84 percent for the same period.

- 48%

Percentage of people 21 to 64 with a nonsevere disability who work full time. This compares with 63 percent without a disability and 16 percent with a severe disability.

Income and Poverty

- \$2,250

Median monthly earnings for people 21 to 64 with a nonsevere disability. This compares with \$2,539 for those with no disability and \$1,458 for those with a *severe* disability.

- \$2,252

Median monthly earnings for people 21 to 64 with difficulty hearing. The corresponding figure for those with difficulty seeing was \$1,932.

- 12%

The poverty rate for people 25 to 64 with a nonsevere disability. This compares with 27 percent for those with a severe disability and 9 percent of those without a disability.

Serving Our Nation

- \$28.2 billion

Amount of compensation veterans received for service-connected disabilities in fiscal year 2007.

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States: 2009, Table 505 <<http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/>>.

Accommodations

- 98.5%

Percent of transit buses that were ADA lift- or ramp-equipped, as of 2006. This represents an increase from 61.7 percent in 1995.

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States: 2009, Table 1075 <<http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/>>.

Unless otherwise indicated, all the data are from the Americans with Disabilities: 2005 report at

<http://www.census.gov/Press-Release/www/releases/archives/income_wealth/013041.html>.

An Advocate's Observations on Olmstead's Anniversary and Disability Civil Rights.

By Steve Gold, The Disability Odyssey continues

June 22, 2009, marks the 10th anniversary of the Supreme Court's Olmstead ruling for disability civil rights. Some people have made an analogy between the Olmstead decision and the Brown v. Board of Education decision in 1954. Let's compare them.

Nearly ten years after the black civil rights movement's victory in Brown, incremental, albeit not overwhelming, progress had occurred. Nonetheless, some people thought the black civil rights struggle had stalled.

Nearly ten years after the disability civil rights movement's victory in the Olmstead decision, incremental progress had occurred as well.

But still, more than 313,000 people with disabilities in nursing homes (23% of the total) want to live in the community, and yet are denied their civil right to integration, primarily because of Medicaid's historical bias in favor of segregation. Many of them are on "waiting lists" for their civil rights. Can you imagine a "waiting list" for black civil rights?

While the black civil rights movement achieved its share of victories, it took the March on Washington for Congress to enact both the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Even then, it took the U.S. Department of Justice to take the right actions and really enforce these civil rights.

Remember that Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act prohibited federal subsidies for racially segregated institutions.

So why not similarly rectify segregation for people with disabilities? Doesn't the Olmstead decision, together with the ADA/Section 504, already provide the necessary handles to prohibit federal subsidies to States that limit services only to segregated institutions, thus denying real choices that would enable 313,000 people to reside in the community?

Some say the disability civil rights issue of ending unnecessary segregation must wait. But as Dr. King

wrote, "For years now I have heard the word 'wait.' It rings in the ear of every Negro [person with a disability who is unnecessarily institutionalized] with piercing familiarity. This 'wait' has almost always meant 'never'."



Last year when some disability advocates wanted an explicit reference to ending unnecessary segregation included in the ADA Restoration Act, they were politely told that other issues were the focus: "wait."

This year when people with disabilities with the lowest incomes, who are entirely dependent on Medicaid, have demanded to end unnecessary segregation by having the Community Choice Act included in any health reform legislation, they have been told that the CCA is not the focus of health reform: "wait."

The "wait" to end unnecessary segregation of people with disabilities in institutions may soon turn into a "never" for civil rights.

How hard is it to understand and accept that, but for the denial of civil rights, many institutionalized people with disabilities would live in the community with adequate programs and supports, especially since its cheaper for the federal government and states to provide such programs and supports in the community?

How hard would it be to enact a Disability Civil Rights Act in 2009 to end unnecessary segregation just as Congress did with the Civil Rights Acts in the 1960s? A Disability Civil Rights Act in 2009 to end segregation could not be as inflammatory as enacting the Voting Rights Act of 1964.

Will U.S. Attorney General Holder look to how U.S. Attorney General Robert Kennedy addressed ending discrimination in the 1960s? General Holder could start by looking at the 313,000 people with disabilities living in nursing facilities who have said they do not want to be unnecessarily institutionalized. He could inform states that Olmstead and the ADA/504 requires providing real choice for people with disabilities who are segregated and want to live in the community.

What do we have to do to create the atmosphere of the 1960s for the disability civil rights struggle in 2009?

Autism News Roundup



Online Tool Kit Provides Information and Strategies for First Responders to Promote Safe Interactions with People Who Have Autism

Autism Speaks, the nation's largest autism science and advocacy organization, announced the launch of the Autism Safety Project, an online tool kit for individuals with autism, families, and first responders that provides information and strategies to promote safety in emergency situations. Created to educate and inform emergency personnel about the different challenges faced by individuals on the autism spectrum, the Autism Safety Project is available for free download at <http://www.autismsafetyproject.org/>.

The Autism Safety Project kit is broken down into sections offering information and strategies targeted to specific categories of first responders: police, firefighters, EMS personnel, hospital emergency workers, search and rescue personnel and judicial system employees. Later this summer, the tool kit will be expanded to include information for teachers, school administrators, security personnel and emergency dispatchers. Within each section there is information about autism characteristics and strategies to facilitate safe and productive interactions. The tool kit also features materials to help families be better prepared for an emergency or crisis situation, including tools for creating an effective safety plan. In addition, there is a list of national autism information resources that includes first responder training programs and safety programs for people with disabilities.

"Situations occur every day that require first responders to interact with people who have autism," said Peter Bell, Autism Speaks executive vice president of programs and services. "The Autism Safety Project offers information and strategies to bridge the gap that is often found between people with autism and emergency personnel and increase the access and availability of information to promote safety and awareness."

"As a police officer, 9-1-1 instructor, and the parent of two children with autism, I feel particularly strongly about the need for greater autism awareness among first responders and encouraging safer interactions with

individuals on the spectrum," said Radcliffe Kenison, chair of Autism Speaks' Western New England Walk Now for Autism. "The Autism Safety Project kit offers valuable information that I hope many first responders will take the time to read and use on the job."

The tool kit is a collaborative effort with first responder organizations across the country, many of which already provide training for first responders and resources to their respective communities. The information in the Autism Safety Project was compiled by autism professionals in conjunction with first responders as well as parents. An advisory committee reviewed the project and provided further input.

"The Autism Safety Project is an important tool that will benefit both individuals with autism and first responders, who are often taken aback when they encounter a person with autism in a crisis situation for the first time," said Captain William A. Cannata, Jr., a 30-year veteran of the fire service and an officer with the Westwood, Mass., Fire Department. "We want to make first responders more familiar with some of the unique behaviors associated with autism and connect them with training programs that model positive interactions."

Source: Autism Speaks

Ad Campaign Launched for Federal Reform

Autism Speaks has launched an ad campaign in various publications to raise awareness about the need for Congress to act on federal autism insurance reform and for members of Congress to become cosponsors of the Autism Treatment Acceleration Act (ATAA). A key provision of the ATAA requires insurance companies from coast to coast to provide coverage of medically necessary autism treatments, such as Applied Behavior Analysis (ABA) therapy. You can download and print out a copy of the Autism Speaks ATAA ad at: http://www.autismvotes.org/atf/cf/%7B2A179B73-96E2-44C3-8816-1B1C0BE5334B%7D/AS_09_Autism_Votes_Ad_Nat_Jour_01.pdf.

Source: Autism Speaks



TULSA ADVOCATES FOR THE RIGHTS OF CITIZENS WITH DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES

16 EAST 16th STREET SUITE 405
TULSA, OKLAHOMA 74119-4447

NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
TULSA,
OKLAHOMA
PERMIT #909

RETURN SERVICE REQUESTED

The TARC newsletter is published monthly by the Tulsa Advocates for the Rights of Citizens With Developmental Disabilities, Inc., to inform readers about issues and legislative action that affect adults and children with developmental disabilities, their families, and professionals working in the field of developmental disabilities. The contents do not necessarily represent the official position of TARC.

Copyright 2008, TARC. All Rights Reserved.

HELP TARC HELP FAMILIES-BECOME A MEMBER TODAY!

Families in Transition

Families in Transition is a support group for parents of adult children with developmental disabilities.

**Next Meeting:
August 12th
6:30 p.m.**

Contact Amie Farinella, 918-582-8272
For more information

Connections Asperger's Group

**Next Meeting:
Wednesday, July 22nd-4:30 p.m.
Hardesty Library, 8316 E. 93rd St.**

The "Connections" Asperger's Group is a social skills group for adolescents and young adults with Asperger's Syndrome. The group meets monthly. Contact Sherilyn or Amie at 918-582-8272 for more information.

Hispanic Parents Support Group
El Grupo Hispano de Apoyo a Padres de Familia

**Next Meeting: Monday, July 27th
7:00 to 8:30 p.m.**
St. Thomas Moore Catholic Church,
2720 S. 129th E. Ave., Tulsa

Contact Zaida at 918-582-8272 for more information.



links to support, to information, to friends.
Support Group for Adults with Asperger's Syndrome

**Next Meeting:
Wednesday,
July 15th
6:30-8:00 p.m.**

Brookside Library, 1207 E. 45th Pl.

Links is a support group for adults with Asperger's Syndrome. Contact Amie Farinella, 918-582-8272 for more information.

Day Makers Activities group for adults with developmental disabilities

Contact: Amie, 918-582-8272

Tuesdays • 10:00-11:30 a.m.
Gatesway Foundation-Mabee Gym
1217 E. College in Broken Arrow

Thursdays • 1:00-2:30 p.m.
McClure Recreation Center
7440 E. 7th Street in Tulsa

MOMS & DADS SUPPORT GROUP

**Next Meeting:
Thursday,
July 30th
7:00-9:00 p.m.**

Kirk of the Hills Presbyterian Church
4102 E. 61st St., Room B-8

The mission of the Moms & Dads Support Group is to nurture and support families whose children have a developmental disability, to encourage positive strategies in dealing with challenges, and to share in the joys of raising our children.

For more information, contact Sherilyn, 918-582-8272

1ST TULSA PEOPLE FIRST
Tulsa People First

**Next Meeting:
Ryan's Steakhouse
11th and Elgin**

July 14th
Dinner 5:30
Meeting 6:30

For more information please contact Amie Farinella
918-582-8272

Support Group for Families of Children with Special Needs in Sapulpa

**Next Meeting:
Tuesday, July 21st, 6:30 p.m.**

CREOKS Behavioral Health, 23 E. Ross in Sapulpa
Childcare is not provided, but please take advantage of Sapulpa's great Respite Care Program

For more information, contact Mindy Littlefield, 378-5632