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Questions

I. What Is Community Living For People with Intellectual And Developmental Disabilities (IDD)?

II. What Are The Key Components Of High-Quality Community Living?

III. How Can Technology Assist In The Attainment Of High-Quality Community Living?

IV. How Can We Promote Access To Technology And Information For Meaningful Participation?
History Lesson
First U.S. State Institution For “Feeble Minded” Syracuse, NY (1851)
New York State Mental Retardation Institution, CIRCA 1960s Expose

*A Christmas in Purgatory* – Photographic essay on mental retardation and the deplorable conditions in institutions where people lived. By Burton Blatt & Fred Kaplan (1966)
Principle Of Normalization

“Normalization was a simple concept...people with and without disabilities should have access to the normal routines and rhythms of American culture.”

- James Conroy
What Is Community Living For People With IDD?

A place to live, simply a location that was in the community
Census Of Institutional Settings From 1844 - 2013


Community Integration And Olmstead

• *Olmstead v. L.C. (1999)*
  
  • Unjustified segregation constituted discrimination in violation of *Title II of Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)*
  
  • Held states are required provide community-based services in the most integrated setting appropriate to their needs
  
  • Moved people with disabilities out of institutional settings and into community homes
Fourteen States And DC No Longer Have State-Operated Institutions

1. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (1991)
2. NEW HAMPSHIRE (1991)
3. VERMONT (1993)
4. RHODE ISLAND (1994)
5. ALASKA (1997)
6. NEW MEXICO (1997)
7. WEST VIRGINIA (1998)
8. HAWAII (1999)
9. MAINE (1999)
10. INDIANA (2013)
11. MICHIGAN (2009)
12. OREGON (2009)
13. MINNESOTA (2011)
14. ALABAMA (2012)

State Operated Institutions In 2013

The average size in New York was 42 residents

37 STATES;
153 INSTITUTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>LARGEST I/DD INSTITUTION CENSUS, 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Texas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Illinois</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mississippi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>New York</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Ohio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If Current Trends Continue There Will No Longer Be State-Operated Institutions In 2028

Source: Braddock, D., Coleman Institute and Department of Psychiatry, University of Colorado, 2015.
“Represented the first step towards recognizing that many individuals at risk for institutionalization can be supported in their own homes and communities, thereby preserving their independence and bonds to family and friends and at a cost not higher than institutional care” - Duckett & Guy (2000)
U.S. HCBS Waiver Participants More Than Doubled From 2000 - 2013

Number of Participants

Fiscal Year
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1,379 18,741 44,713 153,593 308,223 466,040 573,042 631,631 685,597
Where States Proposed To Spend Their HCBS Waiver Money In FY 2013

- Residential Habilitation (48%)
- Day Habilitation (18%)
- Companion, Homemaker, Chore, Personal Assistance, Supported Living (16%)
- Prevocational Services (3%)
- Health and Professional Services (2%)
  - Supported Employment (2%)
  - Transportation (2%)
- Care Coordination (2%)
- Respite (2%)
- Family Training and Counseling (2%)
- Community Transition Supports (1%)
- Assistive and Medical Technologies (1%)
- Financial Support Services (<1%)
  - Adult Day Health (<1%)
- Individual Goods and Services (<1%)
  - Self Advocacy Training (<1%)
  - Education (<1%)
  - Recreation and Leisure (<1%)
- Education (<1%)
- Recreation and Leisure (<1%)
HCBS Community-Based Settings Rule (CMS)

- Is integrated in and supports access to the greater community
- Provides opportunities to seek employment and work in competitive integrated settings
- Ensures services are in the community to the same degree as individuals not receiving services
- Is selected by the individual from among setting options, including non-disability specific settings for a private unit in a residential setting
HCBS Community-Based Settings Rule (CMS)

- Ensures an individual’s right of privacy, dignity, respect, and freedom from coercion and restraint
- Optimizes individual initiative, autonomy, and independence in making life choices
- Facilitates individual choice regarding services and supports, and who provides them
Community Living Is Much More

Provides one stroke to the painting that is our lives
Community Living Means Meaningful Participation

- Employment
- Health and Wellness
- Families
- Social Inclusion
- Self-Determination and Choice

Community Living
Community Living and Participation for People with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities:

What the Research Tells Us

To:    Interested Parties
From: The Association of University Centers on Disabilities (AUCD) and the American Association on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (AAIDD)
Re:    Community Living and Participation for People with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities
Date:  July 24, 2015

Sunday, July 25th is the 25th Anniversary of the signing of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). As he signed the law on the south lawn of the White House, President George H. W. Bush, surrounded by people with disabilities and members of Congress, closed his remarks by stating, "Let the shameful wall of exclusion come tumbling down." Despite great advances in physical access and technology that have made schools, workplaces, and neighborhoods more accessible, there continue to be barriers to equal opportunity, full participation, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency for all people with disabilities.

AUCD supports and promotes a national network of university-based interdisciplinary programs to advance policies and practices that improve the health, education, social, and economic well-being of all people with developmental and other disabilities, their families, and their communities.

AAIDD is a national organization that promotes progressive policies, sound research, effective practices, and universal human rights for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities. Established in 1876, AAIDD is the oldest and largest professional society in the US concerned with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

On this 25th anniversary, we are releasing the attached paper, based on over 50 years of research, to describe how AUCD and AAIDD think the next 25 years of the ADA should translate into access, opportunity, and support for people with disabilities. This work has been shaped by two primary sources: the voices of people with disabilities themselves and the research evidence on achieving the best possible outcomes for people with disabilities. These sources, of course, have also been shaped by our national laws and policies, the most significant being the ADA.
Key Components Of High-Quality Community Living

1. Where and with whom a person lives;
2. Where a person works and how he or she earns money;
3. What a person does during the day;
4. The quality of the relationships developed with others during daily activities;
5. What and with whom a person does activities of personal interest;
6. An individual’s health, both physical and emotional;
7. If, where, and with whom they worship;
8. Their interest and opportunities to engage in learning and personal growth; and
9. Their ability to make informed decisions about their lives (Hewitt, 2014)
Opportunity To Experience The Rhythms And Routines Of American Culture
Where And With Whom A Person Lives

• Nearly 4-in-10 people have never left the place in which they were born
  • The reason people remain in their home state is family ties (Pew Social & Demographic Trends Survey, 2009)

• If they do move, top reasons for moving between 2012-2013 were: 1) Housing-related (48%), 2) Family-related (30%), and 3) Job-related (19%) (U.S. Census Bureau, 2014)
Where And With Whom A Person Lives

• Due to the raising housing prices and unemployment, more young adults are living in the family home - 3.3 Million 30-34 year olds in 2013 (Office of National Statistics, 2013)

• 65% of People in the U.S. live with family members

• 34% of People in the U.S. live with non-family members (U.S. Census Bureau, 2015)
Most People With IDD Live With Family Caregivers

TOTAL: 4,977,911 PERSONS

- With Family Caregiver: 3,556,203 (71%)
- Alone or with Roommate: 785,925 (16%)
- Supervised Residential Setting: 635,782 (13%)

Roughly One Quarter Lived At Home With Aging Caregivers

United States 2013

Caregivers Aged <41
1,445,617

Caregivers Aged 41-59
1,247,516

Caregivers Aged 60+
863,070

TOTAL: 3,556,203 PERSONS

Source: Braddock et al., Coleman Institute and Department of Psychiatry, University of Colorado, 2014, based on Fujiura (2012).
Only A Fraction Of Families Receive Formal Supports

Where A Person Works And How He/She Earns Money

• May 2016 Labor Statistics
  – People with disabilities in the labor force 20.5%
  – People without disabilities in the labor force 68.4%
  – Unemployment people with disabilities 9.7%
  – Unemployment people without disabilities 4.3% (Office of Disability Employment Policy, 2016)
# Top 5 U.S. Occupations

**People without Disabilities**

1. Office and Administrative Support Occupations  
2. Sales and Related Occupations  
3. Food Preparation and Serving Related Occupations  
4. Transportation and Material Moving Occupations  
5. Production Occupations  

*(Occupation Employment Statistics, DOL, 2016)*

**People with Disabilities**

1. Building and Grounds Cleaning and Maintenance Occupations  
2. Transportation and Material Moving Occupations  
3. Personal Care and Service Workers Occupations  
4. Production Occupations  
5. Healthcare Support Occupations  

*(Frank & Clark, 2007)*
Number Of Workers In Supported Employment

INDIVIDUALS WITH I/DD IN DAY PROGRAMS, WORKSHOPS AND EMPLOYMENT: FY 1988-2013

Source: Braddock et al., Coleman Institute and Department of Psychiatry, University of Colorado, 2015.
What A Person Does During The Day

American Time Use Survey, 2014

- Household Activities: 1 hour
- Eating and Drinking: 1 hour
- Leisure and Sports: 5 hours
- Sleeping: 8 hours
- Caring For and Helping Children: 1 hour
- Working on Days Worked: 7 hours

Avg Hours Per Day
Percent Of People With IDD That Engage In Community Activity In The Past Month

National Core Indicators, 2016
Quality Of Relationships With Others During Daily Activities

“Relationship quality depends on beliefs about a relationship partner’s responsiveness—that is, on the perception that a partner understands, values, and supports important aspects of the self. People who perceive their relationship partner as responsive feel close, satisfied, and committed in those relationships.”

(Canevello & Crocker, 2010)
Personal Relationships

Most-Read Articles During April 2016

1. Can you connect with me now? How the presence of mobile communication technology influences face-to-face conversation quality (Przybylski & Weinstein, 2013)

2. Strategic misrepresentation in online dating: The effects of gender, self-monitoring, and personal traits (Hall, Park, Song & Cody, 2010)

3. Too fast, too soon? An empirical investigation into rebound relationships (Brumbaugh & Fraley, 2015)
Technology As A Mechanism For Establishing And Maintaining Relationships

• Those who use Facebook reported 10% closer relationships than non-users (Dellner, 2011)

• Texting is a dominant way of communicating for Americans under 50 (Newport – Gallup, 2914)

• 21% of cell phone owners or internet users in a committed relationship felt closer to their partner because of exchanges they had online or via text (Pew Research Center, 2014)
How heterosexual US couples met their romantic partners 1940-2009

Source: Michael Rosenfeld, Stanford University
How same-sex US couples met their romantic partners 1985-2009

Source: Michael Rosenfeld, Stanford University
Quality Of Relationships For People With IDD

• On average people with IDD have 3.1 people in their social networks (Verdonschot, 2009)
  – Compared to 125 for people without disabilities

• 76% of people with IDD in National Core Indicators (NCI) survey say they have friends that are not staff or family and 79% have a best friend

• 29% of people with IDD in NCI survey say they sometimes feel lonely
What And With Whom A Person Does Activities Of Personal Interest

1. Reading
2. Watching TV
3. Team Sports
4. Shopping
5. Traveling
6. Crafts
7. Watching Sports
8. Bicycling
9. Playing Cards
10. Hiking
Ideal Hobbies

Serve 3 purposes:

1. A diversion (escape from daily life)

2. A passion (engage in something you love)

3. A creation of a sense of purpose

(Brickey, 2000)
What And With Whom A Person Does Activities Of Personal Interest

• Most important aspects of recreation and leisure to youth with IDD
  • Provide opportunity to meet new people
  • Develop intimate friendships
  • Have fun

(Christensen, 2013)
If, Where, And With Whom They Worship

Americans are less satisfied with organized religion then they were a decade ago

### Satisfaction With the Influence of Organized Religion, by Religious Service Attendance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied, want more influence</th>
<th>Dissatisfied, want less influence</th>
<th>Dissatisfied, keep as it is now</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attend church weekly</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend church almost weekly or monthly</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom or never attend church</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jan 5-8, 2015

GALLUP
Spirituality

• 84% of people with and without disabilities considered religious faith “somewhat” or “very important” (Carter, Taylor et al., 2012)

• “Participation suggests that involvement of people with IDD in the life of a faith community may be inconsistently supported or uneven in depth” (Carter, 2013)

• 61% of people surveyed in NCI stated they attended religious services 3-4 times per month (NCI, 2016-2013-14 data)
Normal Routines And Rhythms In American Culture
Morning Routines

• 65% of people sleep with or next to their phones
• 80% of require an alarm clock to wake up in the morning
• 83% of adults in the US drink coffee in the morning – brewed or heated by some technology
• More people now read the news online as opposed to newspapers
## Global Adoption of Technology

### Most Own a Cell Phone

**Do you own a cell phone? Is it a smartphone?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Smartphone</th>
<th>Cell phone but NOT smartphone</th>
<th>No cell phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEDIAN</strong></td>
<td><strong>24%</strong></td>
<td><strong>62%</strong></td>
<td><strong>16%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Percentages based on total sample. U.S. data comes from a January 2014 Pew Research Center survey. Median percentage excludes the U.S.

### Globally, Internet Access Varies Widely

**Do you access the internet at least occasionally? Or do you own a smartphone?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordan</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicaragua</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indonesia</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MEDIAN</strong></td>
<td><strong>56%</strong></td>
<td><strong>44%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** U.S. data comes from a January 2014 Pew Research Center survey. Median percentage excludes the U.S.

Source: Spring 2014 Global Attitudes survey, Q67 & Q69.

PEW RESEARCH CENTER
"Worldwide IT and telecommunications spending will grow 3.8% in 2015 to more than $3.8 trillion and 1/3 of total spending growth will be focused on new technologies such as mobile, cloud, big data analytics and the Internet of Things" – Gil Press, Forbes 2014
Between now and 2018 we’ll see the number of smartphones, tablets, and other connected devices skyrocket.

Smartphone Stats

- 68% of adults now own a smartphone
- Increasing number of aging adults 65+ own smartphones 30%
- Increasing number of those in rural communities 52%
- 52% with a household income of less than $30K
More Smartphone Stats

• 4 out of 5 smartphone users check their phones within the first 15 min. of waking in the morning
  – 80% say it is the first thing they do in the morning

• 1/5 would rather go without shoes for a week than take a break from their smartphone
  REALLY!?!?

• 63% of respondents check their phone for messages or calls once an hour
Nomophobia

“No-mobile-phone-phobia”

• Fear of being without a mobile device, or beyond mobile phone contact
  • Proposal to add to the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual (DSM)

• Average adolescent would rather lose a pinky-finger than a cell phone

• Cellphone vibration syndrome

• Use Screentyme or Menthal apps to track your own time
Internet of Things (IoT)

The interconnection via the Internet of computing devices embedded in everyday objects, enabling them to send and receive data.
Generation Z: Connected From Birth

Born Mid- 1990’s to 2010
Chart 1: An overview of the working generations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formative experiences</td>
<td>Second World War</td>
<td>Cold War</td>
<td>End of Cold War</td>
<td>9/11 terrorist attacks</td>
<td>Economic downturn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rationing</td>
<td>Post-War boom</td>
<td>Fall of Berlin Wall</td>
<td>PlayStation</td>
<td>Global warming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fixed-gender roles</td>
<td>&quot;Swinging Sixties&quot;</td>
<td>Reagan / Gorbachev</td>
<td>Social media</td>
<td>Global focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rock ‘n’ Roll</td>
<td>Apollo Moon landings</td>
<td>Thatcherism</td>
<td>Invasion of Iraq</td>
<td>Mobile focus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nuclear families</td>
<td>Youth culture</td>
<td>Live Aid</td>
<td>Reality TV</td>
<td>Energy crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defined gender roles</td>
<td>Woodstock</td>
<td>Introduction of first PC</td>
<td>Google Earth</td>
<td>Arab Spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>— particularly for women</td>
<td>Family-oriented</td>
<td>Early mobile technology</td>
<td>Glastonbury</td>
<td>Produce own media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Latch-key kids;</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cloud computing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>rising levels of divorce</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wiki-leaks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage in U.K. workforce*</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>Currently employed in either part-time jobs or new apprenticeships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aspiration</td>
<td>Home ownership</td>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>Work-life balance</td>
<td>Freedom and flexibility</td>
<td>Security and stability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward technology</td>
<td>Largely disengaged</td>
<td>Early information technology (IT) adaptors</td>
<td>Digital Immigrants</td>
<td>Digital Natives</td>
<td>&quot;Technoholics&quot; — entirely dependent on IT; limited grasp of alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude toward career</td>
<td>Jobs are for life</td>
<td>Organisational — careers are defined by employers</td>
<td>Early &quot;portfolio&quot; careers — loyal to profession, not necessarily to employer</td>
<td>Digital entrepreneurs — work &quot;with&quot; organisations not &quot;for&quot;</td>
<td>Career multitaskers — will move seamlessly between organisations and &quot;pimp-up&quot; businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signature product</td>
<td>Automobile</td>
<td>Television</td>
<td>Personal Computer</td>
<td>Tablet/Smart Phone</td>
<td>Google glass, graphene, nano-computing, 3-D printing, driverless cars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication media</td>
<td>Formal letter</td>
<td>Telephone</td>
<td>E-mail and text message</td>
<td>Text or social media</td>
<td>Hand-held (or integrated into clothing) communication devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication preference</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Face-to-face ideally, but telephone or e-mail if required</td>
<td>Text messaging or e-mail</td>
<td>Online and mobile (text messaging)</td>
<td>Facetime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference when making financial decisions</td>
<td>Face-to-face meetings</td>
<td>Face-to-face ideally, but increasingly will go online</td>
<td>Online — would prefer face-to-face if time permitting</td>
<td>Face-to-face</td>
<td>Solutions will be digitally crowd-sourced</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentages are approximate at the time of publication.
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The Quality Of Relationships
What And With Whom A Person Does Activities Of Personal Interest

Uber

Basic Fit

Reading Pen

Meetup

Virtual Shelves

Find Me A Hobby
Technology And Worship

Virtual Church

What platforms are churches using?

Social Media

Digital Passages
Federal Initiatives

• Federal Communications Commission – Summit on Telecommunication Needs of People with Cognitive Disabilities
  October 28, 2015

• U.S. Department of Labor Office of Disability Employment Policy – Partnership on Employment & Accessible Technology (PEAT)

• Department of Justice Disability Rights Section–Accessibility cases: Peapod, edX, and H&R Block
  • Launch new Accessible Technology Section
    https://www.ada.gov/access-technology/index.html
Inclusion Paradox

• With all of these technologies readily available, and industry and federal initiatives focused in accessible technologies why do we continue to struggle to provide people with disabilities, particularly those with cognitive disabilities, access to information and technology?
Technology Use By People With Disabilities

- Technology is appreciably underutilized by people with intellectual and developmental disabilities (I/DD) (Tanis, Palmer, Wehmeyer, Davies et al., 2012)
  - The number of people with (I/DD) who need a device outnumber those identified as already using a device/technology in 4/5 life domains
  - Contributing factors to underutilization:
    - Cost of device
    - Lack of information about a device/technology
    - Inadequate training to use the device
- Technological Divide
- Mobile Devices
  - Popularity of smart phones and tablets
  - Physical, sensory, and cognitive accessibility issues
  - Need for personalization and compatibility across platforms
Barriers Remain

- Physical Access
- Universal Design
- Literacy Skills
- Opportunity
- Transmission Pathways
- Social Context
- Economic Barriers
“Federal regulation mandating that information technology platforms be accessible to all, including persons with disabilities, would be one important step to opening more opportunities,” Harkin said. “The ADA covers IT, no doubt about it,” he said.
The Rights of People with Cognitive Disabilities to Technology and Information Access

Whereas

- Twenty-eight million United States citizens have cognitive disabilities such as intellectual disability; severe, persistent mental illness; brain injury; stroke; and neurodegenerative disorders such as Alzheimer's disease;
- People with cognitive disabilities are entitled to inclusion in our democratic society under federal laws such as the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act (DD Act), the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, and under state and local laws;
- The disruptive convergence of computing and communication technologies has substantially altered how people acquire, utilize, and disseminate knowledge and information;
- Access to comprehensible information and usable communication technologies is necessary for all people in our society, particularly for people with cognitive disabilities, to promote self-determination and to engage meaningfully in major aspects of life such as education, health promotion, employment, recreation, and civic participation;
- The vast majority of people with cognitive disabilities have limited or no access to comprehensible information and usable communication technologies;
- People with cognitive disabilities must have access to commercially available devices and software that incorporate principles of universal design such as flexibility and ease of use for all;
- Technology and information access by people with cognitive disabilities must be guided by standards and best-practices, such as personalization and compatibility across devices and platforms, and through the application of innovations including automated and predictive technologies;
- Security and privacy must be assured and managed to protect civil rights and personal dignity of people with cognitive disabilities;
- Enhanced public and private funding is urgently required to allow people with cognitive disabilities to utilize technology and access information as a natural consequence of their rights to inclusion in our society;
- Ensuring access to technology and information for the 28 million people with cognitive disabilities in the United States will create new markets and employment opportunities; decrease dependency on public services; reduce healthcare costs; and improve the independence, productivity, and quality of life of people with cognitive disabilities.

Therefore

We hereby affirm our commitment to equal rights of people with cognitive disabilities to technology and information access and we call for implementation of these rights with deliberate speed.

View endorsers of this document and join us at: colmaninstitute.org/declaration
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EXAMPLES OF THE 467 ENDORSING ORGANIZATIONS IN THE U.S.
Declaration Implementation Grants (DIGS)

Technology in the Heartland: Ensuring Iowans experiencing disability are not left behind

To increase awareness of the Declaration across the state of Iowa in both the self-advocacy and provider communities. It will also help to further address needs identified in our technology needs assessment and seed promising practices in service provider agencies. These activities will set the base for a strong effort to ensure the infusion of technology in the everyday lives of Iowan's who experience cognitive disability.
In addition to the innovative technology initiatives we already have underway, we believe the widespread adoption of the Declaration will require an integrated education plan focused on several key groups - including people with I/DD and their caregivers, rehabilitation professionals, special educators, direct support professionals, government funders, and local legislators.
Declaration Implementation Grants (DIGS)

You, Me, and Technology: Spreading the Word

A 12-month educational campaign whereby a team of self-advocates will be trained and supported to educate others including individuals with cognitive disabilities, their support networks, YAI staff, and the community at large. Self-advocates will learn about the Declaration and develop both in-person and online training's on what the Declaration means to them as well as how its tenets can be actualized.
The Lab provides comprehensive technology training to enable people with I/DD to master digital and pre-employment skills. The Arc of the Capital Area in Austin Texas will embed the Declaration and its principles of access to technology and information into its curriculum, in order to raise awareness and promote adoption of the Declaration among self-advocates, family members, service providers, and the community at large.
Advancing and Promoting the Rights of People with Cognitive Disabilities to Technology and Information Access in Philadelphia

A multi-pronged outreach proposal designed to raise awareness and engagement of the Declaration through; disability training with the Philadelphia school system, mini-grants, and local and state legislative actions, the Arc of Philadelphia intends to produce measurable results in awareness and demonstrated implementation.
complacency today...
...catastrophe tomorrow?
Championing The Rights of People With Cognitive Disabilities
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SAVE THE DATE

October 6, 2016
Broomfield, CO
Chairman Tom Wheeler
Federal Communications Commission

As 31st Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, Chairman Wheeler’s call to industry for a “Cognitive Accessibility Pledge” is an important step forward in securing technology equality for people with cognitive disabilities and their families:

“I have seen up close and personal the power of Internet applications to help individuals with cognitive disabilities learn and achieve independence.”

Richard Ellenson
CEO, Cerebral Palsy Foundation

Richard Ellenson is the father of an 18-year-old son who has cerebral palsy. As founder and CEO of two assistive technology companies, Blink Twice and Panther, he has guided the development of technology which has helped transform and re-imagine the field of assistive technology for people with disabilities.
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