



Protection and Advocacy and Client Assistance Program
Services in the 4th Congressional District

Fiscal Year 2020

CONTENTS

BACKGROUND..... 3

CLIENTS..... 4

 Clients by Age 5

 Clients by Race and Ethnicity 5

SERVICE REQUESTS 6

 Service Requests by Program..... 6

 Priority Areas Covered by Service Requests..... 6

 Service Requests Specific to the 4th District 7

PROJECTS..... 9

 Systemic Issues 9

 Coalition Building..... 12

 Veterans’ Issues 13

 Contact information..... 133

BACKGROUND

DISABILITY RIGHTS ARKANSAS (DRA) is a private, non-profit agency located in Little Rock, Arkansas. Since 1977, DRA has been designated by the Governor of Arkansas as the independent Protection and Advocacy system for persons with disabilities in Arkansas. DRA operates under authority outlined in federal law, is funded primarily by the federal government, and is governed by a board of directors. DRA collaborates with other disability rights and civil rights organizations, social service agencies, the private bar, and legal services agencies to accomplish identified goals and objectives.

Protection & Advocacy for Individuals with Mental Illness (PAIMI)

PAIMI serves individuals with a diagnosis of serious mental illness. PAIMI prioritizes services to individuals receiving care and treatment in a facility and has a mandate to investigate complaints of neglect and abuse. See the Protection and Advocacy for Individuals with Mental Illness Act of 1986, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 10801 *et seq.*

Protection & Advocacy for Individuals with Developmental Disabilities (PADD)

PADD serves individuals with developmental disabilities, including intellectual disabilities, autism spectrum disorder, epilepsy, cerebral palsy, and neurological impairments. A developmental disability is a mental or physical impairment beginning before the age of 22 which is likely to continue indefinitely, limits certain major life activities, and reflects a need for special care, treatment, and/or individualized planning. See the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act of 2000, 42 U.S.C. § 15001, *et seq.*

Client Assistance Program (CAP)

CAP assists individuals with disabilities who have questions or who have encountered problems while applying for or receiving vocational rehabilitation (VR) services from state VR agencies. CAP also advocates for those who receive services from independent living centers (ILCs), the Division of Services for the Blind (DSB), and for those applying for or receiving services from tribal VR offices. See the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, Title I, Part B, Sec. 112, 29 U.S.C. § 732.

Protection & Advocacy of Individual Rights (PAIR)

PAIR serves individuals with disabilities who do not qualify for the protection and advocacy services described above. It is not limited to individuals with a specific disability or confronting a particular issue. See the Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights Program of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended, 29 U.S.C. § 794e.

Protection & Advocacy for Assistive Technology (PAAT)

PAAT serves individuals with disabilities with issues related to assistive technology devices and services. This includes investigating the denial of, and negotiating access to, assistive technology devices and services. See the Assistive Technology Act of 2004, 29 U.S.C. § 3004.

Protection & Advocacy for Beneficiaries of Social Security (PABSS)

PABSS serves individuals with disabilities who receive Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI) or Supplementary Security Income (SSI) and who are trying to return to work, obtain employment, or receive certain employment-related training and services. PABBS educates beneficiaries about Social Security’s work incentives and provides vocational rehabilitation and employment services advice. See the Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act of 1999, as amended, 42 U.S.C. § 1320b-21.

Protection & Advocacy for Traumatic Brain Injury (PATBI)

PATBI serves individuals diagnosed with a traumatic brain injury (TBI). PATBI works to ensure that individuals with traumatic brain injuries and their families have access to information, referrals and advice, individual and family advocacy services, legal representation, and support and assistance with self-advocacy. See the Traumatic Brain Injury Act, authorized as part of the Children’s Health Act of 2000, 42 U.S.C. § 300d-53.

Protection & Advocacy for Voting Access (PAVA)

PAVA educates and assists individuals with disabilities so they may enjoy full participation in the electoral process. These efforts include ensuring physical accessibility of polling sites and informing individuals about the rights of voters with disabilities. See the Protection and Advocacy for Voting Access program of the Help America Vote Act of 2002, 42 U.S.C. § 15461-15462.

Strengthening Protections for Social Security Beneficiaries (SPSSB)

SPSSB, also known as the Representative Payee program, serves individuals with disabilities whose social security benefits are managed by a representative payee. DRA coordinates with the Social Security Administration to conduct periodic onsite reviews as well as additional discretionary reviews to determine whether a representative payee is carrying out their duties in keeping a beneficiary safe and ensuring their needs are being met. See the Strengthening Protections for Social Security Beneficiaries Act of 2018, 42 U.S.C. § 405(j).

CLIENTS

The United States Census Bureau’s 2019 American Community Survey indicates the 4th District’s total population is estimated to be 701,945, with a civilian, noninstitutionalized population of 688,307. Of that total, 135,931 (19.75%) have a disability. In FY2020 (October 1, 2019-September 30, 2020), DRA received 190 new service requests from the 4th District, or an average of 16 service requests per month, a decrease of 27% over FY2019.

Clients by Age

While DRA assisted every age demographic in the district, the table below shows that almost 38% of service requests were for clients under the age of 20 and almost 23% of requests were for those ages 55 or older.

Age Group	Number of Service Requests	Percentage
Unknown	2	1%
4 and Under	2	1%
5-9 Years	22	11.6%
10-14 Years	20	10.5%
15-19 Years	26	13.7%
20-24 Years	12	6.3%
25-34 Years	19	10%
35-44 Years	29	15.3%
45-54 Years	15	7.9%
55-59 Years	21	11.1%
60-64 Years	10	5.3%
65 or Older	12	6.3%

Clients by Race and Ethnicity

DRA seeks to provide services to underrepresented groups in our state. The following chart compares race and ethnicity demographics for the entire 4th Congressional District with that of DRA's requests for services in the 4th Congressional District. The district's Hispanic population of 42,280 comprises 6% of the population.

Race	Estimate	As Percentage	DRA SR's	As Percentage
Total Population	701,945	---	---	---
One Race	688,602	98.1%	---	---
White	519,725	74%	136	71.6%
Black or African American	136,528	19.5%	39	20.5%
American Indian and Alaska Native	3,731	0.5%	---	---
Asian	5,026	0.7%	---	---
Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	1,747	0.3%	---	---
Unknown or some other race	21,845	3.1%	11	5.8%
Two or more races	13,343	1.9%	4	2.1%

SERVICE REQUESTS

DRA received 190 requests for services in FY2020 from residents of the 4th Congressional District. The charts below show the distribution of the requests by grant funding and by priority. The “None” category represents requests for services that did not fall into one of the established priority areas; callers with issues that do not meet a priority are still provided assistance, but usually will be offered information and referral services rather than case-level advocacy.

Service Requests by Program

Program Funding Source	CAP	PAAT	PABSS	PADD	PAIMI	PAIR	PATBI	PAVA
Count of Service Requests	9	1	7	61	31	71	7	3

Priority Areas Covered by Service Requests

Priority Area	Count of Service Requests
Abuse, Neglect, and Exploitation	23
Institutionalization of Youth	3
Medicaid/Managed Care	11
Education	29
Employment	9
Self-Advocacy	4
Voting	3
None/Other	108

Service Requests in the 4th Congressional District continue to include issues related to DRA’s efforts to tackle abuse, neglect, and exploitation and resulted in the second highest number of service requests in the 4th Congressional District in FY2020, despite the limitations on monitoring facilities that resulted from the pandemic. Video monitoring, while not ideal, did provide a means to monitor some facilities during the year. Issues impacting youth through placement in treatment and/or detention facilities continue to be a major focus for our attorneys and advocates; while the inability to monitor youth facilities impacted case work numbers, DRA was still able to continue identifying and addressing systemic issues in these facilities. DRA serves as a primary resource for parents and guardians requesting assistance with special education issues, which continues to be the most requested service not only in the 4th District but throughout the state. Many of the requests in the “None/Other” category are education-related; they are not represented in the Education priority because they did not rise

to the severity level necessary to be served under that priority, which is limited to issues involving expulsion/exclusion, nursing services, and transition services. While we understand the need for assistance with education issues is significant, we unfortunately lack the resources to serve everyone who requests our help, so we must limit education cases to the most serious issues and/or the issues where we might be able to achieve a systemic impact. Assistance continues to be provided to clients wanting to return to work and clients whose services are insufficient to allow them to continue to live in the community; DRA has prioritized cases where a decrease in services authorized through the state's Medicaid managed care system may mean they will have to seek institutional placement to have their needs met, a much costlier alternative to community services. Access issues such as architectural accessibility and effective communication, as well as various housing issues, remain a focus for callers as well, even as limited resources prevent DRA from making them a priority.

Whenever possible, DRA seeks to inform and educate clients so they may effectively self-advocate. In addition to empowering an individual to resolve issues for themselves, this serves to make the relationship between the client and the other party less adversarial than when a third party such as DRA intervenes, and is a means for DRA to serve more individuals with fewer resources.

Service Requests Specific to the 4th District

Example 1: DRA was approached by a youth at one of the juvenile treatment centers (JTCs) DRA has been monitoring with a request to assist him with not being able to take a general educational development (GED) test. This youth was at the JTC to receive mental health services with a goal of preventing further contact with law enforcement once he was released. He told DRA monitors he had requested to take the GED exam for which he had been independently studying; however, despite the onsite GED instructor's endorsement of the student's readiness to test, the facility staff repeatedly failed to arrange transportation to the testing site for the student. The facility also had a protocol in place whereby only two residents were permitted to take the test each month, resulting in a months-long delay from the time a resident initiated the process to test until the date in which they could finally take the exam. A DRA attorney advocated for the resident to take the exam without further delay, noting that needlessly prolonging a juvenile's commitment-which occurs when a facility hampers the ability of a resident to meet preconditions for release- risks an infringement on that juvenile's constitutional rights. Ultimately, the facility agreed to ensure that exams would be scheduled in a timelier manner, and this resident earned his GED shortly thereafter.

Example 2: An individual with a spinal cord injury who receives attendant care services to assist him with activities of daily living contacted DRA after his attendant care hours were drastically reduced following a needs assessment, despite a decline in his physical state. The client had experienced several pressure ulcers that were preventing his return to work, and the reduction of attendant care hours were making his return to work less likely. To ensure the client accessed adequate home healthcare services, a DRA attorney appealed the reduction in

hours. After an all-day hearing, the client was permitted to be reassessed consistent with the orders of the hearing officer. After the reassessment, the client was reinstated to his previous number of hours, allowing him the attendant care necessary to address his immediate healthcare needs and removing the barrier to his returning to work.

Example 3: A client with bilateral below-the-knee amputations had been residing in an assisted living facility for several years and wished to continue living there. He receives assistance with transfers and toileting, but had difficulty articulating the level of assistance he requires during a Medicaid assessment. As a result, the assessor determined the client did not require an assisted living level of care. Discharge from the assisted living facility would have had the effect of evicting him from his home in the middle of a pandemic, with no place to go. A DRA attorney represented the client in an administrative hearing before the state Medicaid agency and highlighted the internal inconsistencies in the assessment that should have demonstrated to Medicaid that the client required a greater level of care than the assessment reflected. Ultimately, the hearing officer agreed, and the client was permitted to continue living at the facility.

Example 4: An individual with physical disabilities contacted DRA in September 2020 to request assistance with a county courthouse whose accessible entrance was being kept locked because of the pandemic, requiring all visitors to use the inaccessible front entrance. When the caller complained to the county clerk, she reportedly told him the entrance was locked by order of the county judge and would not be unlocked to accommodate voters with disabilities, despite the courthouse's designation as an early voting site. The judge was reportedly also refusing to post a phone number visitors could call to have it opened on an as-needed basis. DRA contacted the county clerk, who stated the door was now unlocked and would remain unlocked through election day.

Example 5: The parents of a 17-year-old whose dominant arm was amputated in an accident requested assistance from the Client Assistance Program (CAP) when they encountered issues with Arkansas Rehabilitation Services (ARS) funding his rehabilitation services. Upon completing his high school education early via homeschooling, the client intended to enroll in the welding program at the Arkansas Career Training Institute (ACTI). ACTI was a large residential rehabilitation program managed by ARS and shuttered by the Governor about the same time the client was making his post-graduation plans, leaving the client and his parents scrambling to find a welding program and living arrangements elsewhere. ARS offered only minimal tuition assistance and no financial support for living expenses while he attended another welding program. The CAP represented the client in an administrative review, which resulted in ARS providing the client with funding for housing and other needs in addition to his tuition.

Example 6: The parent of a student who was suspended on two occasions for behaviors related to his disability contacted DRA to request assistance in resolving this issue with the school district. As required by federal law, the school district held a manifestation determination review (MDR) to determine whether the behaviors that resulted in the student's suspension

were manifestations of his disabilities; however, there were no behavioral professionals available during the meeting, and the parent was not informed that she had the right to enlist professionals to provide expert opinions to the student's interdisciplinary team about the impact of the student's disabilities on his behavior. The school district insisted that it would consider only the student's attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), since it was the category under which he was identified as eligible for special education and related services. While his parent provided evidence of the significant disabilities that impacted the student's behavior, the school district did not enlist adequate professional input, and they subsequently determined that the student's behavior was not a manifestation of his disability. The student's suspensions were upheld, and the school district subjected the student to progressive, punitive discipline. A DRA attorney filed a complaint with the Arkansas Department of Education, requesting findings and an order requiring the district to conduct a functional behavior assessment as required by federal law, provide behavior supports and services to the student to enable him to receive an education in the least restrict environment, and provide training for school district staff regarding MDR's and the necessity for professional input regarding mental health diagnoses. The school district agreed to all resolutions requested in the complaint. While the results of the student's assessment did not necessitate a formal behavior plan, the school district agreed to provide him with behavior supports to enable him to stay in school.

Example 7: An individual receiving services under Arkansas' Medicaid managed care system, known as the Provider-led Arkansas Shared Savings Entity (PASSE), contacted DRA because a local business that had contracted with his assigned PASSE to install a ramp at his home failed to do so. The PASSE had paid the contractor to build the ramp in October 2019, but they refused to build the ramp even after accepting payment. A DRA attorney filed a grievance with the PASSE on behalf of the client, and the PASSE connected the attorney with a senior investigator from the PASSE's fraud investigations unit. The attorney and the investigator contacted the local business to prevail on them to initiate construction of the ramp; however, they refused. The PASSE ultimately agreed to pay another local contractor to build the ramp, which was completed in April 2020.

PROJECTS

Systemic Issues

DRA has been working to address the overreliance on institutional placements to treat youth diagnosed with serious mental illnesses, as well as youth with less severe mental health and behavioral disorders. These adolescents are often placed in psychiatric residential treatment facilities (PRTFs), juvenile treatment facilities, and/or juvenile detention facilities due to a lack of community-based resources, the proliferation of for-profit residential treatment entities, lax regulations, and a lack of understanding regarding the utility of institutional-based services. Like many other states, Arkansas lacks sufficient community-based resources, and while this issue has been acknowledged by various stakeholders in relation to the state's juvenile justice system, tangible steps to increase community-based services have yet to be formulated. DRA

has discovered an alarming overlap between the juvenile justice system and PRTFs. Among our observations: children being continuously cycled amongst the PRTFs and acute care facilities, children committed to the Arkansas Department of Human Services, Division of Youth Services (DYS) prior to and upon release from PRTFs and acute care facilities, and PRTFs being used as a diversion option from DHS without officials understanding the true nature of the programs or experiences of youth institutionalized in these facilities. Minimal regulations and lax oversight by the state have led to a proliferation of for-profit PRTF beds and facilities in the state, mostly for out-of-state placements. The monitoring of facilities by the state is disjointed and has not adequately addressed health and safety concerns for residents, much less examined the quality of care and outcomes for the youth receiving treatment. DRA monitored, and will continue to monitor, all 12 PRTFs and all five DHS juvenile treatment centers, with a goal of issuing a public report in FY2021 on the overreliance of institutionalization in the state, specifically focusing on PRTFs. The hope is this report will bring attention to the issue and persuade more stakeholders to engage in these issues. We also plan to assess and compare Arkansas' regulations with other states' regulations and work with DHS to propose and advocate for meaningful changes to the state's regulations and oversight of these facilities.

Arkansas- like the rest of the United States and indeed the world- faced an unprecedented public health crisis in FY2020 due to the COVID-19 pandemic. The risk of infection, serious illness, and possible death from this coronavirus, especially among vulnerable populations, led Arkansas to take the extraordinary measure of declaring a public health emergency and closing public schools for much of the 2020 Spring semester; yet the rate of COVID-19 infection in Arkansas continued to rise. COVID-19 infections in the state's correctional facilities made up a substantial portion of the infections statewide; in fact, it was one of the highest prison infection rates in the country. Of particular concern to DRA is the vulnerability of incarcerated people with disabilities, advanced age, and/or underlying medical conditions that could easily render a COVID-19 infection a death sentence. Those individuals with chronic underlying health conditions such as diabetes, heart disease, chronic lung and liver diseases, respiratory disease, and compromised immune systems are at particular risk for grave outcomes from infection. People incarcerated in prisons overall are more likely to have diagnoses of hypertension, diabetes, heart disease, various respiratory diseases, and various infectious diseases, all of which have been found to increase the mortality of a COVID-19 infection. As a result of the sweeping rate of infection within the state prison system due to inadequate precautions, DRA collaborated with the NAACP Legal Defense Fund and the Arkansas chapter of the ACLU in filing a class action lawsuit seeking the implementation of Centers for Disease Control (CDC) recommendations to minimize the risk of an unchecked spread of COVID-19 throughout the prison system. We requested the court mandate CDC precautions including personal protective equipment, social distancing, and access to hygiene and cleaning products. Litigation has continued into FY2021.

As the COVID-19 pandemic began its sweep across the United States, we observed concerning circumstances occurring in other states related to the potential to ration medical care during this crisis. Some states adopted "crisis standards of care" (sometimes called "altered standards of care") to respond to the anticipated or realized shortage of medical resources, particularly

ventilators. Other states have had ventilator allocation policies in place for some time and are now altering or considering altering such policies to meet the current crisis caused by the pandemic. DRA's research determined the Arkansas Department of Health (ADH) had not adopted such a plan in anticipation of the needs of the community during the current COVID-19 health crisis. We wrote to the Governor to request he empower the ADH with the authority to issue crisis standards of care in a way that does not discriminate against individuals with disabilities. In response, the ADH contacted us through their equity office to discuss the standards they had observed. This resulted in communications between DRA, the ADH, and the University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences (UAMS) about the application of bioethics to crisis standards of care and the proper modification of current crisis standards of care. While the Governor subsequently refused to mandate crisis standards of care for the state, DRA was able to collaborate with the ADH and UAMS to ensure a mutual understanding of ethical crisis standards of care that do not discriminate against people with disabilities. DRA was also invited to participate in a committee that was developed to ensure adequate information and education about the COVID-19 pandemic is provided to individuals in unserved and underserved communities around the state.

In response to the COVID-19 pandemic, we had to alter the way that we monitor facilities while simultaneously trying to track and understand these facilities' responses to infectious disease. The increased risk of infection inherent in congregate care settings was not the only risk COVID-19 posed to residents; it also meant no visitation for the residents, no trips outside the facilities, decreased oversight of the facilities, and the potential for substantially decreased staffing due both to infection and attrition based on unwarranted risk. Early in the pandemic, we recognized these realities would exacerbate the problems we had already encountered and foster environments ripe for abuse and neglect. Tracking cases by facility would not be sufficient; therefore, we developed a survey to send to all youth treatment facilities. In developing the survey, we were mindful of balancing our need for comprehensive feedback and an overly cumbersome survey that would negatively impact our response rate, which ended up being 100%. As the pandemic continued, we updated the survey and periodically sent it to facilities. These survey results allowed us to gauge the efficacy of facility precautions and be alert to potential red flags such as high infection rates or significant staff vacancies. Through these efforts we were also able to identify and report discrepancies between infection rates reported to DRA and those reported to the Arkansas Department of Health.

DRA received several complaints from staff at a PRTF regarding the infection control protocols implemented in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. Staff reported that they were not provided masks and had to bring their own, many staff were not wearing masks, residents were not wearing masks, new residents were not being quarantined, and while facility-wide testing occurred, staff were not notified of their results, or the results were inconclusive. DRA monitors conducted video interviews with residents in which they reported that mask-wearing was lax and that if a resident tested positive for COVID-19, they were quarantined in their room, essentially in solitary confinement. Upon receiving this information, DRA staff spoke by telephone with the person responsible for infection control at the facility, who agreed to reinforce the facility's mask policy with staff, ensure masks are provided to all staff and

residents, and investigate allegations that youth testing positive were being kept in their rooms instead of on a dedicated unit that would allow for some movement and interaction.

In FY2020, Arkansas Rehabilitation Services (ARS) informed the Arkansas Rehabilitation Council (ARC) about a proposed merger between ARS and the Division of Services for the Blind (DSB). A meeting was held between the ARC and representatives from ARS to discuss the details of the potential merger. ARS explained that combining the two state agencies would result in a savings that could then be used to increase services to its clients. During the discussion, however, no details were provided as to when services would be consolidated, what the potential savings would be, how that savings would be created, and how funding would be directed towards client services after Year Two. ARS representatives admitted they had not conducted any fiscal impact studies, but still urged the ARC to vote in support of the merger. An ARC member developed a white paper, endorsed by ARS, that provided some insight into a potential merger while still leaving many unanswered questions regarding the impact on client services. During a subsequent ARC meeting, ARS again urged the ARC to support the integrated program, even as the DSB Board was submitting a letter to the Governor in opposition to the merger. In response, the ARC formed a subcommittee and developed a series of questions for the Commissioner to respond to prior to the ARC taking any position on the merger. As FY2020 ended, the ARC was still trying to obtain additional information from ARS and the Governor's office related to any cost savings and the impact a merger would have on client services.

DRA adapted our voting outreach activities during the pandemic to minimize risk both to the individuals we serve and to our staff. To that end we adapted our voter training materials for remote presentations conducted over Zoom. As the pandemic also created issues with travelling around the state to monitor polling sites, we scaled back this work accordingly but still conducted surveys during early voting and on election day. We also began using an online survey tool for polling site monitoring that would allow us to organize our data more efficiently, and we will continue to develop this protocol as pandemic restrictions are lifted in the state. We continued to be in contact with state and county officials regarding accessibility and helped several of them with planning and access concerns in the lead up to the election. We also continued to partner with other voter outreach organizations for training events and registration activities which were conducted remotely, as well as educating individuals on the absentee voting process.

Coalition Building

DRA continues to partner with the Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities (GCDD) and Partners for Inclusive Communities (Arkansas' UCEDD) to collaborate on issues impacting the developmental disabilities community in Arkansas. DRA also continues collaborations with the Trauma Rehabilitation Resources Program and the Traumatic Brain Injury State Partnership Program at UAMS to work on issues impacting individuals who have sustained traumatic brain injuries. DRA is continuously seeking additional opportunities to develop partnerships with various disability communities in Arkansas to address systemic issues impacting those groups.

Veterans' Issues

DRA welcomes the opportunity to work with veterans; we occasionally receive requests for assistance from veterans, typically involving an accommodation they need on the job or at a business or some other public venue because of a traumatic brain injury or PTSD. Should your offices receive requests for assistance from veterans regarding these types of issues, we would encourage your staff to refer them to us for assistance.

We hope this report has been beneficial in providing an overview of our programs and services. Please do not hesitate to reach out to us if we can answer any questions or provide your office with further information about our work.

Contact information:

Tom Masseau, Executive Director
Disability Rights Arkansas, Inc.
400 West Capitol Avenue, Suite 1200
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201-3455
tmasseau@disabilityrightsar.org
501.296.1775
800.482.1174 Toll Free
501.296.1779 Fax
www.DisabilityRightsAR.org