



## **ADALIVE! EPISODE 60: Supported Decision Making (SDM) Conservatorship**

**Event Date:** September 5, 2018

**Presenters:** Jonathan Martinis, Senior Director for Law and Policy, Burton Blatt Institute

**Host:** Peter Blanck, University Professor and Chairman, Burton Blatt Institute at Syracuse University

**VOICE-OVER ANNOUNCER:** Blog Talk Radio. (Music) Welcome to WADA ADA Live! Talk radio. Brought to you by the Southeast ADA Center, your leader for information, training and guidance on the Americans with Disabilities Act. And here's your host.

**PETER BLANCK:** Good afternoon everyone and welcome to WADA, ADA live. On behalf of the southeast ADA center, the Burton Blatt Institute at Syracuse University and the ADA national network, welcome to episode 60 of ADA Live! Hello! My name is Peter Blanck. I'm chairman of the Burton Blatt Institute at Syracuse University and a university professor at Syracuse. Historically, people with cognitive disabilities have been placed under legal guardianship regimes, often losing their right to make their own decisions about life issues such as where to live, and whether to work, marry or receive health care. Supported decision making, also known as SDM, by contrast, offers an continuity for many adults with different types of disabilities to make their own decisions consistent with fundamental legal and human rights and an emerging national consensus. Before we begin, as a we minder, ADA Live! Listening audience, you can submit your questions about community living and policy at any time at [adalive.org](http://adalive.org). That's [adalive.org](http://adalive.org).

It's my pleasure now to introduce today's guest, Jonathan Martinis. Jonathan is the senior director of law and policy at the Burton Blatt Institute. He's a nationally and internationally recognized expert on SDM, supported decision making. He has over 20 years of experience representing, counseling and advocating for people with disabilities, to ensure that they receive the services and supports they need and want to live full, meaningful and community integrated lives to the maximum extent possible. Welcome Jonathan!

**JONATHAN MARTINIS:** Hello, Peter. Thank you so much for having me.

**PETER BLANCK:** During today's broadcast, Jonathan, we will be discussing many of the recent court cases where you were involved, and others, in which the rights of persons with disabilities were restored using SDM and supported decision making teams were established. It's a pleasure to be with you today Jonathan.

**JONATHAN MARTINIS:** And you, Peter.

**PETER BLANCK:** Jonathan, there have been several important recent court cases regarding individuals with disabilities, cognitive and other disabilities, whose rights have been restricted, but then they were restored when a supported decision making agreement or framework was introduced. A great one to start with is the case which has received national acclaim in which you were counsel, and that is the well known Margaret Jenny Hatch case. Perhaps you can tell me and our listeners about the background of this case and why it is considered such a landmark advancement.

**JONATHAN MARTINIS:** I would be happy to but I have to warn you to please stop me if it's time to ask another question. Because I can talk about this case all day. As background, for those of you who may be unfamiliar with supported decision making, if you ask yourself what is supported decision making. If you ask me that question, the answer I have is this, how do you make decisions. Everyone out there, everyone listening to my voice makes decisions in the same way. You have people in your lives you asked for advice. You do research, you consider your options, you have people you go to; you probably have someone in your life you go to for advice on relationships

or advice on money or like me on car repairs. When you're doing that, you're getting information that you need to make the decisions you need to make. That's supported decision making. The interesting thing about supported decision making it shouldn't need a name. It should just be decision making, but it's how we all do it. It's only people with disabilities who wind up needing the label like supported decision making and Jenny is a perfect example.

Peter, think about for a moment the things in your life that are most important to you. The things you can do during the day, you can choose, you can decide what to do, you can decide who to spend time with, you can decide where to go. You've already decided where you live and where you work. Those are really basic rights that we all have. And Jenny had them to for the first 29 years of her life. And then one day she walked into a courtroom and three hours later she had none of them. Because in just three hours, she was placed under a guardianship where all of her rights were taken away. Where the people who were assigned to be her guardians now had the power to decide where she lived, whether she got health care, where she worked. She wasn't allowed to go back to her job, where she went to church. She wanted to go to her church and was told no, the people in our group home go to this other church. So Jenny had all the rights you have, Peter. And then she lost all of them in just three hours. When we went to court for Jenny, and I say we because Peter was my chief expert witness, and thank God for it. We talked about Jenny using supported decision making just like we all do. You see, Jenny had people in her life just like we do. She had people in her life that helped her understand the decisions she had to make, for example, when she signed a power of attorney when she turned 18, she worked with a lawyer and everyone agreed that that lawyer helped explain things to her so she could understand the document. When she needed surgery, she spoke with her doctor and with her friends, because at first she was afraid to have the surgery. But when she got information, she agreed to the surgery when she had to do her person centered plan. Everyone agreed that she worked with her case manager to help her understand the plan, so she could sign and agree with it. So Jenny made decisions like you do, and like we do, like we all do. She's a person with a disability, so maybe she needed a little different support than you need. Maybe she needed a little bit more support, but the

principle was the same. Well, after a year and after six days of trial, a judge in a small courtroom in new port news, Virginia became the first trial court to say that Jenny doesn't need a guardian for the rest of her life. That she should work with the people in her life so that she can continue to do what she had done her whole life and what you and I do. And since then Jenny has been free. Once again she can decide where to live, where to go, what to do, who to see, where she works, where she goes to church, just like everyone else. And her case has gotten a lot of attention, I'm glad it has, because it's made people consider what decision making is. And that we all need support. And as a result of that we've really seen a growth in not just the number of people who use it, but the people who say they want to use it. And people who recognize that they already use it. And it's become what I hope is an avalanche. I've always called Jenny the rock that starts the avalanche, and for the past five years that avalanche has been going and helping a lot of people

**PETER BLANCK:** How is Jenny doing today Jonathan?

**JONATHAN MARTINIS:** I speak with her a couple of times a week. She's doing just fine. She is once again she is not under any kind of guardianship. She makes her own decisions. She still gets help to do it. I'm very honored to call myself one of the people who supports her, but Jenny is Jenny. I call her the world's most petite giant, and she continues to be.

**PETER BLANCK:** And what have been some of the more than ripple effects that you've seen in your travels across the country? Are people talking about the Jenny Hatch case?

**JONATHAN MARTINIS:** It's not just talking about the case. It would be great if they were just talking about it, but they're doing something about it. In just the four years since Jenny's decision, we've seen several states pass laws that include and mention and encourage and enable supported decision making. We have seen the federal government fund the national resource center for supported decision making that you and I are involved in and other supported decision making projects. We've seen states take on large task force activities to try to figure out ways to incorporate supported

decision making not just as an alternative to guardianship. It is an alternative to guardianship, but not just that, but as a way to make supports and services that people use better. We've seen supported decision making be advocated to be part of special add education and vocational rehabilitation and person centered planning. You called it ripple effects I would call it tsunamis and it's still going.

**PETER BLANCK:** I'm an advocate and a social scientist. Outside of the advocacy realm, what still needs to be done on the research side to perhaps provide evidence based information for policy makers and law change in the coming years?

**JONATHAN MARTINIS:** There's things going on already, but I'll tell you as a non-researchers what I think is needed and why. One thing I've learned in working with you, Peter, is the concept in research and practice of self determination. Self determination is another word that people never think about if they have it. If you're a person without disabilities you never consider self determination. What it is it's the authority, the power to make decisions for yourself. People are self determined when they make their own decisions, when they make their own choices, when they chart their own course. When you are the captain of your ownership, you are self determined. And people without disabilities never think about that because we assume that we can do that. Well, for people with disabilities who often lose their rights under guardianship, self determination is a big deal. And we have 40 years of studies going back to the '70s, 40 years worth of studies showing that when people are more self determined, people with disabilities have more self determination, they have better lives. Demonstrably better lives. Study after study have shown when people have more self determination they're more likely to be independent, employed, integrated into their communities, healthier, safer, et cetera. So in my mind, if we were able to, through research, show that people who use supported decision making have more self determination than those who don't and who are in guardianship, we would be able to show a direct link between supported decision making and improved lives for people with disabilities. It's, as a nonresearcher, it's common sensical to me, if I make my own decisions as opposed to having someone make them for me under a guardianship, I must have more control over my life and therefore must be more self determined and that's an

easy thing to say. But what we need is empirical evidence that shows that it's true. And I'm proud to be part of a couple of organizations that are collecting that data. We are doing research with partners across the country using empirical recognized evidence based tools to make that determination. Whether or not people who use supported decision making are in fact more self determined. When and if we can do that, I think the avalanche will grow even more.

**PETER BLANCK:** And how are you getting this word out to rural America or areas of the United States which perhaps have less immediate access to advocates like yourself?

**JONATHAN MARTINIS:** Well, I travel a lot. I can tell you there have been trips where I've gone from speaking in San Francisco one day to Festus, Missouri the next. I literally just got back from Columbia, Missouri. Prior to that I was in Florida. I've been in Wyoming. I've been in four cities in Idaho just in the last month. The way to get the word out, Peter, is to get the word out. I think the most important thing we can do, and I say this with respect to you as a researcher, but I think the most important thing we can do is to focus on people. Research is terribly important, but if the people who have to use supported decision making, the people with disabilities, their family members, professionals like teachers and health care workers and case managers, if they're not aware of what supported decision making is and how it can benefit people, then all the research in the world is less important. Because at the end of the day, the people who have to use it, who should want to use it, because it can make lives better, need to know about it. And that's a lot of what I do. I had 2,000 teachers in front of me in Tennessee not that long ago talking about, and I was talking to them about using supported decision making for kids in special education. I have spoken with vocational rehabilitation counselors, Medicaid waiver professionals. I have spoken with professional guardians in Missouri. I spoke at the state conference for their public guardians all about these topics. People need to know how supported decision making fits into their lives. It's not just a theory. It's not just a construct or a research question. It lives and it breathes and it can make people's lives better. The people that we live with, love and work with every day.

**PETER BLANCK:** I know the answer to this question, but why aren't you working on a book so you'll get on the Oprah show so you'll have a book that's relevant and easily accessible and written in that way for parents and providers.

**JONATHAN MARTINIS:** Well I wouldn't do very well on the Oprah show because I have bad knees and could not jump on a couch. Beyond that as you know we are writing a book. More than one, actually. I'm honored to be a co writer with Peter and two other researchers, to be writing the first textbook on supported decision making, one that's going to talk about supported decision making is from a research anal and from an implementation angle and that one is due out in January. And Peter I'm excited to be writing the guide, we anticipate will be published in January from the American Association the AAIDD is the initials. And this one is doing what I talked about that excites me. It's aimed directly at people who use or who will need to use supported decision making. It's written in user friendly language, I hope, that gives practical advice, practical tips and strategies for incorporating supported decision making into your life. Everything from pre K to end of life planning. Ways that we can increase self determination and improve people's controls over their life using SDM.

**PETER BLANCK:** Now before we get to some other cases, which I want to talk about with you, what's Jenny's life going to look like five years from now as this whole new paradigm hopefully plays out?

**JONATHAN MARTINIS:** You know, I really hope Jenny's life looks like it does now, like it always has except for the years she was under guardianship. You know, I hope that she is free to make her own decisions, I hope she has people in her life as she does now to help her make those decisions. My pipe dream would be that supported decisions are funded by vocational rehabilitation as ways to make their systems work. For example under a Medicaid waiver if there is a person like Jenny who might need assistance with decision making in various areas of her life, she could get access to that support or education to help her access that support, through a Medicaid waiver. The whole point of a Medicaid waiver is to help people be more independent. To help people succeed and be included in their communities. If the only purpose of a

Medicaid waiver was to help people get out of institutions, they would go into a group home and never do anything, there's no point to it. But it's the point of a Medicaid waiver is to help people be part of their communities, then supported decision making should be a key part of it. Because people who may not have had choices before, or may not have been aware that they had choices or that they could make choices, unfortunately that's a lot of people with disabilities, can now have the access they need to the things they need to make it happen. And that's what I hope not just for Jenny, but for the millions of other Jennys who are out there who may not know about this, who may now be in guardianship but don't need it, who may be facing a guardianship they don't need. It's worth mentioning, I think I should caveat I'm not here to say there should never be a guardianship. What I say is that people who don't need guardianships like Jenny, or who don't need full guardianships, just need partial guardianships but get full guardianships, those folks don't need guardianships they're in or in general. We call those overbroad or undue guardianship. That's what I'm against and that's what supported decision making can help finally, I hope, bring to an end. That's my other dream.

**PETER BLANCK:** It's a good segue into another question I had for you. And again I know the answer. It's important, as you and I both know, not to cast this paradigm shift or debate as parents versus children or providers versus the people they provide services for. It might be helpful if you articulate why this is a move towards a more collaborative decision and not an adversarial relationship.

**JONATHAN MARTINIS:** Oh, lord, yeah. Again, I travel around the country, and I think I can say without fear of being contradicted that very, very, very, very few people are seeking guardianship to hurt a loved one. There are very few moustache twirling villains out there trying to take away rights intentionally from people with disabilities. No of the typical person seeking guardianship is a parent or a family member or a close friend who wants to help or wants to provide assistance or protection. Even in Jenny's case, the psychologist who testified for the people seeking guardianship said what would be the best for Jenny would be surrounded by people who care for her to support her and give her the assistance that she needs. I love that line. It's one I talk to

parents about all the time. That's what supported decision making is. It's not a parent versus a child. It's a parent and a child working together. That's what every parent does. The first job of every parent is to protect their child. But right with that one is the obligation of every parent to prepare their child as much as possible for adulthood. Because some day the parent is not going to be there. This is the first generation of people with intellectual and developmental disabilities that is outliving their parents. There's going to come a day, by and large, when the parent is not going to be there. The parent, just like they should for the children without disabilities, should be helping that child prepare for that day. And a way to do that is to work together to develop the strategies and skills that person needs to make their way in the world. To make the decisions they have to make, to get the help they have to get. And again I emphasize that's what we do. That's what our parents did for us. They got us ready. They told us what to look out for and what to look for. They gave us advice on how to make decisions and how to make the best possible choices in our lives. Sometimes we follow them, sometimes we didn't. We can do the same thing for people with disabilities. It might be a little different shape, it might be a little bit of different intensity, but the idea flows through. We should be working together on this, not going in separate directions.

**PETER BLANCK:** Now, you've told us about Jenny's case, which was landmark of course, the first in the United States. But you quickly follow that up with another first in the United States, the first time in the district of Columbia that SDM was acknowledged by a court. That case involved a man named Ryan King, I think our listeners would be very interested in hearing about that case and how it builds on the prior case.

**JONATHAN MARTINIS:** It actually built on what we just talked about because Ryan's case is a perfect example of parent and child working together. You see, Ryan's parents, who were his guardians, never wanted to be. When Ryan turned 18, 18 years ago, the District of Columbia government at the time, the developmental disabilities administration at the time told Ryan's parents that if they wanted him to get services, they had to be his guardian. The parents argued we don't want to be Ryan's guardian. We want Ryan to be as independent as possible. We've always talked to Ryan about

making his own decisions and then the government said again, if you want services, you have to be his guardian. So what's a parent to do? They did what they had to. They became his guardians. About seven years later they went back to the court and they said we don't want to be Ryan's guardian. He makes his own decisions. We help him when he needs help, but we want him to be independent and they said we think we might die before he does and we don't want a stranger over him so they asked the court to remove a guardianship and maybe try a power of attorney and the judge declined. The judge said we can always appoint another guardian. So what's a parent to do? They stayed his guardian. Jenny's case happened, they heard about it. They said to themselves this is what we do. They didn't call it supported decision making because frankly no one should. It's just life. They had a life where they supported each other. They worked together to make decisions. So they found me. And we spent a good long time documenting all of the decisions Ryan makes and how he makes them. I actually had a psychologist follow Ryan around for the day to watch him at work interacting with people making decisions, taking his paycheck to the bank where he went to the bank to cash his check specifically so he could make budgeting decisions. Watched him pick out his meals and cook his dinner with the support of his family, manage his medication and manage his life. The psychologist said yes, this young man is doing it, he's living his life with the incredible support of his parents. So we went back to court and we were worried because I can tell you as a lawyer, judges don't like being told they're wrong. They especially don't like being told they're wrong twice. So we told the judge that Ryan would sign a power of attorney. We even drafted it up. We said judge if you get rid of this guardianship, Ryan will sign this power of attorney right here in front of you and it's going to give you that protection that you were worried about, he will say if something happens to me I want mom and dad and my sister to make decisions for me, but in the meantime I would like them to make decisions with me, we'll work together, supported decision making using medical care and financial decisions. So we went through the whole hearing and the judge looked at Ryan, not me, looked at Ryan. And said Ryan, your attorney says you'll sign this power of attorney if I terminate the guardianship and Ryan says yes, sir, I will. And then the judge said you can do that if you want. It's your decision. I'm terminating the

guardianship. It's your life. And just like that, Ryan King, who had been under guardianship for at the time I think 16 years, was free. He became a citizen like that, just like that. Rights that you never thought about, he had. He could decide what he wanted to do. People say to me what's the difference, he was already making his own decisions. The difference is now he had the right to do it. He's a citizen and it matters. I have a picture of Ryan that I show when I do presentations signing the power of attorney when he signed it and the smile on his face says I know exactly what I lost and I know what I've gotten back. And now Ryan too has spoken about supported decision making. He appeared before an American bar association panel along with his mom. We spoke out in California all about this exact issue. That people can work together. He and his mom and his dad, they worked together and his sister, they worked together. It wasn't in fact, even though the case was theoretically Ryan against his parents, because they were his guardians, they were all on the same side. There was never any doubt what the parents wanted. There was never any doubt what the family wanted. And working together, Ryan got his rights back. It's a pretty beautiful thing.

**PETER BLANCK:** And the tsunami effects of Ryan?

**JONATHAN MARTINIS:** In DC we certainly have a work group. And DC has passed a law. The partner in the national resource center for supported decision making played a key in a leading role in that. I can't say enough things about people who have really been advocates from the beginning for choice and for opportunities and inclusion and people with disabilities like Thelma green and others who said we do this. This is our life. We may need support but just needing help to do something doesn't mean you can't do it. Think about, again, in your life, Peter. The times you have asked for advice. When you've asked a doctor to explain a diagnosis, the doctor didn't assume that you were incapable of managing your medical cares, just assumed that you needed help. People with disabilities don't get that benefit of the doubt. By and large, people still assume when they ask for help that they can't do things. And people like Ryan and Jenny and Thelma and so many others are leading the way to show that's just not true.

That we can all manage our lives. Or if we can, we ought to be given the opportunity to manage our lives.

**PETER BLANCK:** Once again, ADA Live! Listening audience. If you have any questions about SDM, or any of our ADA Live! Topics, you can submit them at any time to our online forum at [adalive.org](http://adalive.org). I want to pause for a moment now for a word from our sponsor. The national resource center for supported decision making or the NRC SDM.

**VOICE-OVER ANNOUNCER:** The National Resource Center for Supported Decision-Making, NRC SDM builds on an extensive work of quality just by bringing vast and varied partners to ensure that input is obtained from all relevant stakeholders groups including older adults, people with intellectual and developmental disabilities, family members, advocate, professionals and providers. The NRC SDM partners bring nationally recognized expertise and leadership on SDM. Representing interest and receiving input from older Americans and people with intellectual disabilities. They've applied SDM, developed evidence based outcome measures, successfully advocated for changes in law, policy and practice to increase self determination and demonstrated SDM to be a valid, less restricted alternative to guardianship. Find out more by going to their website at [www.supporteddecisionmaking.org](http://www.supporteddecisionmaking.org).

**PETER BLANCK:** Hi again, we're back to our show. We're talking with Jonathan Martinis who is the legal director at the Burton Blatt Institute and his ground breaking work on SDM and supported decision making. Some of the recent cases he was involved with and the now national and international implications for change with regard to guardianship law and emergence of the paradigm of supported decision making. Jonathan we've been talking about Jenny Hatch's case and Ryan King's case and I know there's another case we've been involved with. A woman named miss Heck. Tell us about the process you were involved with to restore her rights and the implications of this particular case.

**JONATHAN MARTINIS:** I was about as uninvolved in Suzy Heck's case as you can be. What I knew of Suzie of this and also what I've read. Suzy was under guardianship

she's been called both the Jackie Robinson and the Jenny Hatch of Kentucky. When Suzy turned 18 she was placed under guardianship. When she got older she realized she was able to do all these things and wanted to do all these things. So she, with her family's support, contacted the Kentucky protection and advocacy system and worked with a friend of mine to set up essentially a petition asking her to have the guardianship removed. She worked with a psychologist and with a team to show all of the decisions she makes and how she makes them and how she can do it with support and at first in Kentucky it was opposed. In the Kentucky system, because she was under guardianship by the public guardian, the county attorney opposed removing the guardianship. The county attorney said let's have a hearing on this. So what I heard about Suzy is I was doing a training for the Kentucky protection and advocacy staff and some other folks on supported decision making and on putting supported decision making supports and services in place and after the call they were talking to me about Suzy's case and I forwarded some materials. The interesting thing that was used in her case, although I don't think it was determinative, was Suzy used a tool that I train on around the country called a dream board which is a way for people, not just people with disabilities but people, to communicate the choices they want to make, their goals and their objectives and their aspirations. And there's a great picture of Suzy with her attorney and with one of her advocates holding up her dream board and they were prepared to bring that into court to show of course Suzy can play a lead role in deciding what kind of supports and services and what kind of life she has. Look, she already has a plan. This is what she wants to do. And these are the people that she works with to do it. So Suzy was able to demonstrate that she makes her own decisions. And again, that's not a triumph of any lawyer, that's a triumph of humans. They didn't need to call it supported decision making, they just called it life. But Suzy showed she's more than capable of living and directing her own life and everyone agreed. The county attorney withdraw the opposition and just like that, Suzy became the first person in Kentucky to have a guardianship just like that. It's a shame she had to demonstrate what we all should assume, that people, unless proven otherwise, can direct their own lives and make decisions if they get the support they need but Suzy did it and there was a great article that I read about her that she went

out with a friend of hers and her friend's supporter, and she said this is the first time I can think of I was able to leave the house without a caregiver. And it was the first time she had the right to choose how to spend her own money. The article talks about her wanting to buy a DVD copy of a movie, which sounds like a nothing, it's probably a \$5 purchase. But when she was under guardianship, her guardian would have had to okay that purchase. I lectured in Kentucky once well before Suzy's case and I had a case manager come up to me and said she works for the young man who is perfectly capable of making his own choices. Does it all the time, does his plan, wants to get an earring and his guardian said no, we don't believe in earrings in this house. That's the difference. Is even when we mean well, a guardianship over a person who doesn't need one can intrude on the most basic rights, whether to buy a \$5 movie or get an ear pierced. It's why I think supported decision making can change the paradigm, where we can start assuming that people can make decisions, whether to get an earring or to date. In many states a person under guardianship is not allowed to get married. In several states the law says a guardian has the same power as a power does over a child. We have the ability to change that. We have the ability to say that people ought to start from a place where we assume they can do things so they can't. And if they can't do things, truly can't, then guardianship is appropriate. But we shouldn't do that until Suzy didn't suddenly gain skill, no more than Ryan or Jenny did. They had been doing it all their lives, people acknowledged their skill. We assume people have the skill to make their own decisions until proven otherwise, as opposed to you're not allowed to make any decisions until you prove to me that you can.

**PETER BLANCK:** What's your next case? What do you see? Hopefully you'll stay out of court for a while, but do you see any troubling issues down the road that are recurring that may eventually end up in litigation?

**JONATHAN MARTINIS:** I always say the issue is cultural. As a lawyer, of course you always think about what kind of cases there are out there. There are real implications around guardianship for people with all kinds of disabilities, people with serious mental illness, people who may have, need additional support at certain times and not others, or people who are placed under guardianship in the name of protection when there's

no proof that it would protect. I see those, and I see the biggest problem and the problem that we're going to face for a long time, because we have faced it for a long time, is cultural. We are still in a place in this world, not just this country, where we start from an assumption that people with disabilities can't do things and therefore need guardians. I was part of a study a few years ago where we asked parents and we asked people when the first time they thought to get guardianship was, or what their first cue was to get guardianship and frankly we expected it to be from lawyers or family members, but no it was teachers. Number one with a bullet was teachers and educational professionals. The first time was a school telling a parent don't you need to get guardianship or shouldn't you get guardianship and that just reinforces that cultural issues and it makes me ask the question if you're telling a parent to get a guardian at 18, what were you doing for 15 years before that to try to build that student's skills? What have we all been doing? In the district of Columbia where I work, they have the first public school with the first policy incorporating into education I think that could be a long way to defeat those cultural assumptions that people can't do things. That's the biggest, quote unquote, battle on the horizon is we need to convince parents who mean well, who have never been told there's an option under guardianship, who are told they have to get guardianship, like they have to run to the courthouse tomorrow to take away their child's rights, that there are options and that requires people talking about it. It requires the Suzy Hecks and Ryan Kings and Jenny Hatches of the world keep proving they can do what we do. The culture changes and the world changes. I know that's a cliché but if one person at a time shows that supported decision making is a real option, a working option, then maybe someone else is going to see that, just like Ryan saw it after Jenny's case. Maybe someone else will see it and try something else. Maybe a parent will say I shouldn't have gotten guardianship. Not they did anything wrong, but they didn't know like Ryan's parents did. Maybe a parent will reconsider seeking guardianship to at least try something else. And that way one person at a time, one decision at a time, we shift the paradigm and we change the world.

**PETER BLANCK:** Well that's fantastic, Jonathan. It's been a great discussion with you today. Thank you so much. Our guest has been Jonathan Martinis of the Burton Blatt

Institute at Syracuse University. Jonathan, thank you again for being with us today. This episode and all the previous episodes are available on our website at [adalive.org](http://adalive.org). The episodes are archived in a variety of formats including streamed audio, accessible transcripts of audio and are also available to download as podcasts to listen at your convenes. Thank you all again for tuning in today. We're thankful for your support in listening for this series for ADA Live! Remember you can submit any questions on any of these topics by going to [adalive.org](http://adalive.org) and join us on October 3, 2018, for our next episode of ADA Live! When our topic will be on the employment of people with disabilities. In particular, celebration of national disability employment awareness month. If you have questions about the ADA, of course contact your center at 1 800 949 4232 at any time, and remember all these calls are free and they're confidential. Thanks again, Jonathan and thank you all for listening.

**JONATHAN MARTINIS:** Thank you so much. Have a great day.

**VOICE-OVER ANNOUNCER:** Thank you for listening to ADA live! Talk radio. Broad to you by the Southeast ADA Center. Remember to join us the first Wednesday of each month for another ADA topic and call 1 800 949 4232 for answers to your ADA questions.

CAPTIONING PROVIDED BY: ALTERNATIVE COMMUNICATION SERVICES, LLC

\* \* \* \* \*

Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART) is provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility. CART captioning and this realtime file may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings.

\* \* \* \* \*