

Digital Law Library


on Guardianship and Disability Rights



Reports, Articles, and Documents Written or
Produced by Attorney Thomas F. Coleman
Legal Director, Spectrum Institute

More than 300 documents with over 2,700 pages:
www.spectruminstitute.org/library

November 1, 2016
Updated: July 26, 2018



In Memory of Mickey Parisio

With inspiration from within and guidance from beyond, I keep writing. It is my intention that these reports, letters, complaints, and educational materials will encourage others to individually and collectively press for guardianship reform in all 50 states – and for guidance from the federal Department of Justice. People with intellectual, developmental, and other cognitive disabilities are entitled to access to justice in these proceedings. It is up to all of us to ensure that the judicial system, legal profession, and legislative process make justice a reality for anyone drawn into litigation that impacts fundamental liberties. We have a long way to go.

– *Thomas F. Coleman*

Contents

Disability and Guardianship Materials	2
Due Process, the ADA, and Access to Justice in Guardianship Proceedings	2
Legal Services for Guardianship Respondents Must Comply with the ADA	5
Deficiencies in California’s Limited Conservatorship System	7
Supported Decision-Making as an Alternative to Guardianship	12
Medical Decision-Making	13
Supported Decision-Making – Focus on California	13
Medical Power of Attorney – Focus on Nevada	13
Modest Reforms in Indiana	14
Protecting the Voting Rights of Guardianship Respondents	14
<u>Complaints Filed with Officials and Agencies</u>	
United States Department of Justice	
– Failure to Provide Effective Legal Representation	15
– Violation of Voting Rights	16
State Bar of California – ADA Non-Compliant Training of County Bar	17
County of Los Angeles – ADA Non-Compliant Legal Services Program	17
Supreme Court of Missouri	17
Supreme Court of Washington	18
Supreme Court of Texas	18
<u>Press Releases</u>	
Access to Advocacy Services and Department of Justice	19
California Senate Judiciary Committee Oversight Responsibilities	19

Voting Rights and Department of Justice	19
---	----

Letters to Officials, Agencies, and Organizations

Attorney General of the United States	20
United States Department of Justice	20
United States Senate	21
Administration on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities	21
National Council on Disability	21
State of California	21
California Legislature	21
California Supreme Court	22
State Bar of California	23
Judicial Council of California	23
Attorney General of California	24
Lieutenant Governor of California	24
Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency	24
Health and Human Services Agency	25
Department of Developmental Services	25
State Council on Developmental Services	25
County of Los Angeles	26
Los Angeles County Superior Court	26
Presiding Judge of the Superior Court	26
Presiding Judge of the Probate Division	27
Other Superior Court Judges	27
Public Entitles in Other States	28

Colorado Supreme Court	28
Colorado State Bar	28
Indiana Supreme Court	28
Indiana State Bar	28
Michigan Supreme Court	29
Michigan State Bar	29
Nevada Supreme Court	29
Nevada State Bar	29
Nevada Commission to Study the Administration of Guardianships . .	29
Ohio Supreme Court	29
Ohio State Bar Association	30
Oregon Supreme Court	30
Oregon State Bar	30
Pennsylvania Supreme Court	30
Pennsylvania Bar Association	30
South Dakota Supreme Court	31
State Bar of South Dakota	31
Utah Judicial Council	31
Utah Governor	31
Washington State Legislature	31
Washington State Supreme Court	32
Washington State Bar Association	32
National Associations	33
American Judges Association	33

Conference of Chief Justices	33
Conference of State Court Administrators	33
National Center for State Courts	33
Uniform Law Commission	33
Disability and Abuse Materials	34
Freedom of Association	34
Prevalence of Abuse	34
Trauma Informed Justice	34
Federal Legislation	35
Safe Schools Study	35
Trauma Informed Politics	35
Freedom from Abuse vs. Right to Marry	36
Spectrum Institute Materials	36



555 S. Sunrise Way, Suite 205
Palm Springs, CA 92264
(818) 230-5156

www.spectruminstitute.org/library
tomcoleman@spectruminstitute.org

Digital Law Library

on Guardianship and Disability Rights

Reports, Articles, and Documents Written or
Produced by Attorney Thomas F. Coleman
Legal Director, Spectrum Institute
www.spectruminstitute.org/library



Award Recipients Dr. Nora Baladerian and Tom Coleman

Thomas F. Coleman has been studying the operations of adult guardianship and conservatorship systems for several years. These are legal proceedings which are authorized by the legislative branch and operated by the judicial branch in all 50 states. The focus of his research started with the limited conservatorship system in California, then expanded to the guardianship system in Washington State, and eventually broadened to review these systems in states through the nation.

His investigation has involved the review of applicable constitutional provisions, statutes, and judicial decisions, as well as studying articles published in law reviews and other professional journals.

Coleman has had conversations with judges, lawyers, legislative staff members, litigants, and disability rights advocates. He has attended conferences

focusing on guardianship reform and has audited training programs for court-appointed attorneys. His investigative work has included an analysis of scores of individual case files and reviews of the administrative records of courts and executive branch agencies.

During the course of his research and analysis of the policies and practices involved in guardianship and conservatorship proceedings, Coleman has produced more than 200 documents – including reports, commentaries, op-ed articles, press-releases, and letters. The *Digital Law Library on Disability and Guardianship* is a collection of these materials. The documents contain the factual findings, legal conclusions, and policy recommendations which have emerged during what may be the most extensive legal investigation of disability and guardianship ever conducted.

Spectrum Institute and its legal director, Thomas F. Coleman, have received awards and commendations for guardianship reform advocacy from an international disability rights group known as TASH, from The Arc of California, and from The Arc of Riverside County. Dr. Nora J. Baladerian has received numerous awards for her work in the field of disability and abuse.

Disability and Guardianship Materials

Due Process, the ADA, and Access to Justice in Adult Guardianship Proceedings



2016 *Pursuit of Justice: Creative Advocacy Activities Advance*
[#001](#) *The Cause of Guardianship Reform*

(A summary and overview of a planned documentary film that will share with a variety of audiences – judges, legislators, attorneys, service providers, government agencies, people with disabilities, seniors, family members, and reform advocates – the need for major reforms in state guardianship and conservatorship systems, telling the story from the perspective of Thomas F. Coleman and a growing group of supporters who are engaged in a “David vs. Goliath” battle to ensure that guardianship respondents receive access to justice as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act; to be produced by documentary film maker Greg Byers (left))

- 2018 *Pursuit of Justice*. (A short film (36 min) documenting the advocacy activities of Thomas F. Coleman, Dr. Nora, J. Baladerian, and a growing network of activists and supporters to improve access to justice in adult guardianship and conservatorship proceedings was released on March 1, 2018. The film, press release, and other written materials are available online at <http://pursuitofjusticefilm.com/> The official poster for the film was released [#002](#))
- 2018 *Beyond Guardianship*. (Spectrum Institute published a summary of proposals made by the National Council on Disability (NCD) calling on the Department of Justice and the Health and Human Services Agency to issue a joint guidance memo to state probate courts on the application of the ADA to adult guardianship proceedings. [#003](#)) On March 7, 2018, Spectrum Institute submitted a set of proposals to NCD recommending actions it could take to advance guardianship reform in the states. [#004](#))
- 2018 *Proposed New Rule in California for Mandatory Training of Conservatorship Attorneys*. (On April 13, 2018, a proposed new rule was released for public comment. The rule adds significant requirements for qualifications and mandatory training requirements of court-appointed attorneys in conservatorship cases. [#005](#)) The new rule was prompted by a report submitted to the Judicial Council by Spectrum Institute in 2015. (See below) Thomas F. Coleman wrote an op-ed for the Daily Journal about the proposed new rule. [#006](#)) He also sent a letter to the Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee recommending that two areas of training be added to the new educational requirements: disability and sexuality; and alternatives to conservatorship. [#007](#))
- 2017 *The ADA and Guardianship Courts* (This commentary takes excerpts from a joint guidance memo issued by HHS and the DOJ to state courts regarding the application of the ADA to child welfare proceedings and applies the principles to adult guardianship proceedings. [#008](#)) The joint memo was issued in 2015. [#009](#))


- 2016 [#010](#) *The Justice Gap: The Judicial Branch Has a Duty to Appoint, Train, and Supervise Attorneys to Effectively Represent Respondents in Guardianship Cases* (A report submitted to the Washington State Supreme Court and published on March 16, 2016 on the website of Spectrum Institute links to 27 references)
- 2016 [#011](#) *Current Law Mandates the Appointment of Counsel: Courts in Washington Just Need to Implement It* (This commentary was submitted to the Washington State Supreme Court on February 11, 2016)
- 2016 [#012](#) *Statutory Right to Counsel for Adults in Initial Proceedings in Probate Guardianships* (A list of states that do and do not require appointment of counsel to represent respondents in guardianship cases, based on research done by the Jenny Hatch Project)
- 2016 [#013](#) *Right to Counsel in Adult Guardianship Proceedings* (A chart showing which states require appointment of counsel, which do not, and which are discretionary, in adult guardianship cases, based on research done by the American Bar Association)
- 2015 [#014](#) *Duties of Court-Appointed Counsel in Conservatorship Cases* (A transcript prepared by Thomas F. Coleman of the remarks of Judge Maria Stratton at a training program sponsored by the Los Angeles County Bar Association given on May 9, 2015)
- 2015 [#015](#) *Proposals to Modify the California Rules of Court for Court-Appointed Attorneys* (A report submitted to the Judicial Council of California on May 1, 2015 provides a framework for new rules governing qualifications, continuing education requirements, and performance standards for court-appointed attorneys representing adults with developmental disabilities in limited conservatorship cases; includes a set of 44 exhibits of more than 240 pages)



Dr. Linda Demer was denied appellate “standing” to argue for her son Greg’s rights

- [2015 #016](#) *Gregory's Law: A Bill to Reaffirm "Next Friend" Advocacy for People with Disabilities* (A report proposing the need for legislation in California to affirm the right of a third party to file an appeal from a conservatorship order in order to defend the rights of a conservatee who has cognitive disabilities and therefore cannot advance his or her own rights on appeal)
- [2015 #017](#) *Gregory's Law: Allowing a "Next Friend" to Appeal on Behalf of a Person with Developmental Disabilities* (An essay summarizing the need for legislation to affirm and clarify the need for modified rules of "standing" in appeals challenging the denial of rights of litigants with developmental disabilities by a trial court or by court-appointed counsel in a trial court)
- [2015 #018](#) *Access to Justice for Limited Conservatees: The Buck Stops with the California Supreme Court* (An essay published on the website of Spectrum Institute and sent to the California Supreme Court regarding the court's supervisory role over the performance of attorneys and its duty to ensure that limited conservatees are receiving access to justice as required by Title II of the ADA)
- [2014 #019](#) *A Strategic Guide for Court-Appointed Attorneys in Limited Conservatorship Cases* (A guidebook designed to assist court-appointed attorneys in California to provide effective representation to clients with developmental disabilities in limited conservatorship cases was published on the website of Spectrum Institute on September 1, 2014 and made available to attorneys attending a training session mandated by the Probate Division of the Los Angeles County Superior Court.)
- [2015 #020](#) *Individual Program Plan (IPP) for Limited Conservatorships: An Essential Advocacy Tool for Court-Appointed Attorneys* (An essay on how a clinical planning process used for identifying appropriate services for adults with developmental disabilities should be used in the conservatorship evaluation and planning process; distributed to attorneys in Los Angeles on April 28, 2015)
- [2015 #021](#) *Limited Conservatorships and the Right to an Attorney: The Role of a Supervisor* (A document submitted to members of the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors summarizing the actions the board can take to protect the right of limited conservatees to effective legal representation by court-appointed attorneys)
- [2014 #022](#) *A Missed Opportunity: Training Program Fails to Help Attorneys Fulfill Ethical Duties and Constitutional Obligations to Clients with Developmental Disabilities* (A report released on September 20, 2014 which documents and analyzes deficiencies in the training program for court-appointed attorneys who represent limited conservatees. The training is mandated by the Los Angeles County Superior Court and sponsored by the Los Angeles County Bar Association.)
- [2014 #023](#) *Adults with Developmental Disabilities Deserve Better: The Appointed Attorney System Should be Reformed* (The first essay written by Coleman about the deficiencies in the court-appointed attorney system operated by the Los Angeles County Superior Court, containing several areas for suggested reform)

Legal Services for Guardianship Respondents Must Comply with the ADA



2016 *Participants and Issues in Guardianship Proceedings: Appointing Counsel is a Necessary ADA Accommodation to Ensure that Respondents with Cognitive Disabilities Have Access to Justice*

(A diagram showing the complexity of a guardianship proceeding and explaining how a respondent not represented by counsel cannot receive access to justice in such a proceeding) ([#024](#))

2016 *Sitting Sucks: 20 States Violate Federal Law by Not Appointing Attorneys for Guardianship Respondents* ([#025](#)) (A list of states that do not require the mandatory appointment of counsel for guardianship respondents and a brief explanation of why the ADA is violated when counsel is not appointed for a litigant with a cognitive disability in a proceeding where liberty is placed in jeopardy)

Due Process Plus

At the very least, probate courts and the attorneys they appoint to represent guardianship respondents must satisfy the requirements of due process of law. But Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act demands that extra attention and services be provided to litigants with intellectual and developmental disabilities in order to ensure they receive access to justice. Thus, "Due Process Plus" is the best way to describe the advocacy and training standards necessary for probate courts and attorneys to comply with the ADA. Nothing less will do.

2016 *ADA and the Right to Competent Counsel in Adult Guardianship and Conservatorship Cases: National Deficiencies in Policy and Practice*

(A brochure announcing the availability of Thomas F. Coleman as a speaker on this topic at conferences and or seminar for judges, attorneys, or lay advocates) ([#026](#))

2015 [#027](#) *Due Process Plus: ADA Advocacy and Training Standards for Appointed Attorneys in Adult Guardianship Cases* (A White Paper submitted to the United States Department of Justice on October 2, 2015 (86 pages), along with a 56-page User's Guide to Reference Materials, and 34 exhibits.) ([#028](#) – Summary of Standards)

2015 [#029](#) *Limited Conservatorships and the Denial of Access to Justice: Who is Responsible Under the ADA – A Suggested Focus of Inquiry for the Department of Justice* (An essay submitted to the DOJ as a follow up to the White Paper submitted on October 2, 2015; shows how various government entities have responsibilities under Title II to ensure access to justice and how failures on their part make them liable under the ADA, including the California Supreme Court, State Bar of California, Judicial Council of California, Los Angeles County Superior Court, Los Angeles County Bar Association, Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, and the Court-Appointed Attorneys)



2015 [#030](#) *Efficiency vs. Justice: A deliberate bypass of legal protections has denied many limited conservatees access to justice in violation of the ADA* (A report submitted to the United States Department of Justice on August 17, 2015, documenting the results of an audit of the practices of court-appointed attorneys representing limited conservatees in the Los Angeles County Superior Court.) ([#020a](#) - A Case Study)

2015 [#031](#) *Legal Services Program Appears to Violate the ADA* (A commentary in the Los Angeles Daily Journal on August 17, 2015 discusses the Efficiency vs Justice report.) An updated version of this commentary was published on the website of Spectrum Institute in 2017. It argues that, as the funding source for legal services for limited conservatees, the County of Los Angeles is also responsible for these ADA violations. [#032](#)

2015 [#033](#) *Deja Vu for Disability Rights at the Justice Department* (A commentary published in the Los Angeles Daily Journal on June 26, 2015 regarding a complaint filed with the United States DOJ alleging that the policies and practices of California's legal services program providing court-appointed attorneys to limited conservatees systematically violated the Americans with Disabilities Act because the legal services are so deficient that they do not provide clients access to justice in these proceedings.)


Deficiencies in California's Conservatorship System

- 2018 [#034](#) *Compliance with the ADA Requires the Sacramento County Superior Court to Appoint Lawyers for All Proposed Conservatees* (This commentary was published after Spectrum Institute learned that the court is not appointing a lawyer for many proposed conservatees, including many who have developmental disabilities and are regional center clients. As a public entity, the court has an obligation to comply with regulations implementing Title II of the ADA. ([#035](#)) The legal basis for the court's obligation to appoint a lawyer for these respondents is spelled out in a section of a White Paper submitted to the United States Department of Justice by Spectrum Institute. ([#036](#)) Spectrum Institute sent the superior court a request for records to verify it is has an ADA complaint procedure whereby grievances can be filed regarding ADA non-compliant practices and procedures. ([#037](#)))
- 2018 *Appointed Counsel is a Necessity in Limited Conservatorship Appeals.* (This commentary was written in support of the request of a 19-year-old autistic woman who filed a notice of appeal from an order placing her under a conservatorship she did not want and appointing someone to be her conservator despite her objections to that person. Since there are virtually never any appeals by conservatees with developmental disabilities in California – because they don't know how to appeal or even that they have the right to appeal – it was an open question as to whether the Court of Appeal would appoint an attorney to represent her at government expense. This commentary was written in support of her request for appointed counsel, which was granted, thereby creating an administrative precedent for future appeals. ([#038](#)))
- 2018 *Access to Justice for the Disabled* (This commentary, published in the Daily Journal legal newspaper on June 11, 2018, explains how a court-appointed attorney in a Los Angeles conservatorship case actively advocated against his own client. The commentary further explains how this violates the client's right under the ADA to have effective legal services in order to give her access to justice and effective communications in the proceeding. ([#039](#)))
- 2017 [#040](#) *Regional Center Conservatorship Assessments: The Need for Guidance and Oversight from the Department of Developmental Services.* (The report focuses on the statutory and contractual provisions regulating the role of regional centers in conservatorship proceedings in California. It calls on DDS to provide necessary guidance and oversight, noting that the failure to do so is adversely affecting the rights of adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities.) A cover letter transmitted the report to the DDS director. ([#041](#)) A letter also transmitted the report to the Association of Regional Center Agencies. ([#042](#)))
- 2017 [#043](#) *Letter sent by Alta Regional Center to Spectrum Institute on March 17, 2017.* (The letter explains that in the region serviced by Alta (Sacramento and surrounding counties) petitions are being filed for general rather than limited conservatorships. As a result, judges are not appointing an attorney to represent these clients, whereas in limited conservatorship proceedings, appointment of counsel is mandatory. Also, the regional center is not even being notified about some of these proceedings so it cannot file a report with the court. Also, the legal services specialist reports that even when attorneys are appointed, they are not knowledgeable regarding disability issues.
- 2017 [#044](#) *Developmental Disability Should Not Become Appellate Invisibility: a call to organizations to join a letter to the California Supreme Court to depublish an appellate decision denying*

third-party standing to appeal on behalf of a litigant with developmental disabilities.

- [2017 #045](#) *Third Party Standing as an ADA Accommodation on Appeal* (A commentary published in the Daily Journal on March 13, 2017 recommends changes in law and appellate practice to allow a third party to advocate for the rights of a litigant with a cognitive disability in an appeal when the litigant is not able to advocate for himself or herself.)
- [2017 #046](#) *Access to Justice: E(quality) = MC-410* (A commentary published in the Daily Journal on January 6, 2017 regarding the need for attorneys to ensure that clients with disabilities are provided the accommodations they need to receive access to justice in court proceedings.)
- [2017 #047](#) *ADA Title II Guidance from the DOJ is Instructive to Participants in the Limited Conservatorship System* (Commentary published on the website of Spectrum Institute explains how new DOJ guidance memo applies to limited conservatorships.)
- [2016 #048](#) *Probate Judge's Remarks Reveal Reasons for Judicial Resistance to Conservatorship Reform* (A commentary published on the website of Spectrum Institute analyzing the remarks of the acting presiding judge of the probate department of the Los Angeles Superior Court during a training of court-appointed attorneys.)
- [2016 #049](#) *Something That's Actually Rigged: The Conservatorship System* (A commentary published in the Daily Journal on November 18, 2016.)
- [2016 #050](#) *Disability Awareness, All Day Every Day (We Need to Fix Complaint Procedures for Disabled Litigants)* (A commentary published in the Daily Journal on November 2, 2016.)
- [2015 #051](#) *Superior Court Judges Are Protecting the County Budget, Not the Vulnerable Adults Who Depend on the Court* (Quotations taken from a report submitted by Spectrum Institute to the Judicial Council of California)
- [2015 #052](#) *Analysis of Tentative Ruling of Judge Daniel Murphy in the Conservatorship Case of Gregory Demer: Errors, Omissions, and Inconsistencies are Abundant* (A review of a tentative ruling in an endlessly contested case in which the conservatee has been repeatedly ordered to visit with his father despite the desire of the adult son not to do so)
- [2015 #053](#) *Why Independence Day Never Comes for Gregory Demer* (An essay written on July 4, 2015 to document how forced visitation violates the basic freedom and independence of a young man who has autism) ([#054](#) – Essay on Right to Avoid Visits)
- [2015 #055](#) *Exhausting State and Local Remedies for Limited Conservatorship Reform* (A list of all officials and agencies that had been contacted by Spectrum Institute about the need for reform as of June 15, 2015)
- [2015 #056](#) *System for Appointing PVP Attorneys Needs an Overhaul* (An essay about the need to revise the procedures for selecting, training, appointing, and disciplining attorneys who are on the list of lawyers eligible for appointments to represent conservatees in the Los Angeles County Superior Court)

2015 *The Department of Developmental Services is Failing to Protect Regional Center Clients in Conservatorships* (An essay about the failure of the California Department of Developmental Services to establish statewide policies to give guidance to regional centers in fulfilling their statutory role to advise the courts of the capacities of clients involved in limited conservatorship cases) ([#057](#) – Number of Cases)



2015 *Limited Conservatorships: Systematic Denial of Access to Justice* ([#059](#))

(A report submitted to the Senate Judiciary Committee of the California Legislature on March 24, 2015, links to 72 pages of reference materials documenting deficiencies in the limited conservatorship system in California). Update: A follow-up communication was sent on March 29, 2018 to a staff member of the committee. ([#060](#))

2015 *Boomerang Justice: When Pressure Tactics Backfire* (An essay written on March 25, 2015, discussing undue influence exerted by a judge and court-appointed attorney to pressure, unsuccessfully, a young adult to say that he liked being with his father) ([#061](#))

2015 *Senate Judiciary Committee – Last Stop Before Federal Intervention* (A press release issued prior to the presentation to the California Legislature on March 24, 2015) ([#062](#))

2015 *Disturbing Details Revealed at Legislative Hearing on the Ability of California Courts to Protect Vulnerable Adults* (A commentary on the testimony of Judge Maria Stratton to the Senate Judiciary Committee; published on the website on March 27, 2015) ([#063](#))

2015 *Legal System Without Appeals Should Raise Eyebrows* (A commentary published in the Los Angeles Daily Journal on February 10, 2015 exposes the fact that there are never any appeals in limited conservatorship cases, thereby depriving the Court of Appeal of the ability to oversee and correct errors and abuses by judges and deficient performance by attorneys.) ([#064](#))

2015 *Reform Long Overdue for State Conservatorship Process* (A commentary published in the Los Angeles Daily Journal on February 5, 2015 discusses the need for systemic reforms to the limited conservatorship system.) ([#065](#))

2015 *State of Denial: Officials in California are Failing to Correct, Much Less Admit, Violations of the Rights of Limited Conservatees* (Letters to government officials asking them to protect the rights of people with developmental disabilities) ([#066](#))



2014 [#067](#) *Limited Conservatorship Trainings of Probate Investigators by the Los Angeles Superior Court: Trainings Deserve a Failing Grade Because Developmental Disability Issues are Virtually Ignored*

(A report released on December 14, 2014 documenting the inadequacy of the training of court investigators who work for the Los Angeles Superior Court.)

2014 [#068](#) *Presentation by Spectrum Institute to the Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee of the Judicial Council of California* (Transcript of a presentation by Thomas F. Coleman, Nora J. Baladerian, Ph.D., and Jim Stream in San Francisco on November 14, 2014 on the need to reform the limited conservatorship system.)

2014 [#069](#) *Statement of Thomas F. Coleman to the Probate and Mental Health Committee of the Judicial Council of California* (A presentation on the need for new court rules and revised policies and practices in limited conservatorship proceedings; presented in San Francisco on November 3, 2014)



Stephen Lopate and Tom Coleman at Judicial Council in San Francisco

2014 [#070](#) *Ten Statewide Concerns About the Limited Conservatorship System* (A summary of areas of concern submitted to the Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee as a follow-up to the presentation on November 3, 2014)

- 2014 [#071](#) *Thinking Ahead Matters: Excerpts from a New Report on the Limited Conservatorship System* (A collection of excerpts from a report titled Thinking Ahead Matters published in August 2014 by the Coalition for Compassionate Care in California that calls for major reforms in the limited conservatorship system in that state)
- 2014 [#072](#) *Gregory's Case: The Tip of an Unconstitutional Iceberg of Disability Discrimination and First Amendment Violations* (An essay using a case study to exemplify how the Los Angeles County Superior Court has become an assembly line of injustices by the manner in which it processes limited conservatorship cases)
- 2014 [#073](#) *Justice Denied: How California's Limited Conservatorship System is Failing to Protect the Rights of People with Developmental Disabilities* (A report released on May 9, 2014 which was submitted to judges, state agencies, and advocacy organizations and which was reviewed by participants at a roundtable conference sponsored by Spectrum Institute on the need to reform the limited conservatorship system in California.)
- 2014 [#074](#) *Ten Is Not Enough: Probate Investigators Cannot Comply with Legislative Mandates* (An essay discussing the under staffing of investigators working for the probate division of the Los Angeles Superior Court.)
- 2014 [#075](#) *Social Rights Advocacy for Adults with Autism: Forced Socialization of Conservatees is Never Acceptable* (An essay on the First Amendment rights of limited conservatees; published on the website of Spectrum Institute on April 17, 2014)
- 2014 [#076](#) *Searching for Clues: Putting Together Pieces of the Limited Conservatorship Puzzle by Examining Court Records* (An essay describing the process of obtaining information about the limited conservatorship system from the Los Angeles County Superior Court.)
- 2014 [#077](#) *A Presentation on Self-Help Clinics Reinforces the Need for Major Reform of the Limited Conservatorship System* (An essay about a legal services program operated by a nonprofit known as Bet Tzedek to help people who do not have an attorney learn how to file petitions initiating a limited conservatorship proceeding.)
- 2014 [#078](#) *A Common Scenario of Assembly Line Justice in Limited Conservatorship Proceedings* (An essay describing how these cases are processed through the Los Angeles Superior Court with utmost efficiency and with little regard for protecting the rights of the respondents.)
- 2014 [#079](#) *Expanding the Role of the Regional Center in the Limited Conservatorship System* (An essay explaining the need for regional centers to become more involved in limited conservatorship cases.)
- 2014 [#080](#) *Limited Conservatorship Reform in California: Several Areas That Need Improvement* (An essay identified aspects of limited conservatorship proceedings that a deficient and need to be reformed)

Supported Decision-Making as an Alternative to Guardianship

2018 [#081](#) *Safe and Legal: Criteria for a Valid Supported Decision-Making Agreement.* (This abstract summarizes the presentation that will be made by Thomas F. Coleman to the World Congress on Adult Guardianship to be held in October 2018 in South Korea.)

2017 [#082](#) *Supported Decision-Making: Considering Safe and Legal Alternatives to Conservatorship* (A PowerPoint presentation to the Public Policy Conference of The Arc of California on March 26, 2017. A video of the presentation is also available. [#083](#).)

2017 [#084](#) *Supported Decision-Making: My Transformation from a Curious Skeptic to an Enthusiastic Advocate* (An essay written by attorney Thomas F. Coleman for distribution at the Public Policy Conference of The Arc of California in Sacramento. The commentary explains cautionary concerns about SDM and gives practical suggestions on how to develop *safe* and *legal* SDM arrangements and agreements.)



2016 [#085](#) *Supported Decision-Making; A Critical Analysis (What Public Officials, Professionals, and Advocates Need to Know – Reducing Risks and Limiting Liability)*

(A special report published on the website of Spectrum Institute on March 27, 2016 links to 17 references and discusses the benefits and risks of using supported decision-making agreements, especially for vulnerable adults at risk for abuse

and undue influence)

2015 [#086](#) *Supported Decision Making is a Right that Needs to Become a Reality* (An essay supporting the concept of supported decision making as an alternative to guardianship for some adults with developmental disabilities – if it is done the right way.)

2014 [#087](#) *Supported Decision-Making: Implications for Seniors* (An essay that argues against the repeal of guardianship laws because supported decision-making would not be a viable alternative for many seniors with cognitive disabilities.)

2014 [#088](#) *Supported Decision-Making: Adverse Effects on Rape Prosecutions* (An essay that highlights some unanticipated consequences of creating a conclusive presumption that all adults have the capacity to make all decisions – a premise adopted by some proponents of supported-decision making who want guardianship laws to be repealed.)

2014 [#089](#) *The Effect that Senate Ratification of the U.N. Convention on Disability Rights May Have on Current Guardianship Laws* (An essay discusses how the ratification of this treaty by the Senate is unlikely to require repeal of state guardianship laws.)

Medical Decision-Making


- 2015 [#090](#) *Intellectual Disability and Medical Decision-Making Bills: New Legislation May Not Avoid the Need for Guardianships* (Announcement of an informational briefing planned for August 7, 2015 for attorneys, parent advocates, sibling advocates, and self advocates about guardianship and alternatives for medical decision-making)
- 2014 [#091](#) *Framework for Model Legislation on Medical Supported Decision-Making* (An essay published on the website of Spectrum Institute on December 14, 2014, in response to a proposed model bill drafted by the Autistic Self Advocacy Network.)
- 2014 [#092](#) *A Review of “Model Legislation” for Supported Medical Decision-Making Agreements: The Defects are in the Details* (An essay published on the website of Spectrum Institute on July 21, 2014 that critically analyzes model legislation developed and promoted by the Autistic Self Advocacy Network. The ASAN proposal was later amended to conform to the principles contained in the framework developed by Spectrum Institute.)
- 2014 [#093](#) (Original Version of) *Model Legislation for Supported Decision-Making Violates Medical Ethics* (An essay published on the website of Spectrum Institute on July 21, 2014 analyzes model legislation developed by the Autistic Self Advocacy Network.)
- 2014 [#094](#) (Original Version of) *Model Legislation for Supported Decision-Making Violates the Supremacy Clause* (An essay published on the website of Spectrum Institute on July 21, 2014 analyzes legislation developed by the Autistic Self Advocacy Network.)

Supported Decision-Making – Focus on California

- 2014 [#095](#) *Principles of Supported Decision-Making Already Exist in California Law* (An essay published on the website of Spectrum Institute on June 20, 2014)
- 2014 [#096](#) *Should the Limited Conservatorship System be Improved or Eliminated Altogether: Some Concerns about Supported Decision-Making* (An essay published on the website of Spectrum Institute on June 14, 2014 in response to calls by some disability rights advocates for the outright repeal of guardianship and conservatorship systems, with supported decision-making agreements as an alternative.)

Medical Power of Attorney – Focus on Nevada

- 2015 [#097](#) *An Analysis of Nevada Assembly Bill 128: Bill’s Passage Would Diminish the Rights of People with Developmental Disabilities* (This report – submitted to the Nevada Legislature on February 19, 2015 – points out that the bill is a form of substituted decision-making (not supported decision-making) and raises serious concerns regarding capacity to contract and informed consent. The bill was substantially amended to address many of the concerns raised by Spectrum Institute to the Legislature.)



2015 [#098](#) *Clinical Concerns about AB 128: A Medical Power of Attorney for People with Intellectual Disabilities* (This essay, written by Dr. Nora J. Baladerian in consultation with attorney Thomas F. Coleman, raised serious concerns about this bill from the perspective of a clinical psychologist who provides therapy services to clients with intellectual and developmental disabilities.)

2015 [#099](#) *A Response to Testimony about AB 128* (This essay gives a critical review of the testimony of witnesses who testified in support of AB 128 on February 23, 2015.)

2015 [#100](#) *AB 128 Power of Attorney: Liability Concerns for Medical Providers* (An essay highlighting concerns about deficiencies in the bill and how the use of this medical power of attorney could pose liability issues for medical providers.)

2015 [#101](#) *Concerns for Nevada Medical Providers: Use of AB 128 May Result in ADA Liability and Loss of Immunity* (An essay raises additional concerns about the bill and the risks it creates for medical providers.)

2015 [#102](#) *AB 128 Medical Power of Attorney Form May Not be Understood by Most Adults with Developmental Disabilities* (An essay analyzing the terminology used in the power of attorney form created by AB 128 shows that many of the key words and phrases would not be understood by many people the form was intended to help.)

Modest Reforms in Indiana

2014 [#103](#) *Indiana Reforms Adult Guardianship System: A Statewide Task Force Prompted Several Changes* (An essay about changes in Indiana)

Protecting the Voting Rights of Guardianship Respondents

2016 [#104](#) *Delay and Denial of Voting Rights in California*, Los Angeles Daily Journal, August 26, 2016 (A commentary published in a statewide newspaper for judges and attorneys in California focusing on the need to restore voting rights to tens of thousands of conservatees who had them taken away by state judges in violation of federal rights and disability rights laws.)

2015 [#105](#) *What a Difference a Year Makes: Progress in Securing Voting Rights for People with Developmental Disabilities* (A progress report issued on June 22, 2015 – one year after Spectrum Institute convened a voting rights conference to focus on ongoing and systemic violations of the rights of limited conservatees and how to improve the situation in California.) ([#106](#) - *Collection of Voting Rights Materials*)



Press Conference to File DOJ Complaint on June 20, 2014

2014 *Voting Rights: How California's Limited Conservatorship System is Violating the*
[#107](#) *Voting Rights of People with Developmental Disabilities* (A report for a conference
 by Spectrum Institute on June 20, 2014.) ([#108](#) – Conference Materials) ([#109](#) –
 Results of two audits of cases showing 90% of conservatees lost the right to vote)

2014 *If a Person Can Communicate a Desire to Vote Then the Person Has a Right*
[#110](#) *to Vote* (An essay written on May 26, 2014 for a voting rights conference conducted
 by Spectrum Institute the following month) ([#111](#) – Essay on Arizona Case)

2014 *Voting Rights of People with Developmental Disabilities: Correcting Flaws in the*
[#112](#) *Limited Conservatorship System* (An essay included in a pre-conference report
 submitted to participants at a roundtable on voting rights convened by Spectrum
 Institute in Los Angeles in June 2014)

Complaints filed with Officials and Agencies

United States Department of Justice – Failure to Provide Effective Legal Representation



Press conference announces a new complaint to DOJ

2015 *Complaint to the United States*
[#113](#) *Department of Justice Against*
the Los Angeles County Superior
Court, on behalf of a class of
limited conservatees

(A complaint filed on June 26, 2015
 alleges that the judicial branch in
 California is violating Title II of the
 Americans with Disabilities Act by the
 way in which it provides deficient legal
 services to respondents in limited
 conservatorship proceedings)

2015 [#114](#) *Limited Conservatorships and Denial of Access to Justice: Who is Responsible Under the ADA?* (An exhibit submitted in support of the complaint to the DOJ identifying the various officers and agencies responsible for violating the ADA right of conservatorship respondents to access to justice in these proceedings, and summarizing the policies, practices, and omissions causing such ADA violations)

2015 [#115](#) *Elusive Justice – False Advocacy: A Case Study of Social Rights for Limited Conservatees Reveals a Larger Problem of Defective Legal Representation* (A report filed along with a complaint to the United States Department of Justice on behalf of Gregory Demer, a limited conservatee under the jurisdiction of the Los Angeles Superior Court) ([#116](#) - Complaint / Plus Exhibits [#117](#), [#118](#), [#119](#), [#120](#), [#121](#), F, G)

2015 [#122](#) *Gregory’s Case: The Tip of an Unconstitutional iceberg of Disability Discrimination and First Amendment Violations* (A report documenting how the freedom of association has been systematically violated in this limited conservatorship case.)

2015 [#123](#) *Vanita Gupta, Division Chief, Civil Rights Division* (September 18, 2015) (Letter expanding the complaint against the Superior Court to include the County of Los Angeles for its role in funding the ADA non-compliant legal services program)

2015 [#124](#) *Vanita Gupta, Division Chief, Civil Rights Division* (July 8, 2015) (Letter regarding complaint against the Los Angeles County Superior Court alleging that the program operated by the court for appointing attorneys to represent limited conservatees violates Title II of the ADA and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973)

United States Department of Justice – Violation of Voting Rights

2016 [#125](#) *Amendment to Voting Rights Complaint filed July 10 2014* (Amendment alleges that the State of California is violating federal laws by failing to promptly restore the voting rights of thousands of limited conservatees who had them taken away in prior years in violation of the VRA and the ADA) ([#126](#) – Examples of Violations) ([#127](#) – People with power to make changes) ([#128](#) – Talking Points on Restoration Project)



Gregory Demer, an autistic young man who lives in Los Angeles, had his right to vote taken away by a judge when he was 18. Neither his court-appointed attorney, the court investigator, or the judge in his conservatorship case inquired about Gregory’s desire to vote. The legal system made assumptions that he lacked the capacity to vote. In 2015, after attorney Thomas Coleman wrote an op-ed article exposing the case in the state’s legal newspaper, Los Angeles Superior Court Judge Daniel Murphy entered an order that same day restoring Gregory’s right to vote. Gregory will vote by absentee ballot in the November 2016 election and will be able to cast a ballot for the presidential candidate of his choice.

2015 *Project to Restore Voting Rights* (A collection of materials about the work of Spectrum [#129](#) Institute to have the voting rights of thousands of limited conservatees restored in California) ([#130](#) – 32,000 may need rights restored) ([#131](#) – Warning of problems)

2014 *Voting Rights: How California’s Limited Conservatorship System is Violating the Rights of People with Developmental Disabilities* (A class-based complaint against the Los Angeles County Superior Court alleging that, through limited conservatorship proceedings, judges are routinely disqualifying people with disabilities from voting in violation of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 [illegal literacy test] and Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act [failure to modify programs and practices or to provide reasonable accommodations] filed July 10, 2014.) ([#133](#) – Supporting Materials) [#134](#) – Statement of Thomas F. Coleman at press conference prior to filing complaint) ([#135](#) – DOJ letter to Spectrum Institute / [#136](#) – DOJ letter to State of California)

State Bar of California – ADA Non-Compliant Training Program of County Bar

2015 *Letter to the State Bar in its capacity as administrators of continuing education providers and issuers of MCLE credits* (Letter sent on October 20, 2015, complained that the educational programs of the Los Angeles County Bar Association, for which it issues attorneys MCLE credits as authorized by the State Bar, are not in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act) ([#138](#) – Attachments to Complaint) The complaint was later withdrawn so that the State Bar could focus on pro-active measures to improve access to justice for people with disabilities in limited conservatorship proceedings. ([#139](#))

County of Los Angeles – ADA Non-Compliant Legal Services Program



2015 *Access to Justice: Complaint for Violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act by the County of Los Angeles* [#140](#)

(A report filed with the County of Los Angeles on June 9, 2015 which documents deficient performance by attorneys appointed to represent limited conservatees, deficient training programs for these attorneys, and insufficient oversight of the legal services program by the county – a program which is operated by the Superior Court and which is funded by the county) (Photo: Dr. Nora Baladerian and attorney Tom Coleman outside of the county building on the day the complaint was filed)

([#141](#) – Summary of Complaint) ([#142](#) – Letter withdrawing complaint because the county failed to follow its own procedures)

Supreme Court of Missouri

2017 *ADA Complaint to Supreme Court of Missouri.* (On September 25, 2017, Spectrum Institute filed an ADA administrative complaint with the Supreme Court of Missouri alleging that the state’s adult guardianship system was out of compliance with various requirements of Title II of the ADA and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. ([#143](#)) The complaint was

accompanied by an essay on the duties of the Supreme Court to ensure ADA access to justice for guardianship respondents. (#144) A letter was sent to the United States Department of Justice informing that agency of the complaint to the court. (#145) A follow-up letter was sent to the Chief Justice on March 29, 2018. Along with the complaint were various supporting materials, including an essay on the ADA duties of the Supreme Court, (#146) A follow-up letter was sent to the court on March 29, 2018. (#147) On May 14, 2018, Spectrum Institute received a reply from the clerk of the Supreme Court indicating that the ADA complaint was under review by the court. (#148) A subsequent administrative records request was sent to the court by Spectrum Institute. (#149) It asked for records that pertain to the court's duties under ADA regulations. (#150) Update: The Missouri Legislature passed SB 806 in 2018, making some minor improvements in the state's guardianship system. Spectrum Institute released an analysis of the new law on June 3, 2018. (#151)

Supreme Court of Washington

2017 *ADA Complaint to Supreme Court of Washington State.* (On November 8, 2017, an administrative complaint was filed with the Supreme Court of Washington alleging that the court was violating Title II of the ADA by failing to bring the adult guardianship system into compliance with Title II mandates. It also alleged that the guardianship system was out of compliance with requirements of Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973. (#152) Excerpts from ADA Title II regulations were submitted with the complaint. (#153) A copy of the complaint was sent to the United States Department of Justice for information purposes.) Update: On December 29, 2017, Spectrum Institute received a letter from the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Washington indicating that the full court was reviewing the ADA complaint. (#154) Spectrum Institute sent the Chief Justice a follow-up letter on January 29, 2018. (#155) Along with that letter, we sent her other materials for consideration by the court in connection with the ADA complaint, including: (1) a commentary on how the ADA applies to Washington state guardianship proceedings (#156); facts on the case of Bonnie Jean Southall, a 98-year-old woman under an order of guardianship (#157); and excerpts from the ADA with comments on how they apply to Ms. Southall's case. (#158)

Supreme Court of Texas

2018 *ADA Complaint to Supreme Court of Texas.* (On April 9, 2018, an administrative complaint was filed with the Supreme Court of Texas alleging that the state's guardianship system is out of compliance with the ADA and Section 504. The complaint is patterned on those filed in Washington and Missouri. (#159) It was followed up with an administrative records request. (#160) Testimony to Congress by the Director of the Texas Judicial Council confirmed that the state's guardianship system has major problems that need to be corrected. (#161) A letter Spectrum Institute received from the Supreme Court on May 16, 2018 indicates that the court has not conducted an ADA evaluation of the state guardianship system as required by federal law. (#162)

Press Releases

Access to Advocacy Services and Department of Justice

2015 [#163](#) *Systematic Disability Discrimination by the Los Angeles County Superior Court is Alleged in Complaint to DOJ about Deficiencies in Legal Services Being Provided to Limited Conservatees* (A press release issued on June 26, 2015, announcing the filing of a class-based complaint with the DOJ against the Los Angeles Superior Court for its failure to provide qualified attorneys to represent limited conservatees and for failure to have ADA-compliant standards for such attorneys and to monitor their performance, all of which violates Title II of the ADA)

2015 [#164](#) *Complaint to the United States Department of Justice Against the Los Angeles County Superior Court*, on behalf of Gregory Demer – a limited conservatee under the jurisdiction of the court (A press release about a complaint filed with the DOJ alleging that the court allowed and encouraged deficient performance by the court-appointed attorney representing Mr. Demer in the limited conservatorship case, in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act, resulting in the denial of his constitutional rights.).

California Senate Judiciary Committee Oversight Responsibilities

2015 [#165](#) *Senate Judiciary Committee Hearing is Last Stop Before Seeking Federal Intervention* (A press release issued on March 23, 2015 to announce the filing of a report to and testimony before the California Legislature’s Senate Judiciary Committee about the failure of the judicial branch to comply with Title II of the ADA in its operation of the limited conservatorship system in California)

Voting Rights and Department of Justice



2016 [#166](#) *Amendment to Voting Rights Complaint Filed with the DOJ*

(Photo: Rally after press conference in San Diego)

(A press release issued on August 22, 2016 inviting the media to a press conference to announce the filing of an amended complaint with the DOJ alleging that the failure of the judicial branch in California to reach out to and restore the voting rights of limited conservatees is a continuing violation of the ADA and Voting Rights Act of 1965) ([#167](#) – Media Response)

2014 [#168](#) *Voting Rights Complaint Filed with the DOJ* (A press release issued on July 10, 2014, inviting the media to a press conference to announce the filing of a complaint against the

Los Angeles Superior Court with the United States Department of Justice, alleging that the Superior Court has been violating the federal voting rights of people with developmental disabilities in limited conservatorship cases by stripping litigants of their right to vote in violation of the Voting Rights Act of 1965 and the ADA) ([#169](#) – 5-25-2015 Release)

Letters to Officials, Agencies, and Organizations

Attorney General of the United States

- 2015 [#170](#) *Letter to Loretta Lynch Sent June 26, 2015* (Cover letter for complaint against Los Angeles Superior Court for violating Title II of the ADA for failing to ensure that court-appointed attorneys representing clients in limited conservatorship proceedings are providing ADA-complaint advocacy services in order to ensure client access to justice as required by the ADA)
- 2014 [#171](#) *Letter to Eric Holder Sent July 10, 2015* (Cover letter for complaint against the Los Angeles Superior Court for violating the federal voting rights of limited conservatees)

United States Department of Justice

- 2017 *Letter to John Gore, Acting Chief of the Civil Rights Division of the DOJ.* (A letter was sent on November 1, 2017 encouraging the DO to issue a guidance memo to the states on the application of the ADA to state guardianship proceedings. The letter was prompted by the passage of S. 178 which has a section that directs the DOJ to develop best practices to improve the administration of guardianship proceedings by state courts. ([#172](#)) Update: A reply letter was received from Mr. Gore on January 31, 2018. ([#173](#)))
- 2015 [#174](#) *Letter to Elizabeth Johnson, Senior Trial Attorney, Disability Rights Section, Civil Rights Division, sent on November 2, 2015* (Follow up letter to a meeting with her and attorney Vincente Tenerelli in Los Angeles to discuss the details of the class-complaint regarding court-appointed attorneys and the individual complaint on behalf of Gregory Demer focusing on the deficient and ADA non-compliant performance of his attorney)
- 2015 [#175](#) *Letter to Vanita Gupta, Division Chief, Civil Rights Division* (Letter sent on October 1, 2015 transmitting to her the White Paper titled *Due Process Plus* that includes a set of ADA-compliant standards for training of and performance by court-appointed attorneys who represent guardianship respondents) ([#176](#) – White Paper Materials)
- 2015 [#177](#) *Letter to Vanita Gupta, Division Chief, Civil Rights Division* (Letter sent on September 18, 2015, asking that the original complaint filed June 26, be expanded to include violations by the County of Los Angeles as the government entity that funds the ADA non-compliant legal services program for limited conservatees)
- 2015 [#178](#) *Letter to Vanita Gupta, Division Chief, Civil Rights Division* (Letter sent on July 8, 2015 calling her attention to the fact that two boxes of exhibits were delivered to the DOJ in connection with the complaint filed on June 26, 2015)

United States Senate

- 2014 [#179](#) *Letter to Senator Barbara Boxer* (Letter sent on July 10, 2014 asking her to support our request to the Department of Justice to open an investigation into voting rights violations against limited conservatees by the Los Angeles Superior Court)
- 2017 [#180](#) Letter to Senator Amy Klobuchar (Letter sent on February 21, 2017 asking her to amend S. 182 on elder abuse to include protections for all vulnerable adults.)
- 2017 [#181](#) Letter to Senator Charles Grassley (Letter sent on February 21, 2017 asking him to amend S. 178 on guardianship reform to include protections for all vulnerable adults.)

Administration on Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities



2015 *Letter to Commissioner of AIDD* [#182](#)

(A letter was sent on January 29, 2015 calling attention to the work of Spectrum Institute promoting access to justice for guardianship respondents and asking him to arrange a meeting between Spectrum Institute and the two major advocacy organizations that receive federal funds to protect the rights of people with developmental disabilities) ([#183](#) – Follow Up Letter)

National Council on Disability

- 2016 [#184](#) *Letter to the National Council on Disability* (A letter was sent to the executive director on February 9, 2016, explaining to this federal agency how, through the Americans with Disabilities Act, there is a federal role in ensuring that guardianship respondents with disabilities receive access to justice in state court proceedings as mandated by the ADA)

State of California

California Legislature

- 2017 [#185](#) Letter to Assemblyman Mark Stone (Letter sent on January 20, 2017 to the Chair of the Assembly Judiciary Committee regarding the need for legislative oversight of the limited conservatorship system.)
- 2015 [#186](#) *Letter to Senator Hanna Beth Jackson* (Letter sent on March 24, 2015 to the Chair of the Senate Judiciary Committee asking the Legislature to create a Joint Select Task Force on Access to Justice in Limited Conservatorship Proceedings in order for the Legislature to provide better oversight of the way in which the probate courts are providing protection to vulnerable adults in conservatorships)

- [2015 #187](#) *Letter to Senator Hanna Beth Jackson* (Letter sent on March 20, 2015 to the Chair of the Senate Judiciary Committee asking for time on the agenda to speak at the oversight hearing scheduled for March 24, 2015)
- [2015 #188](#) *Letter to Senator Marty Block* (Letter sent on April 15, 2015 thanking him for introducing Senate Bill 589 to help people with disabilities in conservatorship proceedings retain the right to vote and to help those who had them taken away in such proceedings to regain them)
- [2014 #189](#) *Letter to Assemblyman Steven Bradford* (Letter sent on August 19, 2014, in support of Assembly Bill 131, sponsored by the Secretary of State, in response to the voting rights conference convened by Spectrum Institute in June 2014) ([#190](#) – Essay Published When the Bill Was Enacted)
- [2014 #191](#) *Letter to Assemblyman Bob Weickowski* (Letter sent on April 10, 2014, pointing out the need for a legislative audit and better oversight of the limited conservatorship system which is operated completely within the judicial branch)
- [2014 #192](#) *Letter to Senator Hanna Beth Jackson* (Letter sent on April 9, 2014, pointing out the need for a legislative audit and better oversight of the limited conservatorship system which is operated completely within the judicial branch)

California Supreme Court

- [2017 #193](#) *Letter to the California Supreme Court About Rule of Professional Conduct on Lawyers Communicating with Clients* (Amendment to Rule 4.1) (Letter sent on April 20, 2017 says the rule should address communications with clients who have cognitive disabilities.)
- [2015 #194](#) *Letter to the California Supreme Court in its administrative capacity as a public entity with duties to comply with Title II of the ADA* (Letter sent on October 26, 2015 to the chief justice and associate justice calling attention to the need for the judicial branch to make policy modifications and provide accommodations to ensure that litigants with developmental disabilities have access to justice)
- [2015 #195](#) *Letter to the Chief Justice of California in her capacity as the presiding judge that provides administrative oversight to the State Bar of California* (Letter sent out on November 30, 2015, asks her to bring to the court's attention its duty to ensure that the State Bar provides methods for litigants with cognitive disabilities, especially in limited conservatorship proceedings, to have access to justice in through procedures that allow litigants to complain about deficient performance of their attorneys)
- [2013 #196](#) *Letter to the California Supreme Court in its adjudicative capacity* (Letter sent as friend of the court on behalf of Gregory Demer urging the court to either grant review or de-publish the opinion of the court of appeal; the published opinion ruled that a parent lacks standing on appeal to challenge orders in a trial court that allegedly violate the constitutional rights of an adult child in a limited conservatorship proceeding)

State Bar of California

- 2017 [#197](#) *Letter Executive Director Elizabeth Rindscof Parker* (Letter sent on February 6, 2017, asking the State Bar to take pro-active measures to enhance access to justice for people with intellectual and developmental disabilities in limited conservatorship proceedings. A separate letter was sent to the State Bar Commission on Access to Justice on December 12, 2016. [#198](#))
- 2014 [#199](#) *Letters to the President of the State Bar* (A letter sent to President Craig Holden on November 25, 2015 and a letter to President Louis Rodriguez on August 29, 2014, asking that the Board of Trustees of the State Bar convene a Task Force on Limited Conservatorships to investigate deficiencies in the performance of court-appointed attorneys who represent conservatorship respondents with developmental disabilities)

Judicial Council of California

- 2014 [#200](#) *Letters to the Chief Justice of California in her capacity as Chairperson of the Judicial Council of California* (Eight letters were sent in 2014: May 15, 2015 transmitting the *Justice Denied* report and asking her to convene a Task Force on Limited Conservatorships; letter on June 15, 2014, sending her a report on voting rights violations; letter on June 24, 2014, informing her of growing calls to dismantle conservatorship systems and replace them with supported decision-making agreements; letter on September 22, 2014, bringing to her attention the deficient training of court-appointed attorneys in Los Angeles; letter on November 22, 2014, reaffirming our call for a Task Force on Limited Conservatorships; letter on November 24, 2014, bringing to her attention a new report by the Coalition for Compassionate Concern in California which also calls for a thorough review of the limited conservatorship system in California; letter on December 29, 2014, sharing the report of a Task Force in Indiana that looked into the adult guardianship system in that state and that called for significant reforms.
- 2017 [#201](#) *Letter to Justice Harry Hull, Chair of the Rules and Projects Committee of the Judicial Council of California* (Letter sent on January 20, 2017 asking for a meeting to learn the progress of the work being done by the Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee as it is reviewing the recommendations made by Spectrum Institute for new rules on performance standards and training standards for appointed attorneys who represent adults with developmental disabilities in limited conservatorship proceedings.)
- 2016 [#202](#) *Letter to Justice Harry Hull, Chair of the Rules and Projects Committee of the Judicial Council of California* (Letter sent on February 4, 2016 regarding the Judicial Council authorization for the Probate Advisory Committee to study our requests for new court rules creating ADA-compliant training and performance standards for court-appointed attorneys who represent clients with developmental disabilities in limited conservatorship cases) ([#203](#) – 2016 Advisory Committee Agenda / [#204](#) – Letter)
- 2015 [#205](#) *Letter to Douglas Miller, Staff to PMHAC* (Letter sent on July 23, 2015 to the attorney assigned to assist the Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee)

confirming the contents of our phone conversation that day about the status of our proposals to the committee)

- [2015 #206](#) *Letter to Justice Harry Hull, Chair of the Rules and Projects Committee of the Judicial Council of California* (Letter sent on April 2, 2015 advising him of the status of our work to reform the limited conservatorship system in California)
- [2015 #207](#) *Correspondence with Justice Harry Hull, Chair of the Rules and Projects Committee of the Judicial Council of California* (Letters to and from him in January 2016 asking him to convene a small workgroup to address the issues raised in prior communications)
- [2015 #208](#) *Email to John H. Sugiyama, Chairperson of the Probate and Mental Health Advisory Committee PMHAC* (Email sent on November 17, 2015 in response to his request at a committee meeting that I submit a written list of the 10 statewide concerns I mentioned during my presentation)
- [2015 #209](#) *Letter to John H. Sugiyama, Chairperson of the PMHAC* (Letter sent on April 2, 2015, asking that an advisory committee of community members and advocates be allowed to work with the committee on developing new court rules addressing the concerns raised by Spectrum Institute)
- [2015 #210](#) *Letter to Members of Center for Judicial Education and Research* (A letter was sent on May 1, 2015, along with proposals submitted to PMHAC, so that the judicial education committee could consider developing similar standards for judges who preside in limited conservatorship cases)

Attorney General of California

- [2017 #211](#) Letter to Xavier Becerra, California Attorney General (Letter sent January 20, 2017, inviting the Civil Rights Enforcement Section to work with Spectrum Institute to ensure that state and local government entities are protecting the rights of adults with intellectual and developmental disabilities who are involved in conservatorship proceedings. A follow up letter was sent to the Attorney General's office on February 18, 2017. [#212](#)) A subsequent letter was sent to Mr. Becerra as a candidate for reelection on April 26, 2018. ([#213](#))
- [2014 #214](#) *Letter to Kamala Harris, California Attorney General* (Letter sent May 23, 2014, sending her a copy of the *Justice Denied* report and asking her to fulfill her constitutional duty "to see that the laws of the state are uniformly and adequately enforced" with respect to the limited conservatorship system)

Lt. Governor of California

- [2017 #215](#) *Letter to Gavin Newsom, Lieutenant Governor of California* (Letter sent on January 20, 2017, asking for a meeting to discuss the role he could play to promote improvements in the limited conservatorship system in California.

Business, Consumer Services and Housing Agency

- [2017](#) *Letter to Alexis Podesta, Acting Secretary of the agency that oversees the California*

[#216](#) Department of Fair Employment and Housing – an agency with jurisdiction to investigate violations of the Americans with Disabilities Act by state and local government entities in California. This would include ADA violations by the County of Los Angeles in connection with the legal services program it funds for people with developmental disabilities in conservatorship proceedings.

Health and Human Services Agency

2017 *Letter to Diana Dooley* (Letter sent on January 20, 2017 to the Secretary of the Health and Human Services Agency requesting a meeting to discuss the role of the Department of Developmental Services in limited conservatorship proceedings, especially in regulating and monitoring regional centers.)
[#217](#)

2018 *Letter to Diana Dooley* (Follow-up letter sent on April 16, 2018 notifying her that the Department of Developmental Services never responded to our report and recommendations regarding its role in providing guidance and oversight to regional centers in connection with their obligations to clients who become respondents in conservatorship proceedings. [#218](#)) Attached to the letter were several emails to various department and agency employees over several months. [#219](#))

Department of Developmental Services

2017 Letter to Nancy Bargmann, Director of DDS (Letter sent on April 1, 2017) as a follow up to a meeting between DDS staff, HHS staff, and Spectrum Institute representatives about the need for DDS to provide guidance to and supervision of regional centers in connection with their role in conservatorship proceedings. Supporting materials were also provided. [#221](#).
[#220](#)

2017 Letter to Nancy Bargmann, Director of DDS (Letter sent on January 20, 2017 requesting a meeting to discuss the role of DDS in regulating and monitoring regional centers and their involvement in limited conservatorship proceedings.) Follow-up letter sent on April 1, 2017 regarding the duty of DDS to provide oversight and guidance to regional centers regarding ADA compliance in capacity assessments for conservatorship proceedings. [#223](#). Supporting materials accompanying letter. [#224](#).
[#222](#)

2015 *Letter to Santi Rogers, Director of DDS* (Letter sent on January 30, 2015, requesting that DDS amend regulations on social rights to clarify that regional center clients have freedom of choice in their associations – and may exercise that choice to visit with or not visit with individuals)
[#225](#)

2014 *Letter to Santi Rogers, Director of DDS* (Letter sent on June 1, 2014, requesting a meeting to discuss the need for DDS to be involved in the oversight of regional centers as they participate in limited conservatorship proceedings)
[#226](#)

State Council on Developmental Disabilities

2015 *Letter to the Aaron Carruthers, Executive Director* (Letter sent on October 20, 2015 to the newly appointed executive director of this agency asking that the State Council
[#227](#)

support the efforts of Spectrum Institute to ensure access to justice for people with developmental disabilities who are litigants in limited conservatorship proceedings)

County of Los Angeles

- 2015 [#228](#) *Letter to Chief Deputy to Supervisor Sheila Kuehl* (Letter sent to Lisa Mandel on July 26, 2015 thanking her for meeting with Nora Baladerian and Tom Coleman to discuss deficiencies in the county-funded legal services program that provides court-appointed counsel to represent limited conservatees)
- 2015 [#229](#) *Letter to Chief Deputy Public Defender Kelly Emling* (Letter sent to her on June 9, 2015, asking that the public defender's office consider providing legal services to limited conservatees as an alternative to the current PVP system of private attorneys performing this function under appointment from the Superior Court)
- 2014 [#230](#) *Emails to Staff of Board of Supervisors* (Emails to staff members of several members of the Board of Supervisors requesting a meeting to discuss the failure of the county-funded legal services program to provide access to justice for respondents in limited conservatorship proceedings)
- 2014 [#231](#) *Letter to Public Defender Ron Brown* (Letter to the public defender seeking a meeting to discuss the possibility of his office taking on responsibility for providing legal services to limited conservatees)

Los Angeles County Superior Court

Presiding Judge of the Superior Court

- 2015 [#232](#) *Letter to Judge Carolyn Kuhl* (Letter sent on June 26, 2015, reinforcing the need for the court to take pro-active measures to restore the voting rights of limited conservatees)
- 2015 [#233](#) *Letter to Judge Carolyn Kuhl* (Letter sent on June 25, 2015, calling to her attention to the need to restore the voting rights of Gregory Demer, a limited conservatee who lost them illegally in a prior proceeding and in whose case two court investigator reports noted a need to restore them but the notations were ignored by the court and by Gregory's court-appointed attorney) ([#234](#) – Press Release issued on Greg's case)
- 2015 [#235](#) *Letter to Judge Carolyn Kuhl* (Letter sent on June 1, 2015, calling to her attention to the need to restore the voting rights of limited conservatees who lost them during past conservatorship proceedings in violation of federal voting rights laws)
- 2015 [#236](#) *Letter to Judge Carolyn Kuhl* (Letter sent on January 7, 2015, requesting a meeting to discuss the myriad problems with all aspects of the limited conservatorship system in the Los Angeles Superior Court)

Presiding Judge of the Probate Division

- [#237](#) 2015 *Letter to Judge Maria Stratton* (Letter sent on November 3, 2015, requesting that an upcoming training for court-appointed attorneys be expanded to discuss their role in assisting conservatees to get their voting rights restored)
- [#238](#) 2015 *Letter to Judge Maria Stratton* (Letter sent on November 3, 2015, requesting that she distribute brochures on the White Paper to court staff and other judges so they will be aware of this resource regarding compliance with the ADA in the processing of limited conservatorship cases)
- [#239](#) 2015 *Letter to Judge Maria Stratton* (Letter sent on July 3, 2015 regarding misconduct of Judge Daniel Murphy)
- [#240](#) 2015 *Letter to Judge Maria Stratton* (Letter sent on April 2, 2015, recognizing several actions she has taken – meeting with me in the chambers, testifying at the Senate Judiciary Committee and making admissions regarding the need for improvement of the system, and her candid comments to PVP attorneys at a lunch seminar)
- [#241](#) 2015 *Letter to Judge Maria Stratton* (Letter sent on February 16, 2015 to acquaint her, as the new presiding judge of the probate division, of the myriad problems with the handling of limited conservatorship cases by the court, court investigators, regional centers, and court-appointed attorneys, as well as the need to repeal a local court rule that gives appointed attorneys a dual role and thereby creates a conflict of interest)
- [#242](#) 2014 Letter to Judge Michael Levanas (Letter sent on May 15, 2014, calling for comprehensive reform of the limited conservatorship system; this was the first official call for reform)

Other Superior Court Judges

- [#243](#) 2015 *Letter to Judge Daniel Murphy* (Letter sent on June 22, 2015, to express concern that Gregory Demer has not been receiving effective assistance from his court-appointed attorney and that counsel's performance violates due process and Gregory's right to access to effective advocacy services under the ADA)
- [#244](#) 2014 *Letter to Judge Daniel Murphy* (Letter sent on February 21, 2014 to express concern that the court has been forcing Gregory Demer to visit with his father, despite the fact that Gregory is an adult and has repeatedly expressed opposition to such visits, and that such forced visitation violates Gregory's First Amendment Rights)
- [#245](#) 2013 *Letter to Judge Roy Paul* (Letter sent on December 30, 2013 asking for permission to file an amicus curiae brief in the case of Gregory Demer in support of his First Amendment right, as an adult American citizen, to refuse to visit with his father)

Public Entities in Other States

Colorado Supreme Court

2016 [#246](#) *Letter to the Colorado Supreme Court* (A letter was sent to the court on February 2, 2016, asking the court to make necessary modifications of policies and practices (per the ADA) to ensure that guardianship respondents receive access to justice in guardianship proceedings by: (1) appointing an attorney in all cases, which is not currently being done; and (2) adopting and enforcing training and performance standards for such attorneys that are ADA compliant)

Colorado State Bar

2016 [#247](#) *Letter to the Colorado Bar Association* (A letter was sent to the executive director of the bar association on February 2, 2016, asking the association to study the White Paper on ADA compliant standards for court-appointed attorneys who represent guardianship respondents with cognitive disabilities and to support our request to the court for the development and enforcement of appropriate standards for such attorneys)

Indiana Supreme Court

2016 [#248](#) *Letter to the Indiana Supreme Court* (A letter was sent to the court on January 26, 2016, asking the court to make necessary modifications of policies and practices (per the ADA) to ensure that guardianship respondents receive access to justice in guardianship proceedings by: (1) appointing an attorney in all cases, which is not currently being done; and (2) adopting and enforcing training and performance standards for such attorneys that are ADA compliant)

Indiana State Bar

2016 [#249](#) *Letter to the Indiana State Bar Association* (A letter was sent to the executive director of the bar association on January 26, 2016, asking the association to study the White Paper on ADA compliant standards for court-appointed attorneys who represent guardianship respondents who have cognitive disabilities and to support our request to the court for the development and enforcement of appropriate standards for such attorneys)

Maryland Court of Appeals

2018 Letter to Chief Judge of Maryland's Highest Court. (A letter was sent to the Chief Judge of the Maryland Court of Appeals commending the court for adopting rules governing training requirements and performance standards for court-appointed attorneys in adult guardianship proceedings. The letter recommended that the new rules be amended to include specific reference to the ADA and its application to guardianship proceedings – a matter that is directly related to the performance of such attorneys. [#250](#)) Submitted with the letter was an essay titled: "ADA Guidance from the U.S. Department of Justice is Instructive to Participants in Maryland's Guardianship System." [#251](#)) The essay was adapted from a DOJ guidance memo on the application of the ADA to criminal justice proceedings. [#252](#))

Michigan Supreme Court

2016 [#253](#) *Letter to the Michigan Supreme Court* (A letter was sent to the court on January 26, 2016, asking the court to make necessary modifications of policies and practices (per the ADA) to ensure that guardianship respondents receive access to justice in guardianship proceedings by: (1) appointing an attorney in all cases, which is not currently being done; and (2) adopting and enforcing training and performance standards for attorneys that are ADA compliant) ([#254 Court's response](#)) ([#255 Our reply](#))

Michigan State Bar

2016 [#256](#) *Letter to the State Bar of Michigan* (A letter was sent to the executive director of the bar association on January 26, 2016, asking the association to study the White Paper on ADA compliant standards for court-appointed attorneys who represent guardianship respondents with cognitive disabilities and to support our request to the court for the development and enforcement of appropriate standards for such attorneys)

Nevada Supreme Court

2016 [#257](#) *Letter to the Nevada Supreme Court* (A letter was sent to the court on January 19, 2016, asking the court to make necessary modifications of policies and practices (per the ADA) to ensure that guardianship respondents receive access to justice in guardianship proceedings by: (1) appointing an attorney in all cases, which is not currently being done; and (2) adopting and enforcing training and performance standards for such attorneys that are ADA compliant)

Nevada State Bar

2016 [#258](#) *Letter to the State Bar of Nevada* (A letter was sent to the executive director of the bar association on January 19, 2016, asking the association to study the White Paper on ADA compliant standards for court-appointed attorneys who represent guardianship respondents who have cognitive disabilities and to support our request to the court for the development and enforcement of appropriate standards for such attorneys)

Nevada Commission to Study the Administration of Guardianships

2016 [#259](#) *Letter to the Commission to Study the Administration of Guardianships* (A letter was sent to members of the commission to remind them that the ADA applies to guardianship proceedings and that any recommendations they make for reform should ensure that guardianship respondents receive access to justice in these proceedings, which would require them to have court-appointed attorneys who are properly trained and who adhere to ADA-compliant performance standards as they provide effective representation to clients who have cognitive and communication disabilities)

Ohio Supreme Court

2016 *Letter to the Ohio Supreme Court* (A letter was sent to the court on January 21,

[#260](#) 2016, asking the court to make necessary modifications of policies and practices (per the ADA) to ensure that guardianship respondents receive access to justice in guardianship proceedings by: (1) appointing an attorney in all cases, which is not currently being done; and (2) adopting and enforcing training and performance standards for such attorneys that are ADA compliant)

Ohio State Bar Association

2016 [#261](#) *Letter to the Ohio State Bar Association* (A letter was sent to the executive director of the bar association on January 21, 2016, asking the association to study the White Paper on ADA compliant standards for court-appointed attorneys who represent guardianship respondents with cognitive disabilities and to support our request to the court for the development and enforcement of appropriate standards for such attorneys)

Oregon Supreme Court

2016 [#262](#) *Letter to the Oregon Supreme Court* (A letter was sent to the court on February 3, 2016, asking the court to make necessary modifications of policies and practices (per the ADA) to ensure that guardianship respondents receive access to justice in guardianship proceedings by: (1) appointing an attorney in all cases, which is not currently being done; and (2) adopting and enforcing training and performance standards for such attorneys that are ADA compliant) ([#263 Court's response](#))

Oregon State Bar

2016 [#264](#) *Letter to the Oregon State Bar* (A letter was sent to the executive director of the bar association on February 3, 2016, asking the association to study the White Paper on ADA compliant standards for court-appointed attorneys who represent guardianship respondents who have cognitive disabilities and to support our request to the court for the development and enforcement of appropriate standards for such attorneys)

Pennsylvania Supreme Court

2016 [#265](#) *Letter to the Pennsylvania Supreme Court* (A letter was sent to the court on February 4, 2016, asking the court to make necessary modifications of policies and practices (per the ADA) to ensure that guardianship respondents receive access to justice in guardianship proceedings by: (1) appointing an attorney in all cases, which is not currently being done; and (2) adopting and enforcing training and performance standards for such attorneys that are ADA compliant) ([#266](#) – Court's response)

Pennsylvania Bar Association

2016 [#267](#) *Letter to the Pennsylvania Bar Association* (A letter was sent to the executive director of the bar association on February 4, 2016, asking the association to study the White Paper on ADA compliant standards for court-appointed attorneys who represent guardianship respondents who have cognitive disabilities and to support our request for the development and enforcement of appropriate standards for such attorneys)

South Dakota Supreme Court

2016 [#268](#) *Letter to the South Dakota Supreme Court* (A letter was sent to the court on February 3, 2016, asking the court to make necessary modifications of policies and practices (per the ADA) to ensure that guardianship respondents receive access to justice in guardianship proceedings by: (1) appointing an attorney in all cases, which is not currently being done; and (2) adopting and enforcing training and performance standards for such attorneys that are ADA compliant)

State Bar of South Dakota

2016 [#269](#) *Letter to the State Bar of South Dakota* (A letter was sent to the executive director of the bar association on February 3, 2016, asking the association to study the White Paper on ADA compliant standards for court-appointed attorneys who represent guardianship respondents who have cognitive disabilities and to support our request to the court for the development and enforcement of appropriate standards for such attorneys)

Utah Judicial Council

2016 [#270](#) *Letters to the Utah Judicial Council* (A letter was sent to the Judicial Council on April 7, 2016, criticizing a new law (HB 101) authorizing courts not to appoint an attorney to represent guardianship respondents with cognitive disabilities; the council was reminded of the duty of courts to appoint counsel as an ADA accommodation to ensure the respondent has access to justice / A second letter ([#271](#)) was sent on April 8, 2016, suggesting modifications of the court's ADA information webpage so that litigants with cognitive disabilities are aware that appointed counsel is an option as an ADA accommodation to ensure access to justice in court proceedings) ([#272 Court's response](#))

Utah Governor

2016 [#273](#) *Letter to the Governor of Utah* (A letter was sent on March 14, 2016, calling the governor's attention to the fact that HB 101 increases the risk of abuse to people with developmental disabilities and violates the ADA)

Washington State Legislature

2016 [#274](#) *Letter to the Washington State Senate Law and Justice Committee* (A letter was delivered to the committee on March 16, 2016, asking for more legislative oversight of RCW 11.88.045 in that counsel is not being appointed in all guardianship cases as required by law; a copy of The Justice Gap report was delivered to committee staff)

2016 [#275](#) *Letter to the Washington State House Judiciary Committee* (A letter was delivered to the committee on March 16, 2016, asking for more legislative oversight of RCW 11.88.045 in that counsel is not being appointed in all guardianship cases as contemplated by the statute; a copy of The Justice Gap report was delivered to committee staff)

Washington State Supreme Court

2016 [#276](#) *Letter to the Washington State Supreme Court* (A letter was sent to the court on March 16, 2016, transmitting to the court a report titled The Justice Gap in which systemic defects in policy and practice were examined with respect to the manner in which Washington State processes adult guardianship cases) ([#277](#) - Justice Gap materials)

2016 [#278](#) *Letters to the Washington State Supreme Court* (A letter was sent to the court on January 15, 2016, asking the court to make necessary modifications of policies and practices (per the ADA) to ensure that guardianship respondents receive access to justice in guardianship proceedings by: (1) appointing an attorney in all cases, which is not currently being done; and (2) adopting and enforcing training and performance standards for such attorneys that are ADA compliant / A second letter ([#279](#)) was sent on Feb. 11, 2016 pointing out that the failure to appoint counsel is not due to a legislative flaw, but to the failure of judges to follow the law) ([#280](#) - Court's response) ([#281](#) - Our reply)



Washington supporters Michael Hazeltine and Tina Baldwin with Tom Coleman and Greg Byers at the State Capitol after visiting the offices of the Legislature, Governor, and Supreme Court

Washington State Bar Association

2016 [#282](#) *Letter to the Washington Bar Association* (A letter was sent to the executive director of the bar association on January 15, 2016, asking the association to study the White Paper on ADA compliant standards for court-appointed attorneys who represent guardianship respondents with cognitive disabilities and to support our request to the court for the development and enforcement of appropriate standards for such attorneys; Two essays ([#283](#) – [#284](#) were sent with the letter)

National Associations

American Judges Association

2016 [#285](#) *Letter to the American Judges Association* (A letter was sent on February 8, 2016 calling attention to the work of Spectrum Institute promoting access to justice for guardianship respondents and inviting the association to make its members aware of the materials on our website on this topic)

Conference of Chief Justices

2016 [#286](#) *Letter to the Conference of Chief Justices* (A letter was sent on February 8, 2016 to the members of the conference about the Access to Advocacy Outreach Project of Spectrum Institute and our attempt to educate the judiciary in all 50 states of the applicability of the ADA to guardianship proceedings in state courts)

Conference of State Court Administrators

2016 [#287](#) *Letter to the Conference of State Court Administrators* (A letter was sent on February 9, 2016 to the president and the president-elect of the conference recognizing that a White Paper published by the conference in 2010 called for the mandatory appointment of counsel for respondents in all guardianship cases and asking the conference to recommend that all state courts adopt ADA-compliant training and performance standards for court-appointed attorneys who represent respondents in such cases)

National Center for State Courts

2016 [#288](#) *Letter to the National Center for State Courts* (A letter was sent on February 8, 2016, to the president of the center referencing publications of Spectrum Institute on due process, the ADA, and access to justice in guardianship proceedings, so the center can inform its members and users of its services about these valuable resource materials)

Uniform Law Commission

2016 [#289](#) *Letters to the Uniform Law Commission* (A letter was sent on February 4, 2016, to the chief counsel of the Uniform Law Commission urging the commission to revise its model code to eliminate the option of appointed counsel for guardianship respondents, considering that the ADA applies to these proceedings and without appointed counsel the respondents will not receive access to justice; A second letter ([#290](#)) with supplemental information was sent on February 6, 2016)

TASH

2017 *Letter of Support and Commendation from TASH* (In May 29, 2017, a letter ([#291](#)) and commendation ([#292](#)) was received from TASH – an international organization promoting the rights of people with intellectual and developmental disabilities. TASH commended Spectrum Institute and its legal director for ongoing efforts to improve guardianship systems and to ensure access to justice for people with disabilities involved in such cases.

Disability and Abuse Materials

Freedom of Association

- 2014 [#293](#) *With Liberty and Justice for All: The Sexual Rights of Adults with Developmental Disabilities* (A report identifying the constitutional and statutory provisions, and relevant case law, that protect the sexual rights of adults with developmental disabilities, published on the Spectrum Institute website on September 10, 2014.)
- 2014 [#294](#) *Reaffirming the Right of People with Disabilities to Freedom of Association* (An essay on the right of respondents in guardianship and conservatorship cases to choose for themselves whether to associate with someone, challenging the authority of a court to order forced visitation)

Prevalence of Abuse

- 2017 [#295](#) *A Review of the Association Between Childhood Disability and Maltreatment* (A report on the findings of several meta studies on the prevalence of abuse of children shows that children with disabilities are abused at a higher rate than children in the generic population.)
- 2013 [#296](#) *Abuse of People with Disabilities: Victims and Their Families Speak Out* (A report released on September 5, 2013 examines the results of a national survey of more than 7,200 respondents – including people with disabilities, their family members, and professionals and service providers who work with them, about their experiences with physical, emotional, and sexual abuse as children and adults.)

Trauma Informed Justice

- 2017 *Administering Trauma-Informed Justice in Adult Guardianship Proceedings*. (A presentation by Thomas F. Coleman at the 4th Annual Education Summit of the Arc of Missouri on September 15, 2017. PowerPoint: [#297](#) Findings and Recommendations: [#298](#) Annotated Bibliography: [#299](#))
- 2015 [#300](#) *Role of the Courts: An Example of Failure to Protect* (An essay and supporting documents about Michael Parisio – a case brought to our attention in 2012 raising serious concerns about the failure of the conservatorship system in California to protect adults with developmental disabilities from serious abuse)
- 2014 [#301](#) *Trauma Informed Justice: A Necessary Paradigm Shift for the Limited Conservatorship System* (An essay that highlights how most respondents in these cases have been victims of abuse and how most perpetrators of abuse are family members or service providers, and as a result there is a need for attorneys, investigators, and judges to process these cases more carefully and vet potential conservators more thoroughly.)

Federal Legislation

2017 *Elder Abuse Bills Are a Start: Reform at State and Federal Level Should Include*
[#302](#) *All Vulnerable Adults* (An op-ed article published by the Los Angeles Daily Journal calling for expansion of the scope of two federal bills – S. 178 by Sen. Grassley and S. 182 by Sen. Klobuchar) An expanded commentary on this topic is published on the website of Spectrum Institute. [#303](#).

Safe Schools Study

2017 *Disability, Abuse, Schools, and Risk Management*. (The Disability and Abuse Project announced the launch of a Safe Schools Study on February 13, 2017. The announcement was accompanied by this commentary.)

Sentencing Letter

2017 Letter to District Attorney of Clark County, Nevada. (Spectrum Institute sent a letter to the prosecutor in a case where a guardian was convicted of abuse of an elderly person under her protection. The letter recommended that a significant punishment be imposed.)



Nora Baladerian, Linda Demer, Ron Simandle, Diane Coleman Rogers and Michael Vasquez in 2013 at the celebration of the 40th Anniversary of the start of the legal career of Thomas Coleman. The Disability and Guardianship Project was launched shortly thereafter. Nora, Diane, Michael, and Tom are members of the Board of Directors of Spectrum Institute. Linda and Ron are supporters of the organization, as are Greg, Tina, and the other Michael.

Trauma Informed Politics

2015 *Trauma Informed Politics: An Inconvenient Truth About Disability and Abuse*
[#306](#) (An essay prompted by legislation introduced in Nevada that would have authorized a power of attorney form to be used by adults with developmental disabilities, without sufficient protections to minimize the risk of them being victimized by abuse, exploitation, or undue influence)

2015 *Statistics on Disability and Abuse Should Inform the Legislative Process*
[#307](#) (An essay that highlights the alarming rate of abuse of people with disabilities, arguing that the legislative process should remain aware of that problem as legislation is drafted and promoted)

Freedom from Abuse vs. The Right to Marry

2018 Commentary on Balancing Competing Freedoms. (A commentary was published today in the Daily Journal – California’s premier legal newspaper – calling on a superior court judge to inquire into the validity of a same-sex marriage entered into by a young man with a developmental disability. The commentary acknowledges the right to marry, but also notes that marriage must be based on valid consent – an ingredient that may be missing in this particular case due to lack of capacity to understand the significance of the marriage contract or because consent was lacking because of undue influence. ([#308](#)))

Other Materials

2017 *Living on the Autism Spectrum: Legal Issues Over a Life Span* (A commentary prepared for a class at UCLA titled “Perspectives on Autism and Neurodiversity.” ([#309](#)))

Spectrum Institute Materials

2011 *About Spectrum Institute* (A description of the various issues and projects that have been included in the education and advocacy activities of this nonprofit organization over the years)
[#310](#)

[#311](#) *Executive Committee* (A photo and description of the three members of the Executive Committee of the Disability and Abuse Project)

2014 *2014 in Review* (A listing and description of activities throughout 2014 for the Disability and Abuse Project and the Disability and Guardianship Project)
[#312](#)

2016 *Disability and Guardianship Project Activities* (A summary of activities of the project during 2014 - 2016)
[#313](#)

2016 *Speaker Availability to Judges, Attorneys, Self Advocates, and Parent Advocates*
[#314](#) (A brochure announcing that of Thomas F. Coleman is available to make presentations about disability and guardianship, effective advocacy for respondents, and the applicability of due process and the Americans with Disabilities Act to state guardianship proceedings)

2016 *What’s New on the Website* (A website page that serves the Disability and Abuse Project and the Disability and Guardianship Project to keep website visitors apprised of new publications that have been released by Spectrum Institute or are available from other sources and new activities of both projects)
[#315](#)



Disability and Abuse Project Founding Executive Committee: Thomas F. Coleman, Dr. Nora J. Baladerian, and Arc Riverside Executive Director Jim Stream (deceased)



Spectrum Institute Board Members: Michael A Vasquez, Dr. Nora J. Baladerian and Thomas F. Coleman

Spectrum Institute
555 S. Sunrise Way, Suite 205
Palm Springs, CA 92264
(818) 230-5156
www.spectruminstitute.org/library
tomcoleman@spectruminstitute.org