

Webinar: The Ethics of Supported Decision Making part two

Event Started: 10/26/2016 11:47:57 AM ET

Good morning everybody. This is Norine Jaloway Gill with the University of North Texas. It is great to have you with us this morning for the second part in a two-part series on ethics of supported decision-making with our speaker Jeff Miller who is a policy specialist with disability WISE of Texas. Before we get started how about if I give everybody a tour through the Control Panel and make sure that everything is operational. If all of our guests could look at the Control Panel and if you would scroll down to where it has the question box. In that box if you can hear me if you would go ahead and give me your name and let me know that you can hear me okay. Also if you have any other kinds of pieces of information you want to provide light where you are from or what you want to learn today that is welcome as well. I'm getting a lot of good feedback on that that the sound is good and that things are operational.

The other thing in your control panel you will see the header that says handouts. The handouts for today not only include the presentation itself which is different than the one you got last week so you need to make sure that you received both sections of the handouts from last week and this week but also as promised a copy of the supported decision-making agreement that is a document that can be used in your will find out a little bit more about that today as well as another piece that will also be addressed is the Bill of Rights for persons under guardianship. You have both of those as PDF documents attached in your control panel.

As mentioned we have with us Jeff Miller is with the Disability Rights of Texas. Jeff not only comes to us with many years of experience working with people with disabilities a lot in the education arena but also as an advocate and working on legislative efforts on behalf of people with disabilities. He is also the parents of a son with disabilities and has that personal experience to share with us as well so both as a practitioner and as an attorney and Britney to us a lot of different perspectives and Jeff the sharing some additional information on decision-making and ethical issues behind the use of the agreement and why we use it as a way to support people with disabilities. Jeff, welcome back to part two. I know you have a cold and you have been fighting an illness therapist thank you for giving us your time today and I hope everybody will air with him. It may be a little rough from time to time but I appreciate you being here.

Thank you and welcome everyone. Welcome back for round two of a discussion about supported decision-making and guardianship issues and ethics. If you remember last week we kind of talked about the legal underpinnings of both supported decision-making and guardianship and what the law says about this things and how they work. This week we are going to talk much more about the ethical considerations about

using supported decision-making and our reactions to guardianships and those sorts of things in the real world.

Last week we focused on the idea of what guardianship is and legally how it works and we look at the requirements where supported decision-making agreement and the idea of the decision-making continuum and who gets to make decisions and how they make decisions. This week we are going to replay review some of those legal concepts that we looked at last week and then we are going to briefly talk about the Bill of Rights of persons under guardianship because it is something you should be aware that exists and can be a reference for you later if you need it. Then people start talking about the ethical practices and standards and principles behind the code of ethics and the code of professional ethics and then get into some examples and a little bit. -- Examples and a little bit.

If you remember last week we talked about guardianship and the fact that guardianship is a legal process where Judge Nixon determination that someone lacks the capacity or it lacks the ability to make decisions that impact their physical and mental health and their well-being and their financial security and those sorts of things. We talked about capacity and competency and how they are interrelated but not quite the same and the fact that capacity is that decision that only a judge can make in Texas that a person lacks the capacity to make decisions about their own lives. Finally we talked about supported decision-making and supported decision-making agreements and that idea of empowering someone with a disability to retain the ability to make decisions about their life even if they need some support in doing that and how a supporter is able to assist in that process. As Noreen said, one of the document that you now have is a copy of that supported decision-making agreement. You can kind of see what one looks like and you would be able to recognize it if they came up.

Finally, just to quickly review the decision-making continuum and the things we talked about last week that we talk about substituted decision-making in terms of guardianship, we can look at either a best interest standard for someone is basically just looking at a cost-benefit analysis focusing on the well-being and health and welfare of an individual and trying to figure out what a reasonable person would decide for them in that situation. Then we talked about the substituted judgment standards which sometimes is used in guardianship where the Guardian act based on what they think the individual would do if they still had the ability to make their own decisions. Then we contrasted those with the idea of supported decision-making where an individual with a disability is empowered by sharing that they continue to be able to be the ultimate decision-maker and their provided support from their supporter to give them the assistance they need to make those decisions themselves.

Just along the lines of information about legal rights and legal processes, one of the things that is important to be aware of and we talked last week about the fact that under guardianship a person's legal civil and legal rights are taken away and the ability to make decisions about these things are given to the Guardian. There are certain rights that even a person under a guardianship retains and in Texas in the last legislative session, law was passed that specifically listed in one part of the estate code 24 specific federal and state rights that an individual with the Guardian retain even if there is a full guardianship and the Guardian is able to make those decisions for that individual. So if you are ever working with someone that is under guardianship, it is just as a point of reference I just wanted you to know that these rights exist and to give you a copy of that so in your free time you can look and see what some of those rights are and just know that there are some specific rights that people continue to have and that it is important to know and to be able to inform people that even if they have a guardian they have rights and there is a way to enforce those rights.

Jeff, I went ahead and click on to the PDF document, the Bill of Rights for persons under guardianship for our participants because I noticed that you noted in their free time to look at it which is the copious free time but employment specialists have as we all do so that document you have posted there is two pages. Part of what you might want to consider is that especially if you know that you have a referral that is an individual who has a guardian that you may want to put in your packet when doing your enrollment or your initial intake with the individual, you may want to go ahead and have in your packet a copy of the Bill of Rights so that you can inform both the Guardian as well as the individual that you are working with that you are aware that these limitations exist even within that guardianship model. There's a lot of things I get taken for granted under guardianship and how decisions were made so this helps, and I think that most guardians I have met probably would appreciate it as well. It is not meant as anything other than a good piece of information and it helps have a conversation that sometimes people are fearful of when they know that they are going to be working with a guardian. That is just a thought and consideration and an idea to make the use of that information as well. Like I said it is not a lengthy document. It is a couple of pages but it will generally match people's information that they need to cover confidentiality and a lot of other issues they would be covering in their enrollment or intake.

I think the next slide is our questions that we wanted people to think about and consider as we are going through the ethical guidelines for all people are all employment specialists. This comes from the rehabilitation counselors code of ethics is what Jeff is going to be covering, but I think as employment specialists we are bound to also follow that code of ethics. Here are some ideas and questions that we

came up with an these are things that I find to be common in the services that we delivered in employment and our situations. As I'm talking to our audience if there are situations that you know of that either match this or that may be different, we welcome your comments. We might not have time to cover it today, put as much as I can of like to share what is really going on out there in the fields. I note Jeff, you asked what of people experiencing and what things were decision-making might be helpful. Here's some situations that occur. For instance when the person we are serving doesn't have Guardian and the support may be lacking in terms of the support that they probably could use to be more successful in their lifestyle, and when you meet the person you are thinking that they lack some decision-making capacity. You're trying to figure it out, you are trying to figure out where they are in certain things and it is difficult so that interaction and being able to get the information, being able to confirm what their decisions are that they are having difficulty there. The other idea is -- did I explained that okay? Two yes. Exactly.

Another situation may be a person who does not have Guardian and you are getting to know the person, they may lack some decision-making capacity but you also are seeing signs that the person might be exploited and their finances are being taken advantage of work they themselves in terms of their work or the situation or how they are living, whatever it is that you are looking at when you're actually doing your discovery process that your suspicions are starting to rise in trying to figure out is this person actually being exploited in some form or fashion by the people they are being supported by whether that is lack of support, there could be a lot of situations there.

Another situation may be a person who has an individual who was with them or a supporter. Again it could be financial support or a foster parent or paid staff and the that person is making decisions for them and what you see in your experience is during discovery or during job placement that those decisions that are being made are in contrast or are contrary to what your consumer, the person you are serving, has expressed to you as what their responsibilities are. There is a conflict.

This is a situation that has come up many times are several times as the person who has a guardian and that Guardian is making decisions on that person's behalf and you think that the individual themselves has expressed to you that they want to make their own decisions and that they have that capacity of doing so.

Again, those are some ideas that we came up with situations I have seen in the work that we have done in employment services. You may have some others to add in there. Jeff, did you have anything to add to that?

You covered it really well, and as we now start talking about the basics of ethics and ethical rules, it helps me to think about, I have a pretty good idea of the way I would

answer some of those questions, but if we look at the foundations of ethics and ethical standards, it gives us a better idea to come up with why we should make certain decisions which is what the whole point of ethics is all about. Hopefully will all [Indiscernible - multiple speakers]

We can even get more specific like for instance, the decision to limit the number of hours a person will work or how much money -- because then it would cause issues with the security and the people would have to send reports and they don't want to send reports to the government. There is a whole series of things that happen when a decision is being made or even a decision about which jobs to choose. There may be several jobs that may be available but which one will that person choose. Those are all the kinds of decisions that we might want to target and think about who is actually making decisions.

Exactly.

If we start with the code of professional ethics for rehabilitation counselors and look at exactly what it is and what it is for, what it tells us is that basically the objectives you hide the code of ethics is to outline what ethical behavior is expected of professionals to establish the principle that defined with the ethical behavior is and to help professionals in putting together a professional course of action based on the standards. That's the whole idea of why there is a code of ethics.

At the our thinking about these as we go through, one of the things that I think about about the code of ethics is to look at those overarching ideas. In the code of ethics does even if we don't find a clear rule that supersedes everything else in tells us exactly the clarity of what we should do in a specific situation, these principles allow us to use our own judgment and reasoning to think of issues or obligations that are at stake so for the next few slides we are just going to review some of those principles and what they mean.

The values behind the code of ethics and looking at those fundamental basic values of respecting human rights and dignity and ensuring the integrity of professional relationships and acting to alleviate the stress and suffering and enhancing the quality of professional knowledge and then looking at diversity of human experience and culture and finally advocating for fair and adequate provisions of services. Based on these values, they inform principles and the fundamental spirit of the code is based on these six principles of ethical behavior. Some of these will sounds familiar and some of them maybe not so much, but this is what all the other rules are based on.

The first one we are going to look at is autonomy. It is often the first one that comes to mind because we value autonomy, especially in the United States. The definition says

it deals with the client's freedom to choose their own rehabilitation, mental health services, plans, and goals. It is our obligation to make sure that we promote a client ability to make those choices on their own behalf. Since that is what we are supposed to be doing, that is why the whole discussion of capacity and not capacity and legal rights comes into a lot of these considerations. Some examples of obligations under this principle have to do with promoting a client self-determination the we talked about last week. In addition, there is an obligation to disclose appropriate information to them about the kinds of information that will be useful to help in making decisions and to understand the kinds of services that you might be considering together. It also -- another point of the Dutch under autonomy -- under autonomy is to -- I lost my place so we will start again. When we look at autonomy it is that idea of people having the right to choose. One of the things does it is why promoting the self-determination is important and looking at the idea of informed consent and making sure that people actually understand that the kinds of decisions that we are asking them to make and give them the information to make those. One of the other things I think it is supported to look at with this idea of autonomy is this idea of a sense. The concept of assent deals with even if someone no longer has the official capacity or legal capacity to make their own decision because they have guardian, ethically we still have an obligation to do everything we can to involve a client in decision-making so that they fully understand and are placing the best is placed in the best possible decision to weigh in on the decision that has to be made and they are involved as much as possible in that process. It is the idea of providing that voice even if someone doesn't legally have a say in what's going on, that they feel as involved as possible. The final points under autonomy here is that I think is really important is looking at the idea of self-inflicted risk. I think that a lot of us know that more in terms of dignity of risk and the dignity of choice. It is that concept that everybody makes dumb decision sometimes and people choose to smoke, people choose to go skydiving, people have the right to make decisions that you or I may not agree with, but that doesn't lessen their right to make that decision. It is important when we think about autonomy and the people that we work with to remember that just because they are making a decision that we wouldn't necessarily agree with, that doesn't necessarily mean that they don't have the capacity or the legal right to make that decision.

Non-maleficent's -- non-maleficence is the professionals obligation not to cause physical or emotional harm to others. This is important and is the basic idea of the Hippocratic principle of above all, do no harm. As we are invited into people's lives in a professional relationship we have an obligation not to cause physical or emotional harm. Some of the obligations are illustrated up here looking at providing an appropriate services or willful acts that may cause harm such as misuse of data or not monitoring plans, the idea of avoiding dual relationships.

I think that when we look at those examples that we talked about earlier that sometimes a decision that might make sense to us because of a person's situation, who they live with, to the other choices are, do not make sense to the person that you are serving. But also there's I was looking at the last bullet and the limitations of the person's capacity. That is a conflict in trying to figure out how can -- what is the most harmful? When I hear stories, especially stories of individuals with psychiatric disabilities who are homeless and treatment and that there are -- this seems to be where this issue comes up a lot is where do we provide the services that support and where can our support for what may be the best decision come in conflict with where they are at. It is not always easy.

No. Another thing in light of what we have been talking about in terms of supported decision-making is the idea of avoiding the will relationship with the client. Would be appropriate if a client asked you to be there supporter to do that? And also have them as a client. I think the code of ethics would probably say no, but I think that is one of the issues that is new in some ways, because unsupported is supported decision-making agreements are a formal alternative to guardianship, but it is just something to think about.

Beneficence and the person is professionals obligation to get you to the welfare of a client. The other side of non-maleficence is the idea of instead of not doing harm is what is our obligation to actually do something so that it is balancing, not harming with positively and proactively doing something which could potentially contribute to the well-being of your clients. Sometimes that can set up attention and there could be some questions.

The example used here of hospitalizing a suicidal person seems pretty straightforward. Doing good and being helpful with clients, is sounds like it is really generic, but it is something that we need to take into consideration when looking at things. I think the other issue here for us to think about is the idea of to you have an obligation if you think that there is an issue with capacity to suggest or facilitate initiating guardianship? Or and set of guardianship, looking at other alternatives and supports and services, where is that line and how much is really your responsibility professionally versus being too involved?

When you talked about earlier that there is that conflict that we need to be careful that we don't put ourselves in the situation for me actually become the supported decision-maker for the person if they are the service provider and avoiding conflict of interest in the non-maleficence -- the non-maleficence , the ways that I have actually used supported decision-making already has been to identify when a person is having difficulty with decision-making or understanding a complex issue usually having to do with money and finances and meeting that level of support and it's been a very

helpful tool to engage in a person's natural circle of support and talk with an individual who would be able to provide the support and the supported decision-making process itself as adding considerable -- considerable importance or weight to that understanding of what their relationship is with the person with the disability, their earnings and the help they are going to need in order to manage their funds and to actually reach the goals that the them -- they have set out to reach. -- Was that the person with the disability agreed to the supported decision-making process because they knew they would always be involved in the decision and every decision that was made had to be made with them there. Even though they still do not understand the numbers and the dollars and all of the -- a lot of the sophistication of our current service delivery system and how it handles money, knowing that they would always need to be there before any decision could be made was what was important or powerful to them. That is using that circle of support and connecting the dots with people and helping them understand that that is how it can actually help that person meet their goals. Hopefully that fits.

I think that really fits, and I think it goes back to show exactly why it was so important to so many people to make supported decision-making an option in Texas because a lot of us, let's be honest, a lot of us don't do well with numbers so we hired accountants or have somebody else that we go to to help us do things. Just because someone has a diagnosis or a label does it mean that because they need help in a certain way they should be treated differently. I think supported decision-making does give that option to a lot of people to continue to have that control and self-determination in their lives.

The next principle here is justice. That obligation to act in a manner that is fair and equal. Justice is something that we probably all are familiar with as an idea and concept, but it also includes assisting our clients and the people we work with in the idea of self advocacy or advocating on their behalf if they can't do it themselves or need that support to advocate in the right way. As this relates to guardianship or supported decision-making, one of the things there is to make sure that if we are going to help them self advocate or advocate for them is making sure we are providing all of the information that they need about a particular situation so that the decision can be made that is the best decision in terms of the individual and that may be both providing information to the individual or making information accessible to a supporter or even informing a guardian.

Another thing that would be in line with this idea of justice is that if we are in a situation where we know that someone has a guardian or there is a guardianship process that is going to be in place or whatever, it would also include making sure the people have the legal representation or formal advocacy that they need depending on these specific circumstances.

Fidelity is the idea of keeping promises and commitments. We all have an obligation to be honest to our clients and to respect their privacy. Unfortunately we have all -- if we have not known it's, we have heard of individuals that just want to make things easy so they may make promises or say things to clients just in order to make the process smoother for everybody and that is really not okay and that really doesn't help anyone, because in the end issues happen. Along with that I guess is the idea the piñatas also includes the idea of having those difficult conversations that we don't necessarily want to help with clients when we have to tell them that what they want to do is not really a possibility and why it is it really a possibility or that they have unrealistic expectations were dealing with those sorts of things. And finally, also the idea of fidelity includes respecting privacy and practicing the idea of minimal invasiveness and minimal disclosure. Find out what you have to find out and tell people what you need to tell them, but you shouldn't really be gathering more information than you need or talking about things that don't need to be related to other people.

If you have any thoughts about any of these, feel free to comment.

Voracity is obligation -- voracity is obligation to be honest with clients. Telling the truth. One of the things we talked about before is providing detailed professional disclosures and being honest and direct regarding what is going to happen in the process of working with people and it would include fully reviewing and truthfully looking at the risks and benefits that the client may experience so -- depending on the ability that they have to make those choices.

One of the areas that we probably do experience it as an ethical decision would be when we are actually working with not just the person with the disability, but when we are working with their support structure and in this case it may be a person assigned to them as a person who is in supported decision-making. I think those for individuals who need additional support and it is our obligation to have that honest conversation with both the person with the disability and their support person that is helping them make decisions because that is how they are going to move forward with an whatever it is whether it is the job placement or confirmation of what their skills and abilities are or if it is understanding what some of those limitations are so you're putting the person in the best possible job placement and making that good job fit. And that understanding that we need to have that conversation in a way that always has the individual with a disability there and that they are a part of that decision-making process. A lot of times that tends to fall apart. We sometimes believe that if we are telling the support person this information that the person with the disability is going to hear it and that may or may not happen and later on you figure out they did it really get the information the way I intended it. Part of it is understanding that the

person with the disability is not giving of their role as being part of that decision-making process and we are obligated to share that information with them. Does that hit this one okay?

Yes. It makes perfect sense. Thank you.

The next couple of slides are just basically for reference. These come from the code of ethics and I just wanted them there's I wanted you to have them together so you can see what these things are here since you have a copy of the PowerPoint you can go back and look at some of these if you need to answer you can see what the rules around autonomy and personal values really say and the rollaround's conflict of interest. I think one of the interesting ones for me when reviewing this was looking at the idea of role changes in the professional relationship and how it can lead to -- how it relates to conflict of interest rules and the possibility at some point that a client -- and not really know where the lines are and that is something that is important for us as we are looking to try to support and advocate for our clients to always maintain a professional relationship and make it clear what our role is in the process, if they have supporter or a guardian or substitute decision-maker, what their role is, and what the role of the clients and how to continue to keep them at the center of things is.

This set of rules focus is more directly on the competencies in supported decision-making that arise so the idea of informed consent and I think it supported for us always remember that a lot of the idea of informed consent comes the idea of making sure that when we are providing information and getting information looking at developmental and cultural sensitivity to make sure that when we are providing information to people with disabilities that we think of somebody who has a hearing impairment, we may use a sign language interpreter, but it may be more than that. For someone that has an intellectual disability, it may be finding different ways to communicate information in different modalities or in smaller chunks or whatever so that people can be fully engaged in the process and understand what it is that we are trying to convey and that we get the right information back from them.

I think of that when I think of the situations where even a person who may be close to the individual that we are serving, the individual with a disability and that they have communicated with that person and whatever form or fashion they communicate it in the same person goes into a different situation, different challenge in our case if they are going to be going through the discovery process and we are going to be confirming their skills and abilities and capacities and so as we go through that process, we approach that individual differently and we will see them in a different light. Sharing that information back with the family member or staff member or group home they will go what I've never seen them do that before and so some of it may be that we are applying our perspective differently to how we communicate and how we

are able to work with that individual or is -- and if we even explore that further when you were talking about the communication challenges. Many of the employment specialists will have a variety of tools in their toolkit of how they are going to try and get information or confirm what they suspect that the person is doing or able to do so they use those tools to hopefully bring out that idea. All of those things are used for us to be able to get to that informed consents are actually helping this person give us the information we need so that we can know for a fact they are comfortable in this situation with what they want to do. Everything is so individualized and you think of those situations where what will happen for a student in the classroom may or may not happen at the home. It is interesting to see this particular standard or ethics at work.

I agree completely. Thank you.

Finally, these are some of the rules around advocacy that I think it is important to be aware of and to know that are there. The first idea of course is all clients can advocate. Helping them advocate for themselves is always the preferred way to do things, but then we become advocates as well so advocacy, figuring out what our role is in our specific organization or agency around what we are doing for a particular client or individual. One of the other things I think that is always good to remember is the idea of advocacy and confidentiality that yes, to be good advocates for the people that we work with, but we need their permission if we are going to advocate on their behalf in a way that identifies them and so before we talk to other people about someone we're working with, we need to make sure that it's okay with the person we are working with. I think it is good to always remember that.

Advocacy also includes the idea of needing to be knowledgeable and competent about areas that we are advocating for which is why we do things like attend webinars so we can find out the legal basis behind some of the things they are working with so we can better use the process to help people that we work with be successful.

Those are some of the basic ideas behind ethics and some of the ethical standards that we can use to help us make decisions as we are working with individuals. Now let's look at those questions that we started to look at earlier and see if we have a better understanding of some of the principles that may be involved as we look at these questions now.

What you want to do is maybe look at this and have people right into the question box [Indiscernible - multiple speakers] that they think apply. That first question, your client does not have a guardian or appropriate support and you think he or she lacks decision-making capacity. When you think about the ethical guidelines, which ones would you apply and why?

Do you have any brave people? I don't know if I could see.

I had an interesting question come in was does the person have the right to commit suicide. I'm not really sure -- there is a huge medical or ethical conversation around that topic itself and doesn't

There are lots of issues there, but that is one of these ultimate ethical questions.

I don't see any brave souls yet coming across. I think they are still thinking about it.

I think when you're looking at if someone doesn't have guardian or the appropriate support your were kind of support but you think that is an issue about capacity, I think autonomy is one of the things that you want people to be as autonomous as possible, but you also have an obligation to look at beneficence and doing the right thing to help them so that if they need support in some way, don't you have an obligation to provide that or at least two more exploration.

We did get some feedback and there were a couple of folks who responded with beneficence and being able to spell is also a comment. And non-maleficence such as the do no harm. You don't want to put that person in a situation where if you can already tell that there may be some issues and that they may need some guidance and support than what do you do about that. The do no harm or creating a situation where it doesn't harm the person and takes them be on their ability to make a decision on their own behalf. In a, the risk-taking and the autonomy and I know that when we looked at the principles of self determination, freedom is the first principle. The freedom to basically have a quality of life and meaningful life and live in the community so our interaction with a person wants to support those guiding principles. Any other incidents of that? I don't see anything at. You want to go onto the second one? To make sure.

The person you are supporting doesn't have a guardian, you is the employment specialists have already seen some situations where they may be lacking in some decision-making capacity and that your other fear is that it appears that they themselves may be a victim of exploitation. Go back to the specific example that I have seen in some circumstances and it tends to be with individuals who are living in facilities or in programs, their actual living situation may be in a group home or facility and that the kinds of exploitation of people become unavailable to actually go out with you so that you can start the discovery process. They seem to just disappear and the person has said that they want a job, that they want to do what they need to do to get a job as somehow every time you start to work with them they become unavailable and someone has control of their life reschedule or it may be -- it may not even be intentional. It may be because the transportation is not there so the only way

they can take care of everybody the way they are supposed to take care of everybody, Mike so that person just becomes unavailable to do the work that they have to do. Or in some situations people have those people who are earning money and somehow that money keeps disappearing. We do have some feedback on this one with beneficence . If you feel they are not able to make decisions it could be harmed by others decisions.

That is a good point.

Another great one is justice and do you have somewhere to share with us in terms of justice but I can certainly see that what is fair and what is good for the person you are serving. And I did have a message that said this is a little bit off topic but if you could share how a person goes about becoming guardians for those clients don't have family members.

That is little bit more of a question and as guardianship as supported decision-making but maybe you could share with the decision-making agreement process and how do people go about doing that when they need that support person and they don't have family members to do that.

That is one of the issues with supported decision-making is trying to identify an appropriate supporter for someone with a disability, because the whole reason that supported decision-making works is it is the individual with a disability who gets to decide who they want to support them in a particular area. Typically that if a friend or family member. If you have an individual that needs supports that doesn't have a readily available identifiable person to support them, that's where I think it becomes more challenging and it is supported for us to try to work with that individual to help them think through and identify if there someone in their life somewhere that they may be able to establish that relationship with that would be interested. It can be challenging for people that don't have a lot of family and who do live more isolated lives, but I think that is one of the things we need to all think through is what kind of resources can we help an individual with in terms of finding nonprofits that have volunteers. I know that there have been some art chapters that have volunteer programs to support individuals and things like this. If that answers the question, but hopefully does

I think it does. What I actually shared also is that once you are able to identify the need, and I don't know if you want to go to your control panel and pull up that supported decision-making agreement, I have actually worked with nonprofit organizations and local communities and found people that much the need. In my case it was financial and in another case it was actually more of a social communication kind of need and we actually went through the supported decision-making process and

that person understood that the individual disability is there at all times while they are making those decisions but we went to the whole process, look at the supported decision-making agreement and there are specific places in there looking at what is a person's specific need and then we took the supported decision-making agreement itself and we made sure that it was shared with all the important service providers, service coordinator, therapist so that if a person is supporting them then that connection has been made and that it is a legal document. That is a great question and the really cool thing about supported decision-making about Mike it is a process, legal process, it doesn't cost any money. I've had one situation where a person had already been called upon as a supported decision-maker [Indiscernible - low volume] for additional information that -- from adult protective services and asking about something and information that they received. Is a great way to get confirmation of their role in their capacity and helping that person through a pretty difficult situation. Is there anything in the supported decision-making that they should know about the process if they are going to share this with other people?

Other than like you said, it is in in formal legal document and that it just basically has the information of the person with the disability, the supporter, the areas that the supporters are agreeing to help with and then it is signed and witnessed. One of the things that I will just point out quick is that on the form itself, it does remind us of the obligation that we have if someone is using supported decision-making and we have any reason to believe that the supporter is abusing or neglecting or exploiting the person with the disability that there is an obligation to report that.

Absolutely. And I myself have not experienced this but this is a story from a colleague that a community member who was a supported decision-maker for a person living in a facility was actually -- actually was able to help create that situation where they were able to make that job happened for them and that person has since not only gotten the job working but have lived at the facility and are living in the community. They used the supported decision-making process to allow the individual to come and help the supported in the advocacy role that that person -- it really started with employment which is kind of an interesting piece for me. Cement we did have a couple of other pieces of input. We are at our our our is up but I wanted to share that we have had people say thank you and also on the last example if you have a reasonable belief that expectation is occurring you have an obligation to assist the client and notifying -- that is important and I appreciate that. We have had some other people say thank you. I want to point out to everybody also that you will be receiving an evaluation form. Please complete the form and give feedback. When she do that you will receive your form back in be able to load your credit into your individual portal. Thank you again Jeff. It has been great and I appreciate you coming in and helping even though I know you were not feeling that great today. Thank you

everybody for participating and I hope you guys have a great and wonderful week. It is Wednesday so the rest of the week is downhill. Have a great day. By.

Thank you everyone.

[Event Concluded]