

Governor's Council on Blindness and Visual Impairment (GCBVI)
Deaf-Blind Issues Committee Meeting Minutes
April 25, 2019

Members Present

Ed Gervasoni, Chair
Sue Kay Kneifel
Cindi Robinson
Megan Mogan
Mary Hartle
Carmen Green Smith
Jonathan Pringle

Members Absent

Steve Wilson

Staff Present

Lindsey Powers

Guests Present

Julie Stylinski, ACDHH
Cindy Walsh, VCD
Larry Rhodes, COPD New Mexico
Karla Martin, CART
Jenn Joralmon, ASL Interpreter
Audrey Evans, ASL Interpreter
Dawn Schoenberger, Tactile Interpreter
Laurence Plate
Kellee Peeplez
Tina Todd
Marsha Sandusky
Lorenzo Gaddy
Andrew Cohen
Virginia Thompson
Bob Wilt

Call to Order and Introductions

Ed Gervasoni, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:05 am in the Arizona Commission for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (ACDHH) Conference Room, Phoenix, AZ. Introductions were made, and a quorum was present.

Approval of January 8, 2019 Meeting Minutes

Sue Kay Kneifel moved to approve the minutes of the January 8, 2019 Committee on Deaf-Blind Issues meeting. Cindi Robinson seconded the motion. Cindi Robinson requested clarification in the minutes regarding how Julie Stylinski would obtain ROI's for individuals to receive services. Cindi Robinson requested the minutes be corrected to reflect the intervener program was a 2-year program sponsored by the Arizona DeafBlind Project. Carmen Green Smith requested the minutes be reflected to show that the ACDHH has a hearing healthcare program. The amended minutes were approved by unanimous voice vote.

Chair Report

Ed Gervasoni reminded individuals to introduce themselves and to be mindful of the different methods of communication. Mr. Gervasoni stated that committee members were permitted to speak without being recognized by the Chair, although he would open the discussion to the members of the public to provide feedback on each agenda item after the committee members had discussed the items. Ed Gervasoni stated there were several exciting things happening in the state, although many things were complex, and everyone was working for the best interest of the deaf-blind community. Ed Gervasoni stated that Chris Desborough had resigned from the committee and Mr. Gervasoni felt that some of his reasons for resigning were legitimate. **(Note: Attachment A)**

Valley Center for the Deaf (VCD) should be represented on the committee as well as an individual from the Helen Keller National Center (HKNC). Cindi Robinson stated the committee should continue to recruit members with Combined Vision and Hearing Loss (CVHL). Sue Kay Kneifel agreed and stated the committee could also recruit individuals from the service providers such as the Arizona Center for the Blind and Visually Impaired (ACBVI) as well as agencies that provided

National Deaf-Blind Equipment Distribution Program (NDBEDP) Update

Larry Rhodes stated that June 15, 2019 would be the last day that Community Outreach Program for the Deaf (COPD) would administer the I Can Connect in Arizona. He noted that the services would be transferred to the Arizona Center for the Blind and Visually Impaired (ACBVI). Mr. Rhodes stated that COPD had a transition plan with the Perkins School for the Blind to transfer the services to ACBVI. Virginia Thompson stated that ACBVI had four individuals that would provide the I Can Connect services. She noted

the organization intended to provide direct services to individuals statewide. Cindi Robinson inquired whether any of individuals that would provide the I Can Connect services be able to communicate in ways other than American Sign Language (ASL). Virginia Thompson stated that Mike Perry was sighted and hearing and had extensive experience in working with individuals that were blind first and hard of hearing second. Mary Hartle inquired whether any of the individuals providing the I Can Connect individuals were blind and noted that blind or visually impaired individuals had a greater understanding of Assistive Technology (AT) such as JAWS and Braille displays. Virginia Thompson stated that ACBVI staff could provide assistance to individuals with AT questions and noted that Andrew Cohen had also been hired to provide I Can Connect services. Andrew Cohen stated he was deaf-blind himself and had extensive experience in technology and was familiar with the different technologies that different populations would use.

Bob Wilt stated that he would like to see increased funding for the I Can Connect program and more follow up instruction in using the technologies. Larry Rhodes clarified that each state received an allocation of funds from the Federal Communications Commission (FCC). Mr. Rhodes stated the funds were used to pay for the technology and noted that one Braille device could be \$4000. Larry Rhodes stated if several consumers received their first technology, those funds could be exhausted quickly, and would not allow for extensive training. Larry Rhodes noted if one state had left over funds, the Perkins School for the Blind could request the FCC move those funds to another state. He noted that some individuals had limited to no experience with technology and required extensive instruction on basic computer literacy and did not leave many additional hours of instruction using the device. Ed Gervasoni stated there could be a benefit to identifying creative ways to educate consumers such as offering group instruction. He noted those individuals could then assist each other with questions regarding AT. Mary Hartle inquired whether the individuals currently receiving I Can Connect services under the COPD would have to reapply for services once the program moved to ACBVI. Larry Rhodes stated that all consumer data files would be moved to ACBVI and individuals would not be required to reapply for services.

SSP Services in Arizona Follow-Up

- **Communication Facilitation Discussion**
- **Policy Updates**

Julie Stylinski stated the Arizona Commission for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (ACDHH) was recently been made aware that Arizona required that interpreters have be certified as interpreters and Support Service Provider

(SSP) were not permitted to provide interpreting services or to copy sign. Julie Stylinski stated ACDHH did not want to put an SSP in danger of violating that law. Carmen Green Smith stated that ACDHH had to follow the law and when the agency shared the information, the agency received many questions from the consumers and the SSPs. Carmen Green Smith stated that SSPs were told that copy signing could be a violation of the law and had concerns. Carmen Green Smith stated that Julie Stylinski had performed research regarding deaf-blindness and interpreting and had obtained information. Julie Stylinski stated the current SSP Training Curriculum clarified that an SSP cannot interpret. Carmen Green Smith stated that under RID standards, they define interpreting for a professional Certified Deaf Interpreter (CDI) as one to one direct interpreting or copy signing. She noted that copy signing, or mirror interpreting, was defined as interpreting for CDIs. Julie Stylinski stated through her research, she spoke with an individual from the National Deaf-Blind Interpreting Center, who indicated that copy signing was considered interpreting. Ms. Stylinski stated the organization also indicated that anyone providing CART services or any type of text of the communication, would be considered an interpreter as well because the individual was listening to the audio and then interpret the information. Julie Stylinski stated that her research findings were presented to the Interpreter Licensure Committee (ILC) and would be included on the committee's next meeting agenda. Carmen Green Smith stated the ILC addressed concerns related to licensure law for ACDHH and was responsible for licensing interpreters.

Ed Gervasoni inquired regarding some potential options to address the interpreting issue. Carmen Green Smith stated the ACDHH wanted to ensure that SSPs were not put in positions where they could violate the law and the agency was seeking clarity on the role of SSPs. She added that the licensure law has been in place since 2007 and SSPs had been providing services for many years, although like the interpreting profession, there were no guidelines regarding the profession. Sue Kay Kneifel agreed that the agency needed clarity regarding the role of the SSP. She added that ACDHH also needed to address the equity of pay of the professions. Ms. Kneifel stated that an individual providing interpreting had a specific set of credentials and should receive appropriate pay equity that was commensurate with those credentials. Ed Gervasoni stated his concern that deaf-blind individuals were already isolated and continued to experience challenges in receiving services. Carmen Green Smith stated ACDHH was beginning to hear from concerns from consumers. She noted that other states such as New Mexico's licensure law allowed certain things in the role of an SSP. Carmen Green Smith stated that ACDHH would seek clarity on how the law applied and was interested in hearing all the feedback from the consumers. Carmen Green Smith stated the law could be modified, which

was not an easy feat. She added that the agency was also considering the safety of the consumers and noted the potential danger in an SSP providing interpreting services.

Larry Rhodes stated that since the inception of SSP services, SSPs in New Mexico provided copy signing services. He noted that five years ago, an SSP was reported for interpreting, which prompted the licensing commission to review the law. Larry Rhodes stated that the law indicated that copy signing was not considered interpreting. Mr. Rhodes stated his understanding that SSPs in any state were not permitted to interpret unless that individual was a certified interpreter. Larry Rhodes stated page five of the Arizona Law that he was able to locate, indicated that an interpreting means an individual was interpreting between ASL and English. Larry Rhodes stated that if an interpreter already provided the interpreting of English to ASL, the SSP was copy-signing what had been interpreting, therefore, copy-signing should not be considered a violation of the law. Larry Rhodes stated he contacted the Helen Keller National Center (HKNC), which confirmed that SSPs did not interpret, and the majority of SSPs did copy sign. Larry Rhodes stated the current Arizona law only included ASL interpretation to English and did not include mention of other languages. Sue Kay Kneifel stated her understanding that the RID indicated that a CDI was certified at the national level and an individual with a CDI took ASL language and interpreted into ASL. Sue Kay Kneifel stated she would disagree that copy signing was not interpreting, and her concern was that there was no current mechanism to pay SSPs at an interpreter level. She noted that those roles needed to be clearly defined because a CDI earned more than an SSP. Larry Rhodes stated his understanding that there was a conflict between the State law and the licensing procedure for CDIs and inquired regarding the requirements for an individual to be certified as a CDI in Arizona. Sue Kay Kneifel stated an individual would need to have RID credentials. Larry Rhodes stated there appeared to be a gap in the state licensure. Carmen Green Smith stated CDIs were able to perform the function of interpreting but noted that an interpreter could expand on a concept. She noted if an SSP was copy signing and received a response from the consumer that the consumer was not understanding, and the SSP intuitively changed the sign or word, that SSP could be interpreting under the state law. Ms. Green Smith noted that the ACDHH was seeking clear guidelines so the SSP would know what was permitted. Ed Gervasoni stated that most SSPs would likely experience that at some point. Mr. Gervasoni stated the primary need of the deaf-blind individuals was to be able to communicate with others and the deaf-blind population would be affected by the limitations. Ed Gervasoni stated that interpreters should be sent to provide interpreting services to the deaf-blind individuals.

Cindy Walsh stated that according to the state law, anyone listening to English and providing a summary in English, could potentially be in violation of the interpreting law. Sue Kay Kneifel stated that English to English would not be considered interpreting. Cindy Walsh stated that she was informed that an individual could type English to an English-speaking individual. Carmen Green Smith stated she would seek clarity and would ensure that the information shared was accurate. Cindi Robinson stated there was a range of services needed by deaf-blind clients, and some individuals would require typed communication. Mary Hartle stated that she would appreciate the ACDHH clarify the roles of an SSP quickly so that the deaf-blind consumers could continue to receive services. Larry Rhodes stated that an individual providing tactile interpreting was taking the ASL interpreting signs and placed them in the hand of the deaf-blind individual, thus already changing the signs. Mr. Rhodes stated the letter sent from ACDHH indicated that SSPs were not permitted to copy sign and suggested the agency wait until the Arizona law was clarified before restricting those services. Carmen Green Smith stated the intent of the letter was to inform the SSPs and consumers regarding the ACDHH's interpretation of the law. She noted the ACDHH would work with the Assistant Attorney General and to seek clarity. Ms. Green Smith stated she was taking the committee's concerns to the ILC and would consult the Assistant Attorney General regarding the state law. Carmen Green Smith noted that some states allowed individuals to copy sign, while other states did not allow it, which added to the confusion. Cindi Robinson inquired whether the ACDHH had influence regarding the interpretation of the State law. Carmen Green Smith stated the ACDHH would also work with the Governor's Regulatory Rulemaking Committee, which would oversee any regulations that were done for any professional group and would help determine the parameters of the rules. She noted that when the law was enacted in 2007, there were no SSPs.

Cindi Robinson noted the current state law also needed to be updated to reflect ASL interpretation into languages other than English. Carmen Green Smith stated that ACDHH would include all the issues, and the Governor's Regulatory Rulemaking Committee would determine the impact and whether those statutes could be revisited. She noted that the public would also have an opportunity to provide feedback regarding any proposed changes. Ed Gervasoni inquired whether the consumer should have an opinion regarding how the individual received the information. Ed Gervasoni inquired whether interveners that were providing interpreting services to students had to be certified interpreters. Sue Kay Kneifel stated the statute did not require individuals working with K-12 students to be licensed. Cindy Walsh inquired whether the ACDHH could send CDIs until the issue was clarified. Carmen Green Smith the agency had received that suggestion. Ms. Green Smith noted that consumer choice was important and noted the agency did not

want to put SSPs in danger of violating the law. Ed Gervasoni inquired whether an individual volunteering as an SSP or interpreter had to abide by the rules as well. Sue Kay Kneifel stated there were rules in the statute regarding volunteering interpreting, unless the individual was in a life-threatening emergency. Sue Kay Kneifel noted she heard many complaints from consumers when the consumer was not in favor of the information received. She noted that in every complaint, the interpreter had to face potential punitive actions, and the ACDHH did not intend to place SSPs in that position. Ed Gervasoni inquired what the deaf-blind consumers should do while the information was being clarified. Carmen Green Smith stated the licensure law only impacted the SSP if the individual was being paid for their services and noted that ACDHH did not have any jurisdiction over an individual providing volunteer SSP services. Ed Gervasoni inquired regarding the separation of church and state and how an individual could be denied SSP services to attend church. Larry Rhodes stated in New Mexico, SSPs were not provided SSPs for religious functions because state funds could not be used, or because an SSP might disagree with the religion. He noted that SSPs would sometimes be willing to provide volunteer SSP support. Sue Kay Kneifel stated a deaf-blind individual could request an interpreter through the church. Carmen Green Smith thanked the committee for their feedback and ACDHH would continue to share updates with the community. She noted the agency was not interested in harming the consumers or the SSPs and was interested in providing the best services to the deaf-blind and combined vision and hearing loss (CVHL) community.

Kellee Peeplez inquired whether the agencies that hired SSPs ensured that the SSPs were able to communicate with the deaf-blind consumers. Julie Stylinski stated that ACDHH would provide training or education regarding working with the deaf-blind or CVHL community. Kellee Peeplez inquired whether SSPs could be certified to provide functions such as assisting with shopping. Ed Gervasoni stated the Deaf-Blind Issues Committee was interested in reviewing the certification and training of SSPs and interveners for deaf-blind individuals. Sue Kay Kneifel stated the ACDHH had been discussing the need to identify skill levels of SSPs and assign appropriate pay for those skill levels. Bob Wilt stated that he considered the email from ACDHH as a threat that could limit the services to the deaf-blind population. Mr. Wilt stated he was unsure how to file a complaint on an interpreter and noted that he hired an interpreter for a meeting, which was \$200. Bob Wilt stated he preferred CDIs because the CDIs had a greater understanding of deaf and hard of hearing individuals. Bob Wilt stated he was unable to locate the law that indicated the roles that an SSP could or could not perform. He noted that an SSP was unable to use a VP to assist his wife in contacting friends. Marsha Sandusky stated that communicating through VP was difficult and she did not have many emails of friends. She noted that

many individuals used Facebook, although she was unable to read Facebook messages or Instagram messenger. Ms. Sandusky stated she was frustrated because she was able to receive messages and updates from family and friends and missed out on those communications. Lorenzo Gaddy inquired how deaf-blind individuals could receive assistance in using relay communication and VP. Virginia Thompson stated that ACBVI could provide instruction on using relay communication. Lorenzo Gaddy inquired how he could request a speaking SSP or an SSP that could interpret. Julie Stylinski stated that SSPs could not interpret and noted that she would contact Mr. Gaddy regarding his request.

SSP Training Curriculum Update

This item was tabled.

SSP Professional Development and Certification Discussion

Ed Gervasoni suggested the committee, or a workgroup discuss the certification of SSPs.

Intervener Training Update

Megan Mogan stated the program was in the second cohort of Online Open Hands Open Access modules, which was a module of intervener training. She noted that the training was for interveners and individuals that provided one on one access to students, such as the speech therapist or the teacher. Megan Mogan stated there were 15 participants in the first cohort and the second cohort had 10 participants. Ms. Mogan noted that cohort one started with all online training and noted that many individuals expressed their desire to have some one-on-one training. Megan Mogan stated the second cohort used video conferencing to reach individuals in rural areas and noted that individuals requested face-to-face and online modules. Megan Mogan stated the program would develop a blended module of online and face-to-face training for the following year. She noted the program would also develop a coaching model to pair individuals new to intervener training with individuals that were more experience. Sue Kay Kneifel inquired regarding the minimum requirements for an intervener in the school system. Megan Mogan stated that most interveners had a paraprofessional background. Cindi Robinson stated that interveners must complete the 2-year intervener in depth training program. Sue Kay Kneifel inquired whether an individual could obtain the training on the job. Megan Mogan stated the Arizona Deaf-Blind Project funds the intervener training although the local educational agency that funds the incentive to becoming a trained intervener. Cindi Robinson stated the that interveners could obtain national certification by

building an electronic portfolio that demonstrates their knowledge and skills in 79 competencies areas.

ACDHH Budget Request

Carmen Green Smith stated the ACDHH would submit the budget request due on September 1, 2019 and would report some of the reasons that all the funding was not used, such as not being able to provide transportation as part of the SSP services. Carmen Green Smith stated the ACDHH would also report the need for in-home service hours as well as services outside of the home. Carmen Green Smith stated the agency would provide a summary of the previous year and would discuss the barriers to the SSP program. Cindy Walsh inquired whether the SSP services program be available for other agencies to bid on or whether the ACDHH would continue to provide those services. Carmen Green Smith stated at the previous committee meeting; the members discussed the attempt to include SSP services in the statewide interpreter contract. Ms. Green Smith stated there was confusion regarding SSP services, and the decision was made to take the SSP services out of the statewide interpreter contract. Carmen Green Smith stated a Request for Information (RFI) went out to individuals registered in the Procurement office and the ACDHH would continue to work with the Procurement office regarding whether the services would be contracted to another organization. Cindi Robinson inquired regarding the number of individuals had been served since the last committee meeting, and where those individuals were located. Julie Stylinski stated the SSP program was currently serving 27 individuals, although not all individuals used their allotted 20 hours of service. Ms. Stylinski noted that all consumers were located in Phoenix. Julie Stylinski stated she continued to send out reminders to consumers to remind them that they could use their service hours inside and outside of the home. Cindi Robinson inquired regarding the methods to recruit SSPs and consumers in Tucson. Julie Stylinski stated there were 2 SSPs in Tucson and she shared information regarding the SSP program with her contacts in Tucson, although many deaf-blind individuals indicated that transportation was an issue. Larry Rhodes stated the COPD funds would be exhausted in June and inquired how those services would continue. Cindy Walsh stated COPD would continue to use any donated funds to provide services to the community, although the ongoing funds that the agency had been using for several years would be exhausted. Ms. Walsh stated COPD would be interested to partner with ACDHH to provide SSP services and had responded twice to the RFI.

AHCCCS/ALTCS Services Update

Ed Gervasoni stated that Dara Johnson was unable to attend the meeting, although she had indicated the Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System (AHCCCS) continued to work on the draft policy and preparing for the new Arizona Long Term Care System (ALTCS) Community Intervener service to be available on October 1, 2019. Ms. Johnson noted that there were two stakeholder meetings in Phoenix and Tucson in which the members of the committee had been invited. Dara Johnson stated that once AHCCCS drafted the final version of the policy, stakeholders would have an opportunity to provide comment during a 45-day public comment period. She added that AHCCCS would ensure that members of the Deaf-Blind Issues Committee would receive notification of the opportunity to provide public comment. Ed Gervasoni stated if any committee members had any questions, they could send them to Lindsey Powers, who would compile the questions and forward to Dara Johnson.

SBVID Report

Sue Kay Kneifel stated that she filled Rehabilitation Counselor for the Deaf (RCD) and a Rehabilitation Counselor for the Blind (RCB) positions and had made offers to offers individuals for the Supervisor positions in Tucson. Sue Kay Kneifel stated she was accepting applications for the RCD position in Prescott Valley and were interviewing for a RCD in Tucson. She added that she anticipated a Rehabilitation Counselor the Hard of Hearing (RCHH) would post in May as well. Ed Gervasoni inquired whether the Services for the Blind Visually Impaired and Deaf (SBVID) would hire a Deaf-Blind Specialist. Sue Kay Kneifel stated that Ellen Boyd still worked with the deaf-blind population and SBVID was also training another counselor that had CVHL to assist with that case load. Ms. Kneifel stated the supervisor in Tucson that worked with the deaf-blind clients was on medical leave, although RCBs were handling cases of individuals with vision loss first and hearing loss second. She noted the 2 RCDs had been covering the cases in Tucson that used ASL as their primary form of communication. Sue Kay Kneifel stated the SBVID Program Manager position had not been posted yet, so she continued to handle the VR portion and Kristen Mackey, RSA Administrator, was handling the Independent Living Blind and the Business Enterprise Program.

AZ DeafBlind Project Update

Megan Mogan stated the Arizona DeafBlind Project was in the first year of a five-year grant. Ms. Mogan stated the program had carried out a project activity related to family engagement, a Family Music program at the

Foundation for Blind Children (FBC). She noted that 118 individuals participated, which was the third year of offering that event. Megan Mogan stated the program was in the process of reporting the child count to the National Center on Deaf-Blindness, which were 204 children and 30 referrals. Megan Mogan stated that one student was of transition age, although the majority were between birth and age 3. Megan Mogan stated the program was charged with identifying individuals with CVHL and with providing them with qualified providers that could support their families. She noted the Arizona DeafBlind Project hosted face to face trainings for early childhood education specialists, which continued to be requested trainings.

Deaf-Blind Connections in Arizona Update

Mary Hartle stated the D-B Connections in AZ was originally created to develop a statewide SSP program, although the focus had shifted to providing advocacy and public education activities. Ed Gervasoni inquired whether the D-B Connections in AZ had any upcoming public education activities. Mary Hartle stated there were no public education activities scheduled, although she would continue to provide updates to the committee due to the committee resignation of Chris Desborough.

Strategic Planning Discussion

Ed Gervasoni suggested the committee identify some areas to focus on and develop workgroups that would work on those activities. Ed Gervasoni stated that workgroups could focus on the SSP certification and training process, how to potentially provide a conference or training to deaf-blind individuals, or any other topics. Jonathan Pringle stated he would be interested in working on the development of a common intake form or package that could be distributed to individuals with CVHL. Virginia Thompson stated she used to be on the Vision Rehabilitation and Assistive Technology Expo (VRATE) Board and stated the committee could collaborate with VRATE. Sue Kay Kneifel stated she was currently on the VRATE Board and had nominated Julie Styliniski as part of the Accessibility Committee for SSPs for VRATE. Sue Kay Kneifel stated the committee could make recommendations for any speakers or presentations that would focus on the deaf-blind population. Ed Gervasoni stated the committee could consider potentially participating on VRATE and could suggest a deaf-blind track for the following year.

Ed Gervasoni stated that he would Chair a workgroup on future VRATE activities. Jonathan Pringle stated he would Chair a workgroup on the development of intake forms.

Conference Updates

Sue Kay Kneifel stated the VRATE Conference was scheduled for November 15 and 16 at the Glendale Civic Center.

Agenda and Date for Next Meeting

The next meeting of the Committee on Deaf-Blind Issues was scheduled for August 15, 2019 from 10:00 a.m. to 1:30 p.m. in the Arizona Commission for the Deaf and Hard of Hearing (ACDHH) Conference Room, 100 N. 15th Avenue, Suite 104, Phoenix, AZ. Agenda items are as follows:

- Chair Report
- National Deaf-Blind Equipment Distribution Program (NDBEDP) Update
- SSP Services in Arizona Follow-Up
- SSP Training Curriculum Update
- SSP Professional Development and Certification Discussion
- ACDHH Budget Request
- HKNC Update
- Deaf-Blind Project Update
- AHCCCS/ALTCS Services Update
- Deaf-Blind Connections in Arizona Update
- Conference Updates

Announcements

Jonathan Pringle announced that his services as Deaf-Blind specialist were available to anyone with CVHL that could work legally. He noted the services were not contingent upon whether the individual had attended HKNC.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Adjournment of Meeting

The meeting was adjourned at 1:35 p.m.

Hello,

I would like to resign my post on the GCBVI DeafBlind issues committee.

It has become quite clear to me that some members of the committee have conflicting interests within their involvement and are not completely focused on the best interests of the community that I am part of. This comes across to me as a conflict of interest, and it seems ethically and morally wrong, and as such I choose not to continue.

Furthermore, the committee is not representative of the deafblind community that exists across the State of Arizona, with very little being done to give a true voice to the population it seeks to serve.

I thank the GCBVI and the DeafBlind Issues Committee for the opportunity to serve. I wish the council and the committee success in their efforts, however, I choose to focus my energies with agencies that are committed to ensuring that all people living with combined vision and hearing loss are given a voice, and that they are treated with the dignity and respect to which every person is entitled.

Chris