ASCSU THE ASSOCIATED STUDENTS OF COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

19TH SESSION OF THE FIFTY-THIRD SENATE
14 Febuary 2024

RESOLUTION #5303
Passage of the Accessibility Caucus Report

NOTICE: *A signature to sponsor means that you only wish for the legislation to be heard, a signature to endorse means that you support the contents and/or actions of this legislation.*

WRITTEN BY: Sammy Trout, Chair, Accessibility Caucus, Associate Senator, Student Disability Center

COLLABORATED WITH: Ruairi Low, Chair-Emerit, Accessibility Caucus; Justin Dove, Director, Student Disability Center; Joe Tiner, Assistant Director of Accommodations, Student Disability Center; Committee for Disabled Student Accessibility;

SPONSORED BY:

ENDORSED BY: Alexander Wilson, Vice-Chair, Accessibility Caucus, Senator, Student Disability Center; Ariadne Athey, Senator, Student Disability Center; Madeleine Kamberg, Associate Senator, Adult Learner & Veteran Services; Gavin LeCerf, Senator, College of Liberal Arts, Secretary, Internal Affairs Committee; Mia Ritter, Recruitment & Retention Officer; Enock Monanti, Chair, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Affairs Committee, Senator, Black/African American Cultural Center; Nora Aslan, Chair, Budgetary Affairs, Senator, Pride Resource Center; Graham Kelly, Chair, University Affairs Committee, Senator, College of Natural Sciences;

ABSTRACT: This resolution aims to adopt the report made by the Accessibility Caucus

WHEREAS

The Accessibility Caucus, established under Bill #5221 and expanded on under Bills #5306 and #5314 respectively, was established to draft and submit a report regarding the status of door buttons and campus accessibility overall; and,

WHEREAS

RESOLUTION #53XX - Passage of the Accessibility Caucus Report

Managing Director, Center for Public Deliberation; Nick DeSalvo, ASCSU President; Alex Silverhart, ASCSU Vice President; Leticia Madrigal-Tapia, ASCSU Director, Diversity and Inclusion; Meron Siyoum, ASCSU Director, Campus Community; Theo Resse, ASCSU Director, Academic Relation; Alayna Truxal, Chief Justice, ASCSU Supreme Court; , Speaker, ASCSU Senate; Claudia Paraiso, Speaker Pro-Tempore, ASCSU Senate; Sammy Trout, Chair, Accessibility Caucus, Associate Senator, Student Disability Center; Ruairi Low, Chair-Emerit, Accessibility Caucus; Enock Monanti, Chair, Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Affairs Committee, Associate Senator, Pride Resource Center; Appointees of the Colorado Disability Services in Higher Education Advisory Committee

---

PASSAGE AND ENACTMENT OF RESOLUTION 53XX
SESSION OF PASSAGE

Yays-Nays-Abstentions

SENATE PASSAGE **DATE**

Ava Ayala 3/27/24

ASCSU SPEAKER OF THE SENATE AVA AYALA **DATE**

THAT THIS LEGISLATION SHALL BE FORWARDED TO:

Tony Frank, Chancellor of the Colorado State University System
Amy Parsons, President of Colorado State University
Marion Underwood, Provost and Executive Vice President of Colorado State University
Mike Ellis, Associate Vice President and Executive Director of the Lory Student Center
Dr. Blanche Hughes, Vice President for Student Affairs
Dr. Kauline Cipriani, Vice President for Inclusive Excellence
Dr. Shannon Archibeque-Engle, Associate Vice President for Inclusive Excellence
Ria Vigil, Assistant Vice President for Inclusive Excellence
Justin Dove, Director of Student Disability Center
Joe Tiner, Assistant Director for Access and Accommodations of Student Disability Center
JoAnn Cornell, Director of the Asian Pacific American Cultural Center
Duan Ruff, Director of the Black/African American Cultural Center
Ty. A Smith, Director of the Native American Cultural Center

RESOLUTION #53XX - Passage of the Accessibility Caucus Report

ARCHIVE INFO [Parliamentarian Use Only]

INTRODUCTION DATE/SESSION: **ARCHIVE DATE:**

COMMITTEE'S REVIEWED: **MONETARY? Y/N**

"There is so much that able-bodied people could learn from the wisdom that often comes with disability. But space needs to be made. Hands need to reach out. People need to be lifted up.

The story of disabled success has never been a story about one solitary disabled person overcoming limitations—despite the fact that's the narrative we so often read in the media. The narrative trajectory of a disabled person's life is necessarily webbed. We are often only as strong as our friends and family make us, only as strong as our community, only as strong as the resources and privileges we have." - Alice Wong

Letter of Transmittal

Accessibility Caucus

Ava Ayala
Speaker of the 53rd Senate
Associated Students of Colorado State University

Dear Madam Speaker,

By a vote of 14-0, on behalf of the Accessibility Caucus, We hereby submit the Accessibility Caucus's Fall 2023 report to the 53rd ASCSU Senate to adopt pursuant to Senate Bills #5221 and #5306 respectively.

Sincerely,

Sammy Trout
Chair, Accessibility Caucus

Alexander Wilson
Vice-Chair, Accessibility Caucus

Ruairí Low
Chair-Emerit, Accessibility Caucus

cc'd:

Madison Enney, Clerk for the Associated Students of Colorado State University

Elisa Randazzo, Front Desk Manager for the Associated Students of Colorado State University

Claudia Paraiso, Speaker Pro Tempore of the Associated Students of Colorado State University

Parker Doyle, Parliamentarian of the Associated Students of Colorado State University

Nicholas DeSalvo, President of the Associated Students of Colorado State University

Alex Silverhart, Vice-President of the Associated Students of Colorado State University

Alayna Truxal, Chief Justice of the Associated Students of Colorado State University

Jamie Binder, Deputy Chief Justice of the Associated Students of Colorado State University

Table of Contents

future where everyone, regardless of how their body and mind move and function in this world, has a place, is valued, and can participate without fear of harm. Likewise, we seek accountability from all on campus in taking responsibility for exclusionary and even retaliatory practices and committing to the inclusion and accessibility of education for disabled people who currently and will attend CSU.

While the Accessibility Caucus was not intended to become a permanent fixture within ASCSU, its impact inside and outside of ASCSU has made it clear that this work must continue. We hope this report, the first of many, will bring permanent change to our campus. Finally, we hope that ASCSU continues what we have started to ensure CSU is accessible for all.

Acknowledgements:

The Accessibility Caucus would like to thank the Student Disability Center staff, Pride Leadership Council, the ASCSU Interim Advisors, CSU Facilities Management, Associate Vice President and Executive Director of Lory Student Center Mike Ellis, The School of Social Work's Committee for Social Justice, The Fat Liberation Initiative, Accessibility Caucus Co-Founder and Recruitment & Retention Officer Mia Ritter, ASCSU Vice-President Alex Silverhart, ASCSU Chief of Staff Braxton Dietz, ASCSU Senate Leadership, the ASCSU Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion Affairs Committee, the ASCSU Women & Social Justice Caucus, Dr. James A. Peth, Associate Dean of Students John Henderson, Professor Rosemary Kreston, University Facility Fee Advisory Board Chair Benton Rosler, and Tommy Guerin for their dedication and support towards our mission goals of the Caucus inside *and* outside of ASCSU.

Introduction and Overview:

The Accessibility Caucus of the 53rd Senate of the Associates of Colorado State University, referred to as "The Accessibility Caucus or simply "The Caucus", is an investigative caucus initially created by the passage of Bill #5221, "I Can't Believe It's Not Buttons Act!", in the 52nd Senate for the purpose of investigating and providing a report to the Senate on the status of door button openers and proposing solutions. The mission of the Caucus was expanded with the passage of Bill #5306, "Extending the term of the Accessibility Caucus" in the 53rd Senate to make recommendations regarding accessibility issues on campus as a whole, not just door buttons. The Accessibility Caucus was established as a permanent entity within ASCSU, pursuant to Section 602 of the ASCSU Constitution with the passage of Bill #5314, "Reestablishment of the Accessibility Caucus as a Standing Caucus".

To facilitate a deeper understanding and engagement with the subject matter, the Appendix of this report serves as a valuable resource repository. Included in this section are pivotal ASCSU documents such as the Caucus's founding legislation, a comprehensive report issued by the Colorado Disability Services in Higher Education Advisory Committee, and essential guides like the Student & Faculty Accommodation Handbooks and an inclusive seating guide authored by the Fat Liberation Initiative ("FIL"). Recognizing the length of these resources, hyperlinks will be provided for convenient access. For any inquiries or issues regarding the hyperlinks, individuals are encouraged to email the ASCSU Front Desk.

This report aims to highlight existing challenges and pave the way for informed discussions and collaborative efforts toward creating a more accessible and inclusive environment within the CSU Main Campus.

Terms & Glossary:

Ableism: *"A system of assigning value to people's bodies and minds based on societally constructed ideas of normalcy, productivity, desirability, intelligence, excellence, and fitness. These constructed ideas are deeply rooted in eugenics, anti-Blackness, misogyny, colonialism, imperialism, and capitalism. This systemic oppression leads to people and society determining people's value based on their culture, age, language, appearance, religion, birth or living place, "health/wellness," and/or their ability to satisfactorily re/produce, "excel" and "behave." You do not have to be disabled to experience ableism." – Talila A. Lewis*

Ableism has as many definitions as people who experience discrimination, prejudice, or social alienation because of real or perceived differences in body and mind. Therefore, the Accessibility Caucus defines ableism as a multilayered phenomenon shaped by individual interactions, hostile physical spaces, institutional and legal frameworks that seek to isolate and prevent people who have or are perceived to have a disability from participating in private and public life. As a Caucus, we problematize notions of being "disabled enough to claim being disabled" because disability itself is fluid and so called "invisible disabilities" are rather highly stigmatized conditions neglected at every level of society. At CSU, ableism takes many forms such as the potentially illegal denial of reasonable accommodations under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, neglect of input from disabled people in building planning and University policy writing, lack of infrastructure to support people who might need transportation on campus due to either permanent and/or temporary disabilities resulting from injury, interpersonal hostility in public and private spaces culminating in retaliation against those who speak out against ableism and inaccessibility, as well as disability being an afterthought in DEI

Accessibility: Accessibility is a social justice movement advocating for intentional and purposeful inclusion of disabled people at all levels of society. As opposed to accommodations, accessibility is about collective access for multiple groups of people. Accessibility is about usability and functionality of any given public or private space, interactions that value difference, and critically, that do not polarize disability to either an extreme inspiration or an extreme tragedy.

Accessibility also considers the needs of parents, particularly those with young children, combat veterans, gender diverse people, and elders. Changing tables, all gender restrooms, prayer or focus rooms, breastfeeding rooms, small reservable study rooms, food pantries, the Lavender Cabinet, the Career Center attire fund, and care packages are all some examples of accessibility in practice on the CSU Campus

Accommodations: Accommodation refers to the process needed to adapt already created material to make it possible for individuals with disabilities to participate. This is extended to all areas of private and public life. Accommodations place the burden onto the individual and are limited in application due to laws surrounding the application of Civil Rights legislation for disabled people. It provides adjustments to the content without fundamentally changing or addressing exclusivity or content that otherwise segregates those who are unable to participate due to not being able to perform to a standardized metric (i.e., reading and literacy). Accommodations therefore are highly limited as they are only implemented by individuals, and often result in both intentional and unintentional discrimination. Accessibility is preferred because it allows spaces and policies to be more inclusive and usable without placing the burden of labor, advocacy and disclosure, disclosure which can often result in tangible consequences like job loss, hiring discrimination, etc., and instead creates an adaptable environment to meet the needs or easily redirect to meet the needs of the people using that particular space or directly impacted by a particular policy.

The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 ("ADA") & The Americans with Disabilities Act Amendment Act of 2008 ("ADAAA"): *"The history of the ADA did not begin on July 26, 1990, at the signing ceremony at the White House. It did not begin in 1988 when the first ADA was introduced in Congress. he ADA story began a long time ago in cities and towns throughout the United States when people with disabilities began to challenge societal barriers that excluded them from their communities, and when parents of children with disabilities began to fight against the exclusion and segregation of their children. It began with the establishment of local groups to advocate for the rights of people with disabilities. It began with the establishment of the independent living movement which challenged the notion that people with disabilities needed to be institutionalized, and which fought for and provided services for people with disabilities to live in the community." – Arlene Mayerson*
The Americans with Disabilities Act was first introduced in Congress in 1988 and eventually passed in 1990. The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 built upon The Rehabilitation Act of

them from being in a space together. For example, someone with a severe allergy to dander would not be able to share a space with someone who uses a guide dog. Conflict access needs refers to the process in which to find a compromise to allow for both people to access the space, attend an event, or utilize a particular service. Furthermore, this term reflects the ingenuity and creativity used by disabled people to create access in real time, and to honor the often messy and emotionally difficult process that comes with creating accessible spaces, reflecting accessibility as a process rather than an end-static product.

Debility/Debilitation: Debilitation and debility is a useful concept as it covers people who do not constitute a disability identity. They may or may not feel they are disabled despite body impairments. They may feel disabled at one moment but healthy at the next. They share the characteristics of having some kinds of ongoing condition, some chronic illness. Debility and debilitation are concepts that help describe how conditions in the Global South and systemic racism in the Global North often produce debility as an ongoing form of systemic oppression. This distinction is also helpful in understanding how care of disabled people have turned disabled people into a commodity and care workers, often women of color or migrant women from the Global South, into providers of that care regardless of their own individual impairment, fatigue, or chronic condition. It is a concept that problematizes access to resources and status by a particular nation State or governing entity.

Disability: Disability is a social construction, meaning, what is categorized as a disability has changed over time and varies across geographical space. Disability is an individual experience as much as it is a collective experience. Disability is as much a personal identity as a political identity. There are numerous models that provide different definitions of disability, such as the Medical Model, the Charity Model, the Social Model, and the Cultural Model.

The Medical Model:

- Disability arises from an individual with a biological impairment.
- A disabled individual can only be integrated into society if they are cured of their disability/underlying condition.
- The individual is at fault for experiencing exclusion, prejudice, or barriers as disability is an individual problem thus the individual is responsible for overcoming it.
- A doctor or medical professional is the arbiter of disability.

The Charity Model:

- Disability is an unmitigated tragedy that can only be solved by curing disabled individuals.
- Charities and nonprofits invest in marketing tragedy to a sympathetic public in order to raise funds for curing individuals.
- Focuses primarily on children with disabilities and their parents; adults with disabilities are seen as a "lost cause" due to their perceived inability to contribute economically.

- For example, the Anangu people in Western Australia rather than seeing impairments celebrates the uniqueness and diversity of people who might be considered disabled under a Western framework. *"Māori people see the nature of humanness as a unique and interrelated phenomenon, which connects the past, present, and future through land attachment and spiritual well-being, with interrelations at its core (Hickey, 2008). This ancestral Māori conceptualization embraces differences and uniqueness, and so impairment is a natural part of being." – Minerva Rivas Velarde.*
- Used to understand how a particular culture might create or might be subjected to disability and debility as a form of oppression, particularly Indigenous communities.
- Expands the Social Model to allow for a more embodied reality of individuals as well as Indigenous frameworks of knowledge (epistemologies) to shape and change understandings of disability, difference, and impairment.

There are many ways to understand and define disability as there are disabled people. An estimated 1.6 billion people live with a disability (roughly 16% of the total global population), and as such ableism and disability take many fluid forms. There is no universal definition of disability because there is no universal, standardized, or sameness in people's experiences of disability, debility, and impairments. Furthermore, defining disability in a rigid way often becomes problematic and exclusionary, those who otherwise have non-apparent disabilities are marginalized and maligned as "not disabled enough" by pervasive negative attitudes about disability and tight control of resources for those who are disabled. In addition, forcing an individual to claim disabled identity is also problematic and often detrimental to disability activism and advocacy. A person should be able to tangibly benefit from the work done by disabled activists regardless of if they label themselves as disabled or not. Therefore, the ASCSU Accessibility Caucus utilizes a Social Model and Cultural Model of Disability, and we see the lack of resources allocated to support people with invisible disabilities at CSU; the lack of accessible transportation, housing, and classrooms; the overall hush-hush or the negligent silence of administration; and the interpersonal discrimination from unequal power dynamics between faculty and students as the cite of ableism and disability at CSU.

Disability Justice: *"The US Disability Rights Movement established civil rights for people with disabilities. Like other movements, the current Disability Rights Movement includes advocacy organizations, service provision agencies, constituency-led centers, membership-based national organizations, as well as cultural and academic spaces. And, like many movements, it is a product of its time and left us with some 'cliff- hangers' that have yet to be resolved.*

- *Disability rights is based in a single-issue identity, focusing exclusively on disability at the expense of other intersections of race, gender, sexuality, age, immigration status, religion, etc.*

stealing of Indigenous lands, and US imperialism without seeing the way that white supremacy uses ableism to create a lesser/'other' group of people that is deemed less worthy/abled/smart/capable. A single-issue civil rights framework is not enough to explain the full extent of ableism and how it operates in society. We can only truly understand ableism by tracing its connections to heteropatriarchy, white supremacy, colonialism, and capitalism. The same oppressive systems that inflicted violence upon Black and brown communities for 500+ years also inflicted 500+ years of violence on bodies and minds deemed outside the norm and therefore 'dangerous.'

Furthermore, racism, anti-Islamic beliefs, ableism, and imperialism come together to feed us images of the 'terrorist' as a dangerous Brown enemy, an 'other' who is sexually and mentally 'wrong.' All this is compounded by the ways ableism, along with queer-hatred and the violence of the gender binary, label our bodies and communities as 'deviant,' 'unproductive,' and 'invalid.'

A disability justice framework understands that:

- *All bodies are unique and essential.*
- *All bodies have strengths and needs that must be met.*
- *We are powerful, not despite the complexities of our bodies, but because of them.*
- *All bodies are confined by ability, race, gender, sexuality, class, nation state, religion, and more, and we cannot separate them.*

Disability justice holds a vision born out of collective struggle, drawing upon legacies of cultural and spiritual resistance. Within a thousand underground paths we ignite small persistent fires of rebellion in everyday life. Disabled people of the global majority — Black and brown people — share common ground confronting and subverting colonial powers in our struggle for life and justice. There has always been resistance to all forms of oppression, as we know in our bones that there have also always been disabled people visioning a world where we flourish, a world that values and celebrates us in all our beauty." – Patty Berne, adapted from "Disability Justice - A Working Draft."

The ASCSU Accessibility Caucus operates in disability justice framework. We have utilized a hybrid model in our Caucus and have not penalized those who participate in remote/online spaces for being unable to attend Caucus meetings on a regular basis. While we maintain the ASCSU Constitution and a neutral Chair, the Chair operates far more as a position to facilitate and guide conversation, and not as a source of absolute power. Input from all members is valued, and the Caucus seeks to and successfully have facilitate hard and difficult conversations about what and when to take a stance on certain issues facing CSU community members. While the work done in Caucus is not always explicitly labeled as disability justice, it is the primary framework of how the Caucus operates and what guides the vision and needed changes to the CSU Campus to create more accessible environments and relationships for disabled people.

qualified individuals with disabilities. Critically, Section 504 includes public schools. Students who do not qualify for Individualized Education Plans ("IEPs") and related services may receive accommodations and modifications to remove barriers to learning with a 504 plan. Section 508 requires federal agencies to make their electronic and information technology accessible to people with disabilities.

The Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1978 authorized independent living centers in providing services for disabled people using community supports and services (as opposed to institutions and public hospitals where abuse, neglect, and medical experimentation were the norm). Subsequent amendments established case workers in every state, and in 1992, for better or worse, employment became the full focus of the Act and subsequent programs created under the Act.

The Rehabilitation Act of 1973 modeled language from other Civil Rights legislation, particularly in Section 504. After the law was passed, in order to be effective, it needed to define several key components to ensure equal enforcement under the law. These regulations of Section 504 were important to have a consistent, coherent interpretation of 504's legal intent rather than leaving it up to any judge who heard a 504 case to interpret what the law meant. Courts were already handing down conflicting verdicts in 504 cases. Between 1973 and 1977 there were no regulations put forward. The Department of Health and Welfare ("HEW") was ultimately responsible for regulation guidelines, however, these guidelines sat untouched on Secretary Califano's desk when former President Carter came into office. During this time, the American coalition of citizens with disabilities ("ACCD"), a national cross disability committee was formed. ACCD became deeply involved in leading the effort to get regulations out.

However, when the Carter administration took office, instead of signing the regulations, HEW set up a task force with no representation from the disability community to "study" them. After many leaks from the inside, it became clear that the proposed regulations were being gutted, stripped down, and the mission of integration was being lost.
ACCD, realizing civil rights protections for disabled people were being gutted, demanded HEW issue the regulations unchanged by April 4, or action would occur. They called for sit-ins at eight HEW regional headquarters, April 5th if HEW didn't comply. HEW didn't comply, and so on April 5th, disabled people protested.

The sit-in and occupation of a federal office in San Francisco was the most influential. Activists and allies occupied the building for 26 consecutive days. Those who could not participate directly in the sit-in in San Francisco turned instead to galvanize community support and were highly successful in doing so. Churches, radical political groups, the Black Panther Party, the Gay Liberation Movement, and politicians all rallied to support the cause thanks to the impact of those occupying the building and those organizing to help sustain and keep them fed for 26 days. During a compelling and dramatic congressional hearing held in the building, the HEW

Data Collected:

This section has the data collected by members of the Caucus going to the buildings and checking the buttons in. The data analysis is expanded upon under the "Data Analysis" section.

Key:
Blue: Buildings examined by Facilities Management.
Green: Buildings with all buttons functional/consistent functionality.
Yellow: Buildings with 1-2 buttons not functional/inconsistent functionality.
Red: Buildings with no buttons.

Blue Category	Green Category	Yellow Category	Red Category
CSU Administration	CSU Health Center	Canvas Stadium	Danforth Chapel
Alder Hall	Education	University Center of the Arts	
Behavioral Science	Gifford	Johnson Hall	
Biology	Parmelee Hall	South College Parking Garage	
Centennial Hall	Physiology		
Chemistry Research	Visual Arts		
Clark A - Wing			
Clark B - Wing			
Clark C - Wing			
Computer Science			
Corbett Hall			
Durrell Center			
Eddy Hall			
Engineering			
Glover			
Industrial Sciences & Lab			
Lory Student Center			
Military Annex			
Military Sciences			
Morgan Library			
MRB			
NESB			
Student Recreation Center			
TILT			

Data Analysis:

The Caucus divided the work of investigating buttons as individuals had the capacity to. The Caucus did, as a group, reviewed 3 buildings due to their size. These were the Canvas Stadium, the CSU Health Center, and the University Center of the Arts ("UCA"). While Facilities Management reviewed the majority of significant campus structures, the caucus dedicated considerable effort to scrutinizing the remaining buildings, particularly focusing on the functionality of their access buttons. Regrettably, out of the eleven buildings assessed, the caucus can confidently assert that only six exhibit properly functioning buttons across the board. Notably, the Caucus does not have data on the buildings reviewed by the Facilities Management, a circumstance the caucus laments and hopes to acquire during the Spring semester or after their independent review.

The accompanying graph illustrates the number of buildings and the corresponding button outages in absolute values and percentages. Buildings experiencing only 1-2 non-functioning buttons include Canvas Stadium, University Center of the Arts, Johnson Hall, and the South College Parking Garage. In contrast, CSU Health Center, Parmelee Hall, Physiology Building, Education Building, and Gifford Building boast all buttons in working order, representing the pinnacle of accessibility on campus. Despite their current status, these buildings could still benefit from additional improvements, including the installation of new buttons in their interiors as needed.

The absence of interior buttons is prevalent across all buildings reviewed, with only a few exceptions scattered throughout, such as Parmelee, the Education building, and Canvas Stadium. These interior buttons, primarily located in restrooms, remain sparse however and had issues working consistently. This was particularly noticeable as many of the interior doors were heavy and made it difficult to open if you are utilizing mobilities aids or physical disabilities that impact a person's muscle and grip strength.

Danforth Chapel, a building devoid of buttons, was a disheartening discovery during our campus-wide investigation. The caucus finds this absence particularly disappointing and endeavors to advocate for the prompt installation of buttons, at the bare minimum, for the exterior entrances.

Notably, the UCA had the fewest reliable buttons, excluding Danforth Chapel, with only eight buttons, and a concerning 25% failure rate. This is especially alarming given the building's

It is important to know that door buttons are limited in terms of explicit building requirements by the ADA and are only mandated if the door weighs over a certain amount. Many models also suffer from lack of weather proofing, which proves to be detrimental to their functionality in the ever-changing Colorado climate. In addition, people kicking, punching, or otherwise using the buttons in a rough way can lead to quicker decline, malfunctions, and buttons breaking. The average cost of a door button opener in the United States is roughly $2,122.80, ranging between $1,458.25 to $2,787.35 in cost. Automatic doors are even more expensive, often starting at around $10,000.00 and increasing beyond $20,000.00 for larger, more complex automatic doors. Automatic and power operated doors are considered ideal in heavy traffic areas, however, the United Nations provides a comprehensive framework for creating accessible doors (both power operated and non-power operated doors, this guide can be found here). The Accessibility Caucus intends to spend the Spring semester reaching out to potential campus partners to find this funding and will continue to review buildings not mentioned in this report.

Beyond door buttons, The Accessibility Caucus of the 53rd Senate of the Associates of Colorado State University recommends the following actions to continue to advocate for the inclusion of people with disabilities who work and attend Colorado State University. These recommendations come from meetings and discussions as well as from student testimony held over the Summer and Fall Semesters of 2023:

1. The Accessibility Caucus recommends the creation of programmatic events to increase communication between students, professional staff, administrators, and faculty members.
    a. This programmatic event should be available through hybrid and remote options to provide multiple access points for those who are unable to participate in person for a variety of reasons such as lack of access to childcare, having a chronic condition that limits in person participation due to fatigue and pain, having a condition that causes the immune system to be weak and/or compromised whereas in person participation would lead to undue and dangerous exposure to viral and bacterial infections not limited to the seasonal flu, the Respiratory syncytial virus ("RSV"), and the ongoing Novel Coronavirus 2019 ("COVID-19"), having a family member who is high risk for adversarial outcomes if exposed to infectious disease, and for those who simply prefer attending events remotely.
    b. We as the Caucus recommend the CSU Center for Public Deliberation ("CPD") as a host and partner for this event in order to facilitate complex and nuanced dialogue in a moderated setting in order for all CSU community members to voice their needs and find solutions for campus accessibility problems.
    c. We as the Caucus recommend a partnership between CPD, ASCSU, Student Disability Center ("SDC"), the Committee for Disabled Student Accessibility

About Us Without Us" model allows disabled people to participate without having to disclose their individual disability and allows a focus on structures and policies that exclude disabled people rather than on individuals and their various impairments.

k. The Accessibility Caucus recommends that prior to events, all parties involved in planning create guidelines for dialogue and questions that focus on needed policy and structural changes and supports in order to protect those with less institutional power from retaliation or adverse reactions. Furthermore, we advise that these questions be shaped by the community through ASCSU outreach and online submission of questions.

l. Input of discussion topics prior to the event should offer the ability to provide input anonymously in order to protect the privacy of individuals out of concern for safety. An anonymous option furthermore allows input from individuals with disabilities who would not be comfortable otherwise asking or providing input due to not wanting to disclose disability status in the process.

2. The Accessibility Caucus recommends that relevant ASCSU branches develop a relationship with Facilities Management in order to continue continuity of ASCSU projects and the completion of ADA upgrades partially funded by ASCSU under the Christian Dykson-Merry Gebretsadik Administration.
    a. Facilities Management was allotted roughly $182,000 by various campus partners, including ASCSU, in order to bring several key buildings up to compliance in addition to addressing door button openers. Facilities Management indicated many of these buildings are still waiting for contract bids. The purpose of developing a relationship with Facilities Management is to understand the upgrade process and ensure that upgrades are not being needlessly delayed for buildings identified as needing repair and renovations.
    b. This relationship furthermore would allow ASCSU to understand the status of several dozen remaining buildings' needs and the University timeline to complete needed repairs and renovations to increase campus accessibility.
    c. Additionally, The Accessibility Caucus recommends that any projects related to accessibility and accommodations also be sent to the Student Disability Center's Leadership as well as the Committee for Disabled Student Accessibility to ensure continuity of projects as well as ensure transparency, as members of the office's professional staff did not know of the project until members of the Caucus informed them.
3. The Accessibility Caucus recommends that Housing & Dining Services ("HDS"), in conjunction with Facilities Management, conduct a thorough ADA inspection of Residential Halls and Dining Halls, and present those findings to the ASCSU Executive Cabinet and the Senate.

6. The Accessibility Caucus recommends further communication with Facilities Management, Housing, Dining Services, and the Lory Student Center, to implement and ensure the validity and safety of the EpiPen installation throughout campus and the further implication of AEDs throughout campus.
    a. Allergic reactions, especially anaphylaxis, can occur suddenly and without warning, posing a severe threat to individuals with allergies. With their diverse student populations, college campuses must be equipped to handle such emergencies promptly. Epi-Pens, containing epinephrine, are crucial in providing immediate relief during severe allergic reactions. Colorado law recognizes the significance of Epi-Pens on college campuses, emphasizing the need for institutions to have policies to address allergic emergencies.
    b. In Colorado, SB23-299, "Epinephrine Auto-injectors At Institutions Of Higher Education" (C.R.S. § 23-5-149) allows for public schools, including colleges and universities, to maintain a supply of undesignated epinephrine auto-injectors. This law permits trained personnel to administer epinephrine in emergencies, providing a legal framework that supports the accessibility and use of Epi-Pens on college campuses.
    c. Cardiac emergencies, such as sudden cardiac arrest, can affect individuals of any age, including college students. AEDs are critical in these situations, as they can deliver a potentially life-saving electric shock to restore normal heart rhythm. In Colorado, HB19-1183, "Automated External Defibrillators In Public Places" (C.R.S. § 25-53-10) outlines the legal framework for placing and using AEDs in various public settings, including colleges and universities.
    d. Colleges are encouraged to establish AED programs, ensuring that these devices are strategically placed in high-traffic areas and that personnel are trained to use them effectively. The law underscores the importance of AED accessibility and highlights the role of these devices in enhancing campus safety.
    e. Colorado colleges and universities are encouraged and legally obligated to comply with the state's regulations regarding Epi-Pens and AEDs. By doing so, these institutions create an environment prioritizing the health and safety of their students, faculty, and staff.
    f. Colorado's legal framework provides the necessary support for colleges to implement comprehensive policies and training programs, ensuring the proper storage, maintenance, and use of Epi-Pens and AEDs. Compliance with these laws is not only a legal requirement but a moral obligation to safeguard the lives of those within the campus community.
7. The Accessibility Caucus recommends further communication with housing and dining regarding residential student employees' access to accessibility.
    a. Resident Assistants ("RA") are often drawn from a diverse pool of students, each with unique abilities, needs, and perspectives. Ensuring inclusivity involves recognizing and accommodating these differences, creating an environment

Individual Member Recommendations & Statements:

Caucus members were encouraged to formally submit personal recommendations for inclusion in this report, specifically emphasizing individual contributions distinct from the Caucus's collective efforts. The emphasis on individual recommendations does not imply dissent within the Caucus but rather underscores the commitment and efforts of individual members that extend beyond the purview of the Caucus. Additionally, members were encouraged to make statements regarding their work for accessibility and disability justice both inside and outside of ASCSU and the impacts the Caucus has had on their advocacy journey.
It is important to note that individuals had no mandatory obligation to submit their own recommendations or statements.

Sammy Trout – Chair, Accessibility Caucus & Associate Senator, Student Disability Center

Statement:

Reflecting on the inception of this Caucus last Spring, I am genuinely astounded by the unforeseen growth and expansion it has experienced in just a few short months. What began as a humble initiative has blossomed into a resilient and permanent entity within ASCSU, surpassing the initial expectations we had set for it. The success of this transformation is indebted to the unwavering advocacy of ASCSU members and the active engagement of the broader community who enthusiastically participated in the Caucus.

Our original vision for this Caucus, conceived as a temporary investigative body, has matured into an indispensable component of ASCSU, solidifying its place within the governance structure by the students, for the students. The tireless efforts, invaluable insights, unyielding determination, and passionate advocacy exhibited by the members of this Caucus have been nothing short of extraordinary. I am immensely proud of the collaborative spirit that has propelled us forward, demonstrating a commitment to the betterment of Colorado State University.

The significance of our mission goals being not only met but exceeded cannot be overstated. Through its multifaceted approach, this Caucus has played a pivotal role in shaping the landscape of student success on campus. As student leaders, we understand the responsibility we bear in fostering an inclusive environment, both within classrooms and across the entire campus. Our collective dedication ensures that CSU remains an accessible hub of higher education, where every student's journey is met with support and opportunities.

each member of the Caucus are echoed in the sacrifices made by those who stand by us, whether in the gallery, virtually watching live streams on platforms like YouTube, or providing support in various other ways.

Engaging in advocacy is not for the faint of heart, and having a network of incredible advocates for our advocates is truly reassuring. Your presence, whether tangible or virtual, serves as a source of strength. It is a comforting reminder that we are not alone, even in the face of adversity. Whether audible in the room or conveyed through digital platforms, your cheers echo a shared commitment to our cause.

The inherent challenges of our work are met with the profound reward of positively impacting the community we serve. Your love and support, expressed in myriad ways, have not gone unnoticed or unappreciated. It is your belief in our mission that fortifies our resolve and encourages us to persevere. In the grand tapestry of our advocacy, your contributions weave a thread of encouragement and solidarity, creating an invaluable and enduring support system.

As we navigate the complexities of our future endeavors, I extend my deepest gratitude to all those who stand by us. Your role as advocates for our advocates has been an integral part of the success we collectively achieve, and I am genuinely thankful for the strength and unity that your support fosters within our Caucus.

Recommendations:

- I personally recommend that the Associated Students of Colorado State University, through whatever capacity it sees fit, to establish a connection with the Colorado Disability Services in Higher Education Advisory Committee ("Advisory Committee") housed under the Colorado Department of Higher Education ("CDHE")
    - The Advisory Committee was established with the passage and signage of House Bill 22-1255, "Improve Higher Education for Students with a Disability."
    - According to members of the Advisory Committee, there are considerations of establishing a Student-led Ad-Hoc Subcommittee/Task Force which would "bring a team of students from across the state together who are interested in voicing their disability academic needs to inform the Committee on Whole."
    - Besides the Caucus, ASCSU currently has multiple officials and entities that would have jurisdiction, based on their job descriptions and/or relevant bylaws, to handle this engagement. These include, but are not limited to:
        - ASCSU Director of Diversity & Inclusion
        - ASCSU Director of Government Affairs
            - Legislative Strategy Advisory Board
        - ASCSU's Senate Committee on University Affairs
        - ASCSU's Senate Committee on Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion Affairs

Alexander Wilson – Vice-Chair, Accessibility Caucus & Senator, Student Disability Center

- I personally recommend the Accessibility Caucus, in collaboration with other ASCSU officials/entities, take on a project relating to accessibility within the dining halls at CSU.
    - Currently, the dining centers have allergen-friendly options. These options are not fulfilling and are frequently cross-contaminated through human error.
- Additionally, I personally recommend the Accessibility Caucus, in collaboration with other ASCSU officials/entities, work with the dieticians hired by CSU for the dining halls to ensure the student body's safety.

Ruairi Low – Co-Founder & Chair-Emerit, Accessibility Caucus

Statement:

When I first thought of the Accessibility Caucus, I had several concerns I felt needed to be addressed:

1. There needed to be a space for disabled students on campus to give direct input on accessibility concerns in an environment where they did not necessarily have to give that direct input to staff and faculty.
2. Many buildings, even newer ones, remain hostile in design.
3. Making sure people can actually get in the door to get a degree at CSU.

According to Colorado Statewide Independent Living Council ("Colorado SILC"), a committee for the independent living movement, 52.9% of Coloradans with a disability have found it difficult to get or maintain a job due to their disability. There is a discrepancy in employment rates between disabled and non-disabled people. 43.5% of disabled people have a job compared to 83.8% of non-disabled people who have a job in Colorado. Colorado SILC, like many other disability rights organizations, have rightfully pointed out that this discrepancy in employment is due more likely to structural barriers than each individual medical and/or mental condition that is disabling. Research conducted in 2021 showed that 85% of autistic people are unemployed due to bias in employment opportunities and inaccessible workplace environments. According to the National Center for Education Statistics ("NCES"), roughly 19% of undergraduate students reported having a disability and about 12% of graduate students reported having a disability. However, according to the US Department of Education, in 2017, the six-year graduation rate of students with disabilities at four-year colleges is 49.5%, compared to roughly 68% for students without disabilities. That means when I started my undergraduate degree in 2017 at the Metropolitan State University of Denver, I was 18.5% less likely than my non-disabled peers to finish my undergraduate bachelor's degree. Furthermore, now that I have graduated, I have a 4.7% higher chance of facing unemployment than a non-disabled person with a bachelor's degree, who faces a 1.9% chance of facing unemployment, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics data from 2022. There is a well-documented problem with accessibility, discrimination, and disparities in opportunities based on ability (or a perceived lack thereof).

- I also recommend that CSU prioritize expanding TRiO programming like the Summer Bridge college readiness program and connect secondary students on IEP and 504 plans with college students on 504 plans to help them build community on a volunteer basis. The more disabilities of all kinds are made visible, the more opportunities it allows for community building.
- CSU should provide more funding and support to the SDC to expand beyond a provider of accommodations and an entity for compliance. There is a lot of initiative to do this within the SDC now, and more funding should be allocated so we can have an actual space for disabled students, faculty and staff to build community on campus. We deserve a cultural space for disabled students that prioritizes the inclusion and community building opportunities for all disabled people, especially disabled people of color, disabled trans people, and disabled queer people.
- CSU should provide equitable benefits for ASL interpreters and expand sign language interpretation services in dialects of Black Sign Variation ("BSV") and other world languages.
- CSU should prioritize creating scholarships to help enable disabled people pursue a degree at CSU. These scholarships should also be made accessible by working with integrated education specialists in Poudre School District to help secondary students have a direct pathway into CSU and professional careers.
    - There are many ways CSU can and should work to help bridge the gap between K-12 disability services and services provided at CSU. CSU plays a direct role in helping close the unemployment gap faced by people with disabilities and the state of Colorado and nationwide. There should be an expansion of community building opportunities, education opportunities, and professional development opportunities. CSU must practice the inclusion it preaches and should embrace the opportunity it has to be a leader for inclusion, accessibility, and justice for disabled people who choose to work, live, and attend this university.

Ali Owens – Founder & Organizer of the Fat Liberation Initiative at Colorado State University

- I personally recommend the implementation of accessible seating across campus utilizing a universal design.
    - I have written a seating guide specifically with the Clark renovation in mind, but the key points and designs mentioned are pretty universal. A pdf version can be found in Appendix IV below.

Madeleine Kamberg – Associate Senator for the Adult Learner & Veteran Services

Statement:

It is disheartening that some of our student leaders seem to dismiss the significance of Title III and view accessibility for disabled students as a "non-issue." However, it is my personal belief

collection, institutional integration, student involvement, legislative advocacy, and educational initiatives.

1.) Sustained Advocacy:
The Caucus has demonstrated its effectiveness in monitoring and addressing access barriers. Future efforts will likely involve a continuation of advocacy, ensuring that accessibility remains a priority in campus development and policymaking.

2.) Expanded Scope:
While initially focused on door button accessibility, the Caucus has broadened its mission to address wider accessibility issues. Future initiatives may encompass a comprehensive approach to create a fully inclusive and accessible educational environment.

3.) Community Engagement:
Programmatic events, as recommended by the Caucus, will likely play a crucial role in fostering ongoing communication among various stakeholders. These events aim to ensure that the diverse needs of the CSU community are heard and addressed effectively.

4.) Collaborative Partnerships:
Building on existing collaborations, the Caucus may expand its partnerships with various departments, student organizations, and community stakeholders. This collaborative approach is essential for a holistic and sustainable impact on campus accessibility.

5.) Transparency and Accountability:
The Caucus's emphasis on transparency in decision-making and collaboration with relevant organizations indicates a commitment to accountability. Future efforts may include pushing for increased transparency in the implementation of accessibility initiatives.

6.) Continued Data Collection:
Ongoing data collection efforts will likely remain a cornerstone of the Caucus's work. This approach ensures a dynamic understanding of accessibility challenges, assesses the impact of implemented changes, and identifies new areas for improvement.

7.) Institutional Integration:
Future initiatives may focus on further integrating accessibility considerations into the institutional framework of CSU. This could involve policy changes, institutional commitments, and the incorporation of accessibility into long-term planning for campus development.

8.) Student Involvement: