

## What is the significance of Congress' finding that "unjustified segregation of people with disabilities is discrimination" and Title II of the ADA that "no qualified individual with a disability" shall, by reason of disability, be excluded from participation in, denied the benefits of, or subjected to discrimination by a public entity?

### Congress Made Segregation Discrimination Under Title II

The significance is threefold: Congress defined **segregation** itself as disability discrimination, Title II turned that principle into a binding ban on exclusion by public entities, and *Olmstead* converted both into an enforceable right to integrated public services (Blanck, 2021; Batavia, 2002; Jackson et al., 2003).

#### Legal Meaning

Congress's finding matters because it moved disability law beyond banning only overt hostility and treated **isolation and segregation** as discrimination in their own right (Batavia, 2002; West et al., 2022; Bagenstos, 2017).

Title II's prohibition on excluding a qualified person from a public program gave that finding operative force across state and local government services, not just institutions (Mathis, 2001; Ireland & Bales, 2008; Pfeiffer & Finn, 1997).

That broader reading is why later courts and commentators treat Title II as reaching schools, employment services, and other public programs when segregation blocks equal participation (Ennis & Katsiyannis, 2018; Farmer, 2025; Ireland & Bales, 2007).

- **Segregation** became a civil-rights injury, not merely a service preference (Lakin et al., 2009; Flores, 2017).
- Public entities include **state and local governments** and their instrumentalities (Mathis, 2001; Pfeiffer & Finn, 1997).
- The ADA's goals include **full participation** and **independent living** (Batavia, 2002; West et al., 2022).

#### Practical Effect

*Olmstead* gave the statutory finding concrete effect by holding that **unjustified institutionalization** is discrimination prohibited by Title II (Mathis, 2001; Blanck, 2021; Burnim, 2015).

The associated DOJ regulation requires services in the **most integrated setting appropriate**, so states must provide community-based services when professionals find them appropriate, the person does not object, and accommodation is reasonable within state resources (Lakin et al., 2009; Farmer, 2025; Flores, 2017).

This mattered because the Court recognized that unnecessary institutional placement perpetuates assumptions that disabled people are unworthy of community life and restricts family relations, work, education, and social contact (Blanck, 2021; Farmer, 2025).

- States can raise a **fundamental alteration** defense based on resources and obligations to others (Blanck, 2021; Mathis, 2001).
- A working **comprehensive plan** and reasonable waiting list can help satisfy that defense (Mathis, 2001; Farmer, 2025).
- The rule does not require community placement for someone who **opposes transfer** or cannot benefit from it (Mathis, 2001; Blanck, 2021).

## Reach Beyond Institutions

The significance extends beyond psychiatric hospitals because later applications treat **unnecessary segregation** as unlawful in education, sheltered workshops, housing, and even carceral systems (Ennis & Katsiyannis, 2018; Farmer, 2025; Dinerstein & Wakschlag, 2019).

DOJ findings in segregated school programs concluded that many students could be served in more integrated settings, showing that the principle applies whenever public systems isolate disabled people without adequate justification (Ennis & Katsiyannis, 2018).

Implementation, however, has been **slow and uneven**: deinstitutionalization continued after *Olmstead* but not clearly because of it alone, compliance varies by state, and underfunded community services can reproduce segregation in new forms (Lakin et al., 2009; Gould, 2024).

State experience shows both the doctrine’s force and its limits: litigation and settlements have moved thousands into community settings, yet inadequate funding can leave people isolated even after formal compliance steps (Burnim, 2015; Gould, 2024).

Significance	What It Changed	Example
Conceptual	Segregation counts as discrimination	Congress identified segregation and institutionalization as discrimination (Batavia, 2002)
Doctrinal	Title II bars exclusion by public entities	Public programs cannot deny equal participation by reason of disability (Mathis, 2001)
Remedial	States must modify systems toward integration	Community services may be required unless fundamentally altering (Mathis, 2001)
Systemic	Rule applies beyond institutions	Education and employment-service segregation also face challenge (Ennis & Katsiyannis, 2018; Farmer, 2025)

FIGURE 1 Main legal and practical effects of Congress’s anti-segregation finding and Title II.

In short, Congress’s finding and Title II are significant because they recast **unjustified segregation** from ordinary administration into prohibited discrimination by public entities, creating the legal foundation for a right to **integrated participation** in public life.

*These search results were found and analyzed using Consensus, an AI-powered search engine for research. Try it at <https://consensus.app>. © 2026 Consensus NLP, Inc. Personal, non-commercial use only; redistribution requires copyright holders’ consent.*

## References

Bagenstos, S. R. (2017). Law and the Contradictions of the Disability Rights Movement. <https://doi.org/10.12987/yale/9780300124491.001.0001>

Batavia, A. (2002). Consumer Direction, Consumer Choice, and the Future of Long-Term Care. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 13, 67 - 74. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10442073020130020201>

- Blanck, P. (2021). On the Importance of the Americans with Disabilities Act at 30. *Journal of disability policy studies*, 2023, 176 - 198. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10442073211036900>
- Burnim, I. (2015). The promise of the Americans with Disabilities Act for people with mental illness.. *JAMA*, 313 22, 2223-4. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2015.4015>
- Dinerstein, R. D., & Wakschlag, S. (2019). Using the ADA's 'Integration Mandate' to Disrupt Mass Incarceration. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3424085>
- Ennis, R., & Katsiyannis, A. (2018). Avoiding Unwarranted Segregation of Students With Behavioral Needs: Lessons Learned. *Intervention in School and Clinic*, 53, 212 - 215. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1053451217712954>
- Farmer, D. (2025). Integrating the Workforce: A Proposed Expansion of the Lane v. Kitzhaber Rule. *Michigan Law Review*. <https://doi.org/10.36644/mlr.123.4.integrating>
- Flores, R. L. (2017). State reform and respect for the rights of the disabled people: A reflection on the Olmstead decision the case of New York state. *Cogent Medicine*, 4. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331205x.2017.1360542>
- Gould, J. B. (2024). From Policy to Practice: Socio-Ecological Challenges in Implementing the Home and Community Based Settings Rule. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 36, 29 - 39. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10442073241289081>
- Ireland, J., & Bales, R. A. (2008). Employment Discrimination Under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act.
- Ireland, J., & Bales, R. A. (2007). Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and its Prohibition of Employment Discrimination.
- Jackson, S. R., Hafner, G., O'Brien, D. J., & Benjamin, G. (2003). Approaches to Implementing the Olmstead ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) Ruling. *The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics*, 31, 47 - 48. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-720x.2003.tb00747.x>
- Lakin, K., Scott, N., Larson, S., & Salmi, P. (2009). The 10th anniversary of olmstead (1999): has it made a difference for people with developmental disabilities?. *Intellectual and developmental disabilities*, 47 5, 403-6. <https://doi.org/10.1352/1934-9556-47.5.403>
- Mathis, J. (2001). Community integration of individuals with disabilities: an update on Olmstead litigation.. *Mental and physical disability law reporter*, 25 2, 158-62.
- Pfeiffer, D., & Finn, J. (1997). The Americans with Disabilities Act: An examination of compliance by state, territorial and local governments in the USA. *Disability & Society*, 12, 753-774. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09687599727038>
- West, J. E., McLaughlin, V. L., Shepherd, K., & Cokley, R. (2022). The Americans with Disabilities Act and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act: Intersection, Divergence, and the Path Forward. *Journal of Disability Policy Studies*, 34, 224 - 234. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1044207322114113>