- Page 4: insert the Accenture footnote where it states "Tania's Accenture footnote"
- Page 20: The first sentence of the last paragraph doesn't make sense: "The 21 regional centers provide Regional Centers and DOR work with contracted agencies and service providers (vendors) who can provide clients with *higher support needs*" I believe this may be intended to state that both regional centers and DOR have the primary role of service coordination and as funders of service providers. The service providers then directly support clients as directed and overseen by DOR or regional center respectively. I am not sure if "clients with higher support needs" is appropriate in this sentence since the agencies support clients with a range of abilities and support needs
- Page 26: I have had several conversations with Sue Sawyer on this topic and my understanding is that many districts have graduation requirements that exceed state requirements and the pathway exempts students that meet certain eligibility requirements from these *additional requirements*. **Statements that concern me:** 
  - "This initiative was meant to provide students with disabilities who do not graduate with a traditional high school diploma to receive diplomas...." (perhaps change to "meant to increase the number of students with disabilities who can graduate with a diploma")
  - "Prior to this alternative, students with intellectual and developmental disabilities were not eligible for high school diplomas" (They were eligible, they could not meet the higher burden)
- Page 33, EFC recommendation 1: "Within the disability employment sector, business to business trainings exist where managers who have hired applicants with disabilities...." I prefer referencing trainings but if there is a preference not to, please either state "Business to business trainings exist" or use a phrase that has clarity....what is the disability employment sector?