



**Supportive Living Accommodation Standards**

**Survey**

**January 2017**

# **Introduction:**

**ACDS sent a survey to our members on Wednesday January 4, 2017 with a request to answer three questions:**

- 1. What are the challenges with the Supportive Living Accommodation Standards?**
- 2. What are the challenges with the Supportive Living Accommodation reviews?**
- 3. What recommendations would you give to improve them?**

**The deadline for the survey was at noon on Friday January 6, 2017.**

**There were Thirteen respondents to this survey.**

## **Copyright©**

The survey information for the Supportive Living Accommodation Standards is the exclusive property of the Alberta Council of Disability Services (ACDS).

All rights reserved. The use of any part of this publication, whether it is reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form by any means (including electronic, mechanical, photographic, photocopying or recording), without the prior written permission of ACDS is an infringement of copyright law.

**Supportive Living Accommodation Standards Survey**  
**January 2017**

**Question 1: What are the challenges with the Supportive Living Accommodation Standards?**

inadequate funding to ensure to meet standards, fundraising dollars are being used to offset funding shortfalls.
PDD funded programs with more than three people living in the home usually have just over three people. The standards are set up for much larger residential facilities and usually for seniors with different needs than those who are younger but need supports for daily living.
As an organization that provides a variety of individualized supports to people who live in licensed homes, unlicensed homes and live independently, we believe the accommodation standards require us to treat people differently based on the number of roommates they have. Accommodation Standards is focused on seniors who have moved out of their homes, we support people who still live in their community homes and some of them in the same home for over 20 years. The people we support have input to who their roommates are and it is not based solely on care or support needs as in the Health Care system. We have very independent people who do not need or request 24 hour support, choosing to live as a roommate with someone who is very dependent on staffing support.
1. when a new standard or change comes in it may effect other standards or living arrangements that can impact client quality of life. Clients living in larger homes (4-10 people) have more accountability than other homes. This means many more staffing hours to meet the standard however the funding source does not take this into consideration when providing funding.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Standards are not designed for real people, especially #13,14,15. Most people served by PDD do not have food prepared and served to them. They are taught, supported to buy, prepare and eat what they like - within their budgets and healthy limits. Also applies to cleaning, laundry and all activities of daily living. Also companionship is key.</li><li>• Being able to "personalize" a room is a demoralizing concept. Under PDD, the house, apt is usually rented by the residents. They personalize the whole place. Choice in as many areas as possible is essential to a decent quality of life.</li><li>• These standards apply more to the SPCA than to a home. Complying to these standards would lead to a loss of accreditation under PDD.</li><li>• Also the "operator" in PDD is not always or even commonly, the landlord. The "operator" service provider under PDD is prohibited from being trustee.</li></ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• lack of clarity regarding what Safety Codes are applicable to small 4 person group homes ( fire standards that inspections are based on)</li><li>• if the above Safety Codes exceed those of typical residences it creates a hardship</li><li>• the requirement for proof of zoning and the process for obtaining this not clear, is excessively difficult and expensive</li></ul>
It has created a lot more work. We are supposed to be serving individuals with the best quality of care but some of these standards take away from the hands on work to accommodate the paperwork. It seems as though we are going backwards instead of mainstreaming and collaborating with Licensing Standards.
None - they are relevant to ensure health and safety for all
In the past when we had a different inspector each year their focus varied from year to year. We have been fortunate to have the same inspector for the past years so we appreciate the consistency.
None

## Question 2: What are the challenges with the Supportive Living Accommodation reviews?

have not participated
The challenge comes when the inspectors change and you have to explain again the different philosophy where in PDD supported homes you actually want the individuals to get out in the community to access services, to do their own cooking as much as possible, to have the right to change the meal up when they want just like anyone else in their home changes the menu at the last minute. These homes are not institutions and should have the freedom to make changes to a menu/schedule of activities etc.
Our Accommodations licensing is on the same three year cycle as our CET survey and follows a month after our CET review. We just hand over the exact same documentation from the CET survey that is applicable to the Accommodations inspector. We strongly believe that Accommodations Standards is not a good fit for the individuals we support. It is a duplicate inspection and review.
Can be time consuming take more staffing hours to support that is not recognized by funder and can sometimes be overlap in what other reviews have already assessed. eg. CET looks at some of the same areas.
No measurement of resident satisfaction. All standards could be met and the person could still experience a bleak and potentially abusive life.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>one method of compliance with the standards that is acceptable to one inspector is not acceptable to another. This is very frustrating for the operators.</li><li>non-compliance are issued for issues outside of the operator's control - e.g., demand for fire inspection when the city was not conducting fire inspections due to the pause on the August 2015 Standata. - inspector should have known this was the case and not requested a fire inspection report.</li><li>home in operation for decades moved to PDD Safety standards designation for a short period, then could not be reinstated under Supportive Living Accommodation Standards without applying as a new application. Very bureaucratic.</li></ul>
The reviews are more like an interrogation. We understand accountability and agree with it. However, the understanding of "Supporting Albertans" gets lost in the standards.
Agencies are accountable to Trustees/Guardians (both public and private) The standards of expectations are clearly defined in all agreements.
None
We have one more set of regulations to follow. We meet CET Standards and some of these standards are duplicated.
None
Looking more at the environment being facility based rather than a personal home. Felt more institutionalized and based on the services provided to the individual such as the quality of the food rather than a more holistic community inclusive environment. Health based standards and regulations which do not always align with the PDD program. The standards appear to be more related to seniors care and not aligned with services to people with disabilities.
These reviews are time and resource intensive. While it makes sense to monitor for standards they could be once every 2-3 years if the agency has a track record of compliance.
Inappropriate for the individuals who receive supports in rented (or self owned) houses.

**Question 3: What recommendations would you give to improve them?**

any that require additional funding, for example we use fundraising \$ for menu reviews by a designated professional
There should be a different set of criteria or questions for homes with few people compared to lodges/nursing homes with many people.
We truly believe that the collateral authorities including, CET, Fire, Building and Health provide inspections and evaluations based on their expertise that ensures the same high quality of services for all individuals in our organization. If Accommodations needs to remain licensing the homes that some of our individuals live in, then they should review the inspections and surveys received from qualified experts to issue licenses.
Talk to funders about recognizing the work increase needed to be compliant. Talk to other review bodies to prevent looking at the same areas
Think the whole set of standards should be rethought from the residents' point of view. Use the ACDS accreditation standards.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• be clear on what safety/fire codes need to be met - before inspection is undertaken</li><li>• make information about zoning requirements clear and readily available without having to go through the change of use process</li><li>• -make zoning requirement for programs operated out of typical residential dwellings, residential zoning regardless of funding source or disability.</li><li>• look at reducing bureaucracy to the minimum required especially regarding applications and renewals</li></ul>
If there are suggestions in the review about how financials are to be done, that should be directed towards the trustees, not the agencies. Most policies reflect the expectations of all Guardians, Trustees and Licensing Requirements.
Consistency in inspectors
None
Recommend that situations where 4 people or more reside in their personal home and where those people are also receive funding from the PDD program that they be exempt from being required or included in the SLALA standards. The Human Services Ministry report - Support Safe and Inclusive Lives should be considered and the principles and intent of the standards of this report could provide guidelines and direction for this issue. The Ministry of Municipal Affairs holds the building codes which do not align with the values and principles of the PDD Safety Standards report which recognizes the balance of safety and risk and that safety is more than structural building codes. Safety is inclusive community living.
see above and consider consolidating with CET reviews for agencies who have a track record of compliance
If there has to be Standards how about the CONSULT with the affected individuals, their families and the service providers BEFORE enacting knee jerk and reactionary Standards, as was the case for these Standards when, under the old Seniors Ministry, PDD funded individuals and agencies were forced to abide by them.