

1. From your perspective, what are the key questions that need to be addressed in this review?

- What are the gaps and how to address them?
- How would you know whether it's effective & whether it's accomplishing what it set out to do?
 - Are accountability measures adequate? Is adaptive management built in?
 - Is the new delivery model actually better for people with developmental disabilities?
 - Do families feel more supported?
 - Did it end the "black hole" at 19, deliver IF to those who wanted it, etc?
- Is the budget adequate and are available funds distributed equitably and/or put to best possible use?
 - Have waitlists been resolved?
 - Are services appropriate to need (e.g. denial to people with IQ < 70)
 - Are we targeting more \$\$ to the front lines instead of to bureaucracy?
- What are the positive achievements and how do you build on them?

2. How would you describe CLBC's current service delivery model?

- **What are the key characteristics of the current model?**
- **How does your sense of the SDM differ from CLBC's sense of what the model *should be*?**
- A flawed model – was based on flawed premises to start with, e.g.
 - False expectations that you could cut costs and stretch the budget by offering IF and new housing options because people no longer wanted group homes
 - False expectation that communities would step in to pick up the slack - capacity was never there
- A self-help model that focuses on cutting costs, not meeting needs
 - Designed by people who didn't like social workers as gatekeepers & who just wanted a cheque
 - Caters to a narrow range of realities, not the diversity of needs and situations that BC families and individuals actually face – e.g. over-emphasis on IF/direct funding, programs focussed on capital homeowner grants, and elimination of case management
 - Everything seems to be driven by belt-tightening, not supporting people with developmental disabilities
- A top-heavy, over-centralized, authoritarian mode
 - Families feel more alienated, more abandoned, not more in control; self-advocates feel more vulnerable & helpless, not empowered – they describe feeling fearful and betrayed
 - Too many high-paid staff at HQ, too little presence at front lines & in communities
 - Too much spent on pricy conferences, etc
 - Board, management, even advisory/ community councils not connecting with clients—seen as puppets for government & making poor choices
- An awkward, unresponsive, un-accessible model
 - No consistent human face as the liaison; no case manager means no system "memory"
 - Feels like more bureaucratic red tape, not less
 - Emphasis on solving issues via PR instead of trying to resolve concerns
 - You have to be well-connected and knowledgeable to get the system to work for you
 - Barriers to access at every turn & at every level – from getting someone to return a call
- An unstable, incoherent, reactive model in constant turmoil
 - Confusing, sense of constant crisis and chronic change
 - Crisis-driven system that doesn't resolve problems, root causes
 - Lack of clear objectives, entitlement, priorities & effective process heightens insecurity, anxiety, mistrust.

3. What do you think the current service delivery model was trying to ameliorate – what were the targeted issues with the previous system?

- To reduce costs of administration and delivery
- To separate planning from funding so that plans would reflect real needs and thus drive funding
- To enhance choice and flexibility, e.g. portability of funds, optional IF, alternatives to group homes
- More person-driven services and more family-driven policy
- Lifelong services that eliminated gaps at key transition points (e.g. black hole at 19)
- Building and working with community capacity
- Eliminating waitlists

4. How does the current service delivery model address those issues?

- It doesn't.
 - *Reduce administrative costs*: no data, but sense that it's worse, not better
 - *Separate planning/funding*: Hasn't happened, just lost case management
 - *Enhance choice/flexibility*: No IF, no portability, choices meaningless without dollars to fund them
 - *More person-driven services/family-driven policy*: No, families, individuals feel more powerless
 - *Lifelong services*: black hole at 19, lack of service for IQ >70 worse than ever
 - *Build community capacity*: Hasn't happened – everyone else is tightening belts
 - *Eliminating waitlists*: They're worse than ever

Discussion:

- As per #1, many initial assumptions about what was wrong with the old system were flawed:
 - E.g. that separating planning/funding would increase access & stop the gate-keeping; or that offering alternatives to group homes would deliver major savings).
- Other expectations were naive:
 - E.g. that you could eliminate unions and/or bureaucrats and save millions, that you could easily introduce IF as a choice, or that the community would step in and take over if you opened it up, or that innovation would flourish once they took control away from Victoria.
- Inadequate funding and/or political will have also grossly hampered progress and created mistrust
- The flawed planning process, repeated delays & major implementation woes have further undermined the public support and trust that would have been crucial for the success of such an ambitious restructuring project.

5. What would you say are the 3 or 4 key strengths of the current service delivery model?

- We came up with several thoughts initially, like encouraging innovation or independent living options, but realized these could be done under any model and were thus not inherent strengths of the new model.
- Having a separate crown corporation offers the potential to increase/focus understanding and expertise in community living. That hasn't really happened, however. Perhaps the "arm's length" nature of the model has also facilitated the erosion of government's commitment by diluting direct political accountability.
- Having a crown corporation has forced management to put more effort into building a solid business case for the funding required (e.g. documenting waitlists). In practice, however, Treasury Board simply keeps raising the bar and finding new reasons why the business case is not yet solid enough.

6. What do you see as the 3 or 4 key risks facing CLBC with the service delivery model

• What are the most critical aspects of the service delivery model that need to be improved or enhanced?

- Inadequate govt funding and commitment, CLBC not able to respond to needs
- Community mistrust, eroding public confidence in community living as a whole due to CLBC's failures
- Safety, quality of life compromised – inadequate effective oversight/public accountability

7. What performance measures are in place to assess:

- **Client satisfaction**
- **Flexibility**
- **Sustainability**

8. What performance measures are planned for implementation? What is the status?

We are aware that certain performance measures exist in the service plan, but either the measures themselves are not the right ones, and/or the way they are being used has not provided an effective mechanism to promote resolution of key issues, adaptive management or led to any significant amelioration of problem areas. Everything seems to focus on how to cut costs, which is inconsistent with client satisfaction and flexibility when underfunding is already severely restricting available options and resources.

9. What are the 2-3 key factors that support/enable CLBC's capacity to meet government's expectations and requirements?

CLBC was created to serve people with developmental disabilities, not government, so we believe the proper question here should be about CLBC's capacity to meet their expectations and requirements.

10. What should CLBC's priorities be over the next year in order to improve service delivery to clients and families?

- Develop a business case on what is needed to serve individuals and their families, including clear standards/expectations for service delivery, a risk assessment that assesses the potential consequences of not meeting those standards, and an action plan with clear timelines, milestones, etc for addressing key challenges identified in this review, and make it all public
- Implement an effective complaints resolution system that ends at the Minister's door when needs aren't met.

11. Regarding guardianship role: what are the key issues from CLBC's point of view? What options are there to address the issues?

(Awaiting further clarification and feedback to comment)