

Developmental Services Community-Based Residential Services 2019 Case Study

Three developmental service agencies that have shifted services from group living to individual housing arrangements in a community setting

March 2021

Important Information:

This study, prepared by the Ministry of Children, Community and Social Services, is a compilation of the experiences of three agencies with similar goals related to shifting their service delivery model away from group living to supporting people in individualized housing arrangements in a community setting.

This study is not a policy or directive of the Ministry of Children, Community and Social Services.

A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Overview	3
2. Executive Summary	4
3. Case Study Agencies	7
4. Method	8
5. Results – Impacted Areas	9
6. Enablers	17
7. Overarching Challenges	24
8. Conclusions	26
9. Appendix A	27
10. Appendix B	29

A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

Overview

The Ministry of Children, Community and Social Services (MCCSS) funds developmental services (DS) agencies to provide residential services and supports in a variety of settings to people with developmental disabilities. The ministry supports and funds Supported Group Living Residences (group homes) to provide housing and are one of five residential supports funded by the ministry to meet the housing needs of people with developmental disabilities. The following MCCSS-funded agency-based residential supports are provided by over 200 transfer payment recipients:

Supported Group Living Residences: three or more individuals live in a staff-supported residence operated by a transfer payment recipient and receive services and supports from the agency.

Intensive Support Residences: one or two individuals live in a staff-supported residence operated by a transfer payment recipient and each receive intensive support where care and services are provided.

Host Family (Lifeshare) Program: individuals reside with and receive care, support and supervision from a host family in exchange for remuneration.

Supported Independent Living: individuals live alone or with others but independently of family members or of a caregiver and receive services and supports from a service agency.

Specialized Accommodation: transitional and permanent specialized settings for individuals with a developmental disability who have a co-existing mental illness (dual diagnosis).

Currently, the overall number of people waiting for residential services continues to increase and investments are targeted to meet the needs of the priority populations, those at the highest risk of homelessness. The targeted population is likely to have high support needs and would then be traditionally viewed as appropriate for group living, intensive support or specialized accommodations. Some people may already be in receipt of MCCSS funded residential supports and may choose to remain in their existing support arrangement (group living, intensive support or specialized accommodations) and have the funding responsibility shift from children to adults' services. In 2018/19 approximately 20,600 people requested residential services.

Some people with exceptional behavioural needs will require specialized support to be stable in their housing arrangement. The ministry funded a research study, through the ministry's 2017-18 DS Grants process, which examined the "Key elements of successful housing for individuals with developmental disabilities and exceptional behavioural needs" to learn more about effective space designs. Findings from this study have been shared as part of the Ministry's Knowledge Translation and Transfer (KTT) work with ministry staff and sector stakeholders.

A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

At the same time, the ministry is focused on improving partnerships with the municipal housing sector to expand housing options for people. This may mitigate the need for investments in new capital as well as reduce the need for future investments to address repairs and maintenance.

DS agencies that have been shifting away from operating group living residences to providing supportive services to people in their own homes in a community setting have been sharing their experiences in a variety of forums across the province. They have shared the benefits to their agencies, the people being served and the opportunities for the developmental services system to serve more people with the same limited resources.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The case study was undertaken to gather information (qualitative and quantitative) about the benefits and challenges of agencies shifting their service delivery models. The agencies selected to participate have agreed to share their experience through this study.

Community Living Brant (CLB), an agency providing residential services and operating in western Ontario, proposed and was approved for an innovative housing project through the Developmental Services Housing Task Force - 'Imaginative Living Options'. The project provided the conditions for CLB to collect and maintain specific financial and outcomes data for people in the project who moved from group living arrangements to individual arrangements and aligns with the goals of this study.

At the same time, other DS agencies across the province including **Community Living Upper Ottawa Valley (CLUOV)**, in eastern Ontario, and **Community Living Algoma (CLA)**, in northern Ontario have been similarly shifting their service delivery for many years and have been open in sharing their experiences in professional, provincial and local settings.

This study provides information about three agencies that have shifted their focus from group living in dedicated DS only spaces to transitioning and supporting people in individual arrangements in a community setting. Through this study they agreed to share their experiences and lessons learned. The impact on the people receiving services, agencies and other stakeholders are described, and conditions that support the successes in shifting service and supports are outlined as enablers. Illustrative examples, resources and probing questions have been included for context.

Note: The examples in the study have been paraphrased for confidentiality purposes.

Together, the three community living agencies participated with transparency and commitment to share information. They answered fifteen questions in a two-hour interview, provided available financial information, numerous resources and examples that illustrate their experience. Although, each agency



A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

is at a different phase in their service delivery transformation, similar strategies and themes were used by the agencies and identified in this study.

The agencies' experience demonstrates that more people can be served with the same level of funding and people with complex needs can live successfully in an individual community setting. For example, CL Brant demonstrated they were able to change from supporting three people in group living to supporting nine people in individual arrangements in community settings with the same amount of funding.

Additionally, people can experience improved independence and become more satisfied with their quality of life, as measured by CL Brant's utilizing a personal outcomes measurement tool. Accessing community-based resources and housing from other public and private sources led to funding efficiencies and, as a result of deeper community connections, successful housing arrangements.

The examples shared in this study include people with complex support needs originally supported in group living who became more independent in an individual setting. This is contrary to the widely held belief that a high-level staffing ratio and high intensity supports (i.e. 24 hours supports) are needed to support people with complex and high needs.

The agencies identified the following eight areas impacted by the shift in service delivery, which would benefit from additional exploration. The extent of the impact varied depending on the agency and is described below.

1. The **cost to support people** was generally reduced when they moved from group living to an individual setting in the community.
2. The impact to the **agency** is noted from the sale of the group living residence which often required additional agency resources (non-MCCSS) for ongoing operations and maintenance. This freed-up the resources that would no longer be needed to maintain and operate the capital asset. Sale proceeds retained by the agency could then be redirected to supporting people in an individual arrangement. (Agencies that own sites with no ministry interest on title, or agencies that retain a share of the proceeds, can direct how those proceeds will be used.)
3. Staff observed that **individuals gained** a greater level of independence and improved outcomes when they moved to living in an individual arrangement. Although their level of support needs varied, the focus was on the unique circumstances of the individual and the agency's approach and commitment to providing supportive services.
4. The emphasis of an agency **program** shifted to an emphasis on providing supportive services to people to meet their unique needs, so each support arrangement is unique to the person.
5. The **community** perception of the agency shifted to being viewed as a community member that contributes and not just a service provider for people with developmental disabilities.

A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

6. **Families** become an informed partner and are included in the agency process to shift their service delivery model and are kept informed along the journey.
7. The impact to **agency staffing** required reorganizing and re-orienting staff roles and duties to support the vision of the person-centred service delivery model. The necessary skill sets for staff reflect the changing roles.
8. Agencies were able to increase system capacity with this service delivery shift and as a result some individuals who had been **waiting for residential services** are now accessing residential supports.

To support the shift in service delivery, **11 key enablers** were identified as important to varying extents, for all the agencies. Each enabler on its own can be an element of best practice for any organization; however, together they were intentionally pursued to support the service shift.

1. Agency stakeholders share the **vision** of person-centred, affordable housing and supports to meet people's needs and empower them to live as independently as possible.
2. Intentional **leadership commitment** (Executive Directors and Boards) to shift service delivery is necessary to work through challenges and take the extra time needed to achieve support and commitment from staff and families.
3. The use of a **Quality of Life personal outcomes measurement tool** guided the service plans created for people, including informing their unique living arrangements and ensured that their interests and goals were reflected in their overall support plans.
4. **Transparency with families** about the agency's interest in shifting their service delivery reduced fears, addressed questions and developed the foundation for the success of people living in an individual arrangement in a community setting.
5. The **right staffing** complement with a community focused skill set to create linkages and connections across sectors and within the community for people being supported is needed when people are no longer supported in group living environments.
6. Building **community relationships and collaborations** for the continued interactions of the people being supported, positions the agency as a community partner. This creates opportunities for the agency to foster partnerships, expand housing options, access financial, supportive and volunteer resources, and cultivates community good will.
7. **Connection to housing: real estate developers, landlords and social housing programs** result in access to affordable housing units which in turn can reduce the need for developmental services residential services. These connections also can support long term planning for housing for people with developmental disabilities.
8. **Access to unrestricted funds** to supplement shortfalls in rent can close the income gap to secure rental units and address temporary needs. Agencies have been securing this type of funding in various ways to support the success of some individual arrangements and support transition needs.

A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

9. **Relationships with bargaining agents** that are fostered and well-informed create the best environment for changes in the service delivery model. Although it does not eliminate potential challenges, it creates the environment to work through concerns and allows for proactive measures to be explored and introduced.
10. Cultivating **private landlord relationships** by sharing information about people with developmental disabilities promotes opportunities to access housing units from private landlords.
11. **Diverse sources of non-governmental funding** that are flexible can help the agency maintain stability and help support financial shortfalls the agency may experience during the service shift.

The quantitative and qualitative information gathered can be shared in the short term to support agency practices in service excellence. It is important to note, however, that additional research is needed to infer a causal relationship between shifting away from group living and many of the outcomes described due to this study's small sample size, resources and data collection issues.

For the purpose of this study, a **community setting** refers to a home location that is non-congregate and not dedicated to housing people with developmental disabilities.

CASE STUDY AGENCIES



Community Living Algoma (CLA)

CLA is a non-profit transfer payment recipient that has an integrated service contract with the MCCSS North Region and provides services for 500 children and 660 adults with developmental disabilities.

A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

Approximately 17% of services provided are residential and the remaining services range from employment supports to assessment and counselling. Providing services since 1954, CLA became the single provider for the region in 1994 with the amalgamation of six regional providers. Service area: City of Sault Ste. Marie and District of Algoma - <http://communitylivingalgoma.org>

Community Living Brant (CLB)

CLB, established in 1954, is a community-based government-funded organization primarily providing adult developmental services for 533 adults. Approximately 36% of services provided are residential and the remaining 64% are focused on Employment, Respite and Community Participation. Service Area: Brant County and Brantford - <http://clbrant.com/>

Community Living Upper Ottawa Valley (CLUOV)

CLUOV is a charitable non-profit association started by families in 1958 and a transfer payment recipient that serves 234 adults. Approximately 40% of the services provided are residential services and 60% are focused on Respite and Community Participation. Service Area: Pembroke and surrounding areas - <http://www.communitylivingupperottawavalley.ca>

METHOD

A questionnaire was developed to draw on the experiences, knowledge and relationships with developmental service agencies. Themes from the Housing Task Force funded projects on innovative housing solutions were also leveraged to develop questions. The questionnaire contained fifteen questions and was emailed to the agencies in advance of their two-hour interview. Agencies were also provided with an opportunity to supplement their oral answers with written responses. (Appendix A)

A budget template was developed with agency input and completed by the three agencies participating in the case study. The template requested data to capture the impact on agencies and individuals as a result of the shift in services. The agencies completed their templates to the best of their ability and submitted them after their interviews. Based on their current practices including ministry reporting requirements, small sample size and limitations of current financial practices, collecting financial data for the purposes of this study required additional follow up with the agencies and regional offices.

Individual agency interviews were conducted through a teleconference with ministry representatives, and agency executives and their supporting staff. Each interview was interactive with follow-up and clarifying questions being asked throughout the interview. Subsequent teleconferences were held to further refine the qualitative data, as it proved challenging to infer causal relationships and generalization of the findings due to limited access to specific financial data.

A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

In addition to the agency portion of the study, the ministry reviewed the available accountability, risk assessment, and financial documents available as a part of the on-going relationship with the three transfer payment recipients. All three agencies are in good standing.

The interview responses, financial data and accountability documents were all analysed to inform the case study. The study content has been shared with participating agencies to ensure accuracy and completeness.

RESULTS – IMPACT AREAS

Eight areas impacted by the agencies' service delivery shifts are highlighted through the case studies and described below.

1. Cost of supporting people

The three agencies interviewed identified that by shifting people from a group living service delivery model in dedicated DS-only residential spaces to an individual support arrangement in a community setting, they were able to provide supports to more people with the same amount of ministry funding

Individual level expense data from the approved Housing Task Force project was provided by CL Brant. As described by the agency, the project focused on imaginative and innovative housing and support options using existing resources in non-traditional ways. The following is the outcome from the project.

One group home supporting three people originally cost \$430,158 to operate. This home was closed and now four people are being supported in their own home at total cost of \$261,970 which is about 40% less than the cost to support the same people in a group living residence. Average group living costs per person are estimated by dividing the cost of running the group home by the total number of people being supported. Further individual level data is not available with current funding practices, but as people shift to an individualized arrangements, the actual costs per person become clearer.

Additionally, with the reinvestment of the savings from the closure of the group living residence and with the additional Housing Task Force project funding, the agency was able to increase system capacity and as a result a total of nine people are now being supported.

A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

Number of People	Original cost in Group Living	New cost in a home of their own, in the community
4 Original People	\$430,158	\$261,970
5 New People	-	\$168,199
Total – 9 People	--	\$430,158

Notably in this scenario, the reduction in costs is largely due to savings on residence staffing and occupancy.

Operating Costs	Before - Group Living	After - Home of their own in the community	% Reduction
Staffing	\$354,804	\$212,786	40%
Day Program	0	0	
Occupancy/Individual-Related Costs	\$44,280	\$17,400.12	
Total OPERATING COSTS	\$376,044	\$230,186.12	39%
Other Staffing Costs	\$5,700	\$2,448	
Total ACA Admin	\$31,998	\$19,487	
Total Program Admin	\$16,416	\$9,489	
Total Other/Admin Costs	\$54,114	\$31,784	32%
Total Cost	\$430,158	\$261,970.12	40%

CL Algoma experienced savings from the closure of a group living residence, where the three people supported were placed in another home with no new costs incurred. The closure allowed nine additional people to be served who were waiting for service utilizing the residential resource management process. With in-depth planning with community partners, people and their families, individual living arrangements were identified that were person-centred and promoted their independence.

A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

People	Original cost for people in group home before home closure	New cost for people moved to vacancies in another group home	Cost to support additional people in individual arrangements
3 people from original group home moved to vacancies in another group home	\$571,210	0	--
9 people who were on the service registry waiting to be matched to available supports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8 supported to remain at home with family • 1 supported to live independently 	--	--	\$571,210
Total	3 People \$571,210		9 People \$ 571,210

2. Agency

The impact to the agency is that financial resources are no longer required to operate and maintain the group living residence, a physical capital asset especially where non-MCCSS resources have supplemented the residence operations.

All resources allocated to keep a physical structure operational are now available to directly support people. This, coupled with accessing housing through providers in the public or private sector, has led to leasing costs that are affordable and creates an environment that encourages people to seek and identify options to enhance a person's income, i.e. employment and entrepreneurial endeavours.

Community Living Brant closed a 2,000 square foot group living residence built in 1991, that in the last three years of its operation cost approximately \$68,000/year and supported three people. This expense covered: home operations (salaries and benefits for staff supporting the operation, not people), utilities, repairs, maintenance, furniture and equipment.

Community Living Brant Group Living Residence:

- Built in 1991, 1,950 square feet
- Ravine lot with walkout basement, four bedrooms and two bathrooms and barrier free
- In a suburban neighbourhood, close to public transportation and other amenities

<u>Operating Expenses before Sale:</u>	<u>2013/2014</u>	<u>2014/2015</u>	<u>2015/2016</u>
Salaries & Benefits--Program Admin.	44,930	45,654	35,284
Utilities	5,400	5,400	5,400
Repairs & Maintenance	14,400	13,500	13,140
Furniture/Equipment/General	6,600	9,300	5,100

A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

Community Living Upper Ottawa Valley recently closed a 1,600 square foot home built in 2004 that supported four people and cost \$193,021 annually to operate. This expense covered home operations (salaries and benefits for staff supporting the operation, not people), utilities, repairs, maintenance, furniture and equipment.

Property management activities and staff roles that don't involve supporting people were eliminated. Staff are now focused on being community connectors, resource specialists and focus on potential and available resources for the people they support.

It is important to note that agencies that own sites with no ministry interest on title, or agencies that retain a share of the proceeds, can direct how those proceeds will be used. For TPR-owned real estate with ministry interest on title MCCSS approval must be obtained to sell the site. The ministry directs how its proportional share of the proceeds will be used. The ministry's share of proceeds cannot be used for operating and must be used for capital (in the same fiscal year the proceeds are realized) or returned to the province's Consolidated Revenue Fund.

3. Individuals

The potential for individuals to experience a greater level of independence after adjusting to their new community setting was described by the agencies. Their interactions with people emphasized active listening and probing questions to understand the person's needs, as well as the right level of supports to allow them to be stable in their new living arrangement. People with the most complex needs were successfully supported in their home in the community. The notion that people with complex needs cannot be stable outside of a group setting was not evident in this study.

Ten individuals included in these case studies completed a needs assessment at their local Developmental Services Ontario office. Based on available assessment data from Developmental Services Consolidated Information System: the support needs of these individuals ranged from a low to high on the support needs index percentile (i.e., through the Developmental Services Consolidated Information Systems). A composite score of overall support needs to participate in activities of daily living ranged from 9% to 95%. Total scores on the medical support needs scale of the Supports Intensity Scale (SIS) ranged from 0-6 (low to moderate) and total scores on the behavioural support needs scale ranged from 0-18 (low to high).

The diversity in support needs indicates that regardless of high or low support needs, anyone can be supported in independent living arrangements. Furthermore, this underscores that people with a wide variety of needs can be supported and thrive in unique, non-traditional/congregate care models where the agency has shifted their service delivery model in this direction.

Reductions in behavioural reported incidences and serious occurrences were achieved when people moved to individual arrangements of their choosing, and numerous descriptive examples were noted. However, reporting and tracking of this data longitudinally is not readily available and could not be



A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

provided within the time constraints of the study. Further work with the ministry and service agencies is needed to compile this data.

Outcomes related to quality of life measures for individuals were monitored and generally the outcomes improved over time. The quality of life measure directed the agency's continued work with the individual to holistically problem solve the type and depth of supports a person required. The Council for Quality Leadership (CQL) Personal Outcomes Measure tool was used by the agencies in this study, however, there are other tools used by agencies in the province such as, but not limited to, the Commission on Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities (CARF) and Focus.

Based on the 21 CQL Personal Outcome Measures, the four people who were originally being supported by CL Brant in the group living residence that was closed, experienced improved outcomes and a decrease in level of complexity when they moved to being supported in their individual living arrangements. The CQL Personal Outcome Measures tool describes the complexity of a person's life circumstances and the supports needed (e.g., person's behaviour, mental and physical health, mobility, communication, and natural support networks). See Appendix B for a description.

Additionally, the high level of complexity of two people did not limit their ability to live in an individual arrangement in the community and actually resulted in improved outcomes for the individuals.

One person with complex needs supported by CL Upper Ottawa Valley who received 24/7 staffing and had regular incident reports and serious occurrences reported achieving greater stability when they moved out of their group living arrangement. They had a baseline outcomes interview upon entry into agency services and planning and transition took place over three years. Today, they are living in a two-bedroom apartment by themselves with shared overnight support and are planning to purchase their own home with the support of their family. This home will have a tenant income relationship to support affordability.

Case example shared by the agencies:

A person with challenging behaviours like autism and acute anxiety lived in many places as a child where they hurt themselves and others. These challenges were interpreted by their support circle as the person conveying that a different living arrangement was needed. They then lived successfully with a Lifeshare Family and after some time began to indicate they needed a change. This person was able to change their living situation while maintaining their deep roots in the community and circle of supports. They found a new room-mate and continued to expand their friendships and now feels a great sense of pride in their home and living situation where they host gatherings and share their interests. Neighbours help out with decorating, home repairs and gardening.

A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

Case example shared by the agencies:

It's hard to describe the complexity of people - they generally don't change, and we are all complex and unique. What changed is relationships, lives that are valued, purposes for people and how we provide support to people.

4. Programs

The focus of the word 'program' has been minimized, if not eliminated altogether, within some agencies. This is a strategic move to put the emphasis on providing supportive services for people to lead their own lives in their own homes. To support this perspective, staff roles are structured to include forming community connections, leveraging community resources and understanding available public and private programs that are available. The agency's staff roles have shifted from managing and operating properties to focusing on community and relationship building with the goal of connecting people who now live in a home of their own to natural supports.

Case example shared by the agencies:

A person who lived in a number of group living situations for years had a very negative reputation and it was often difficult to find staff to support them. A range of anger and unpredictable behavioural issues were in the forefront and people believed these behaviours needed to be fixed. Creating an individualized team of people who believed in them and truly listened while focussing on their gifts and talents changed their life! They were able to access a City Housing Supplement and now live in their own apartment with support from their team as needed throughout the day and access to staff overnight if needed. Additionally, with help from a good friend and agency support, they started a small business that turned their personal challenges into an asset. Their business prospered and they have a great network of customers that they call on for help and have even received part-time job offers.

Case example shared by the agencies:

A person moved to live in an affordable housing complex. Agency support staff engages with them and with all tenants at social functions, seasonal events and have arranged for a neighbour check in for safety. This results in social interactions, coffee time without staff usually in the engagement...aka a new friend. All events at the housing complex are advertised 'as you're invited to come' and not mandatory, but this individual makes every effort to not only attend but to be a greeter and welcomes everyone.

5. Community

The community perception of the agency and the people they serve shifted from one of 'your/those people' and 'their needs' to a community partner and people that can contribute to community goals. People supported by the DS agency are also community stakeholders and a constituency for community leaders and groups to include in planning, activities and use as a resource.

A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

A shift in community perception is evident as agencies open their activities and events to all community members and do not limit gatherings to only the people they provide services to. Also, the agencies participate in community meetings and events that are not DS specific with the goal to provide support for activities important to the community. People supported by the agency also become community volunteers, organizers and participants. The community in turn views people supported by the agency as viable tenants, contributing members/volunteers and potential employees.

Case example shared by the agencies:

We connected with multiple local community partners to look at opportunities for people with limited income and resources to have access to healthy, fresh food at a reasonable price with the results being pop-up fresh produce markets across the City. A person supported by the agency became an active member of the organizing committee and a volunteer at the local markets in a variety of roles. This resulted in a win - win for this person to expand their relationships and to hold a valued social role while many in the community, including other supported people, benefitted from easy access to nutritious fresh produce.

Case example shared by the agencies:

We host one community development day a year free to all community members. Events have included Grief and Dying sessions, Asset Based Community Development, Women's day Breakfast, Housing developers' wine and cheese, Nick Foley, Innovative Housing Symposium.

6. Families

From the initial consideration of this shift to the community and until the right housing option and level of supports are in place, families are included and considered to be a partner in the journey. Families shift their perceptions and beliefs from the notion of relying on 24/7 care for their adult child in a group living arrangement to the possibility that their adult child can be independent and live in a home of their own in a community setting with supports provided and made available based on the individuals unique needs. Agencies note that this can be the most challenging aspect to transitioning people from group living arrangements. However, agencies equally note that the quality of life measures and the level of independence can improve for the person and can be significant in achieving family support.

Case example shared by the agencies:

A quote from a family that believed their child required 24/7 support, but who now lives on their own and accessed a City housing supplement. "Our child lived with us all their life. It made them feel like a child, not ready or able to leave us, the parents. Just because they live with a disability does not mean they have to miss out on the good things in life. They now live on their own and are very proud of that.

A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

They told me the other day that they finally felt like an adult; the housing supplement gives some breathing room to be able to afford things that many of us take for granted. I am very grateful that our child had this opportunity to move out on their own. Thank you!”

7. Agency Staff

Agencies noted that some staff may not be supportive of all people living in a home of their own in a community setting, especially if they have complex care needs. This contrary philosophy could result in significant staffing changes for agencies that are shifting their focus away from group living. Having all staff working towards the same goal of providing supports to people living in an individual setting in the community is foundational for the agencies and people to succeed in a home of their own.

Having all staffing positions filled continually challenges the agencies in the study. Their focus on managing staff turnover through deliberate relationships with colleges, school board guidance departments and other training settings is crucial for the agency to succeed. Also, of benefit for agencies was widening the scope of potential candidates to include people with real life experiences in community development and who possess additional relevant skills to fulfill the community connections role.

Agencies noted that higher job satisfaction can be achieved when staff are supporting people to have meaningful lives of their choosing. In addition, agencies prioritize staff training and development and have a staffing structure that is adaptable to providing proper oversight for staff who work remotely. Also, a clear value-based orientation or on-boarding process that reinforces being present, asking, listening and following through on all things important to each person emphasizes the expectations of the role. It is critical that potential staff be a good fit for the agency as well as the right match for each person they will be supporting.

Agencies’ best practice:

Agencies have recruitment postings that focus on outcomes of the position and not the wage and benefits, as well as staff meetings that reinforce the shift and keep all in the loop with an internal newsletter.

A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

8. Service System

When individual arrangements in a community setting are created for people, agencies have experienced the ability to extend resources to increase system capacity and support additional people that have complementary service needs. With the support of the local Planning Tables, people are identified who would be suitable for the newly created system capacity resulting in an opportunity to support additional people who are waiting to receive developmental services.

Case example shared by the agencies:

A group home was closed and the reinvestment of resources allowed for additional people to be supported in a high-rise apartment building where the agency was currently supporting 3 other people. A person in their 30's who suddenly lost a parent and became homeless, benefitted from the resources that became available and is now being supported in the same high-rise building. The apartment was close to their neighbourhood making the transition easier.

ENABLERS

Throughout the study, key themes and strategies were common to supporting the success of the three agencies in supporting people in their own home, in the community. For the purpose of this study they will be described as enablers which are significant, to different extents, for each agency to be successful.

1. Shared Vision

Programs and services are viewed from the perspective of providing supports to the individuals in the community and not anchored by the agency. A range of person-centred, affordable housing and supports to meet people's needs and empower them to live as independently as possible underlies the approach each agency took. With this approach, people can change their minds if their arrangement is no longer suitable for them and make changes to their arrangement without affecting their supports.

For agencies thinking about changing their service delivery model, have you considered how your program delivery can be less agency based and more centered around a person's needs to promote independence and stability?

2. Leadership Commitment

Decisive and intentional leadership to shift service delivery is a key enabler for the success of the agency. Agency leaders were frank about the challenges internally and with families, as well as the effort needed to bridge the gap in community knowledge and building relationships. The shared vision supported their resolve and the use of data and research helped mitigate the challenges.

A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

Each agency shared an unwavering commitment to:

- a. divesting in residential ownership and management;
- b. successfully supporting people with the most complex care needs in a home in the community;
- c. relocating people as needed if the housing arrangement is not working; and
- d. re-assessing the level of supports for the individual as time progresses to promote as much independence for the person as possible.

For agencies thinking about changing their service delivery model, have you considered opportunities for professional development around innovations in the sector, exploring best practices and peer support? This could include staff exchanges and road trips to leading agency innovators.

3. Quality of Life Measurement Tool

The Council on Quality Leadership (CQL) outcomes measurement tool provides metrics to measure the quality of life for individuals and their success. Each agency in the study uses this tool, however there are other similar tools used across the province. The tool guides the monitoring of the outcomes for the people they serve through the review of an extensive list of questions using 21 personal outcome indicators under five critical factors for people's well being: My Human Security, My Community, My Relationships, My Choices, and My Goals for people's well being. Agencies have shared that outcomes may be incremental and transitional, however there can still be a positive impact on the person's satisfaction. Agencies are using this tool to guide the services they provide, continuously gauge the quality of life experienced by the people they serve, and support changes to the person's individual support plan as needed.

Example: Achieving Personal Outcomes includes choosing where and with whom you live, intimate relationships, choosing where you work, natural support networks and continuity and security.

A young person was trying hard to find a place to live and leave the family home but was struggling with finding a place they could afford in the same neighbourhood. They did not want to move to another part of the city fearful of losing many important connections and friendships. With support from the agency and the help of a portable housing supplement from the City, they found an apartment that was affordable in the same neighbourhood. The other outcomes affected by this decision beyond choosing their location were: keeping their job and finding a second job within walking distance of home, ability to date and have friends over, ability to walk to visit family, and the financial security of having an affordable apartment. All these choices were important to this person to have a meaningful good life and their own home.

For agencies thinking about changing their service delivery model, how do you use person-centred plans and other agency tools to better guide service delivery and promote people's satisfaction in their lives?

A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

4. Transparency with Families

Including families in the discussion about changing the agency service delivery model, with frequent touch points in large and small settings, was critical to continuing positive family engagement and relationships with the agency and their family members and garnering support for the shift. Agencies cited numerous engagement sessions with families, hosting housing forums, sharing data and addressing concerns on a case by case basis. CL Upper Ottawa Valley used resources such as ones from Peter de Jager, a change management professional, to support interactions and conversations. CLUOV also used speakers from the Speakers Bureau to help shift community and agency culture.

Topics covered with families included:

- Housing options available in the community
- Supports provided to ensure success
- Benefits to being in a community setting and opportunities for greater independence
- Best practices and data that encourages this type of change

For agencies thinking about changing their service delivery model, what opportunities do you see to interact with people you serve and their family members that lend to open and honest conversations about upcoming change?

5. Striving for the 'Right' Staffing Complement

The community connections role of staff becomes important to successfully create linkages of natural and community supports for the individual. This skill set is different than what is needed to support people in group living environments. With the shift in service, staff may need to be provided additional development opportunities and supported to be good community connectors. This expectation is clearly communicated with new staff and emphasized in staff orientation and training plans.

Staff training and professional development is key to agency staff successfully supporting people in a community setting. Having a training plan in place, participating in job fairs and supporting the local educational institutions to develop and train students to enter the field are necessary for agencies to have a competent pool of staff to draw on. This is especially important with the limited number of employees province-wide trained to work in developmental services and the challenges with new staff retention. Each agency continues to work towards the staffing complement that would promote their focus on supportive services.

Example: CL Upper Ottawa Valley hired a marketing company to interview current, past and recently hired staff to determine why they chose to work at CLUOV. They also met with a focus group of 15 staff from an internal Culture Committee and asked questions like how do you describe what you do? What

A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

is it like? etc.... The responses informed the development of a new job advertisement to accurately represent the job and attract people that want to do this work.

Example: The agencies invested and continue to invest in training and learning to instill and reinforce their values in how supports should be provided to achieve a meaningful life for people supported. They are learning organizations sharing opportunities with staff/board/people supported/families and other community providers that help them grow and shape their services. Specific resources noted by the agencies are listed:

- Mary Kealy: Ending congregate services and changing non-traditional supports so each person can have a good life and place to call home.
- Lynn Seagle: Learning how her organization has changed from congregate segregated residential homes to each person having a home of their own.
- Joe Erpenbeck: Asset Based Community Development in building a person's relationships and sense of community belonging.
- Bruce Anderson: Understanding and supporting people to have a full life by using their core gifts.
- Michael Kendrick: Optimal Individual Service Design to teach about creating a good life for people that is valued and truly based in community, not services.
- Ongoing learning about the power of relationships and the Importance of Belonging
- David Pitonyak and Associates: Biopsychosocial Model of support
- Council on Quality & Leadership: Personal Outcome Measures embedded in agency through daily practices, systems and training, person centred planning. CQL shares our vision of dignity, opportunity and community for all people
- Nancy Getty: International speaker and published author, shares about the day to day experiences of people on the autism spectrum
- Peter Marks: Conscious Care and Support
- Mindfulness and Positive Approaches to support
- Al Condeluci: Cultural Shifting and understanding social capital
- Shaun Wood, WISE: Providing specialized training and support to build our capacity to support employment in community businesses for individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

For agencies thinking about changing their service delivery model, have you considered how to improve awareness of community resources and how people with developmental disabilities can access them?

6. Community Relationships and Collaboration

Agencies developed champions in the community which are critical for the people they support to succeed in their own homes. Their champions see people with developmental disabilities as community members, contributors and assets to the community. Champions need to be cultivated, acknowledged

A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

and continually educated about the positive work of the supporting agency and how it impacts the people being supported.

Agencies also established personal connections with key community leaders and the regular contact was instrumental in dispelling misconceptions about the DS sector and people with disabilities. Using awards, newspaper and agency newsletter acknowledgements, and supporting community events and interests, positions the agency as a contributing member of the community. This also allows for the opportunity to mend any community relationships that may have been broken or tainted by negative behavioural events from the past. Hosting events like forums with guest speakers that are open to all community members can increasingly position the agency as a community resource.

Example: CL Brant created an Asset Based Community Development (ABCD) Symposium for their broader community. They connected with community partners and leaders to initiate, plan and host symposium that saw over 100 diverse participants come together to learn about building a better community and putting those ideas into action. This resulted in an ongoing working group comprised of agencies, dedicated citizens and neighbourhood groups that will organize and host this symposium on an annual basis. People supported have been involved in the working group and all other aspects of the Symposium, expanding their networks and roles in their community.

For agencies thinking about changing their service delivery model, have you considered identifying three community partners to cultivate as champions for the work of your agency?

7. Connections to Housing: Real Estate Agents, Developers, Landlords and Social Programs

Local housing developers, private landlords, and real estate agents have been receptive to learning about the housing needs of people with developmental disabilities. They have connected and/or committed to providing access to housing units in new projects, existing buildings and private homes for people with disabilities. Agencies have deliberately cultivated active relationships with these housing partners that are not DS specific stakeholders and have shared information about people with developmental disabilities and the supportive services they access to live a full life and remain stably housed. Seeking out these partners, establishing relationships over time and sharing about people with a disability, facilitates access to affordable housing units in the community.

For example, agencies noted that attending and participating in local business leaders' groups led to interactions with municipal leaders and housing developers, which ultimately led to housing projects that ear-marked a certain number of affordable housing units for people with developmental disabilities.

A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

Similarly, working in partnership with Social Services Administration Board (SSAB) has led to approaches to consider housing for the future. The equity in properties owned by developmental services agencies can be utilized by the SSAB's to leverage future housing to meet growing housing needs.

For agencies thinking about changing their service delivery model, have you considered developing a plan to connect with local business leaders' groups, municipal leaders and housing developers?

8. Access to Unrestricted Funds to Supplement Rent Shortfalls

Building on #7, accessing affordable housing units may still necessitate the need for additional funding to close the income gap for the person who now has their own home. A flexible source of non-government funding that has little to no restrictions can fill the gap to meet rental payments. This may be a temporary need as the individual settles into their new living arrangement and their supports are adjusted. Their ability to work, as well as their community connections, can provide other benefits that can free-up resources to put towards rent. Seeking out local grants and doing annual fundraisers with other groups can support a dedicated fund to address rent shortfalls. Agencies have had success with regularly occurring events that can replenish a fund, such as annual golf tournaments.

For agencies thinking about changing their service delivery model, have you considered how to identify or create a funding source that can be flexible enough to meet many needs? This could be resourced through targeted fundraising campaigns, partnerships with service organizations or through private sector grants.

9. Relationships with Bargaining Agents

Building relationships with union leaders and bargaining agents can create an agency champion. Cultivating a personable relationship that is easily accessible can be very beneficial to the agency. Agencies agreed that keeping the agents apprised and aware about upcoming changes in the agency and potential challenges is helpful and proactive for contentious issues that may arise. It was noted that this relationship took time as well as constant contact to keep knowledge about changes to the connection meaningful. An open line of communication with agents can be an agency resource as well as a tool.

For agencies thinking about changing their service delivery model, have you considered having a standing meeting with your bargaining agent to establish an open line of communication and to foster a positive relationship?

10. Landlord Relationships

Cultivating relationships with private landlords and sharing information about the DS sector and the needs and resources of people with developmental disabilities promotes opportunities to access housing units with private landlords. This also positions the DS agency as an active problem solver if tenant challenges arise and reinforces the concept that people with developmental disabilities can be viable

A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

tenants. Additionally, positive community relationships can follow for people living in homes that belong to private landlords.

Example: A young person looking for an apartment was known to have disruptive outbursts and as a result the landlord was hesitant to rent to them. The landlord had an established relationship with the agency who had previously placed three tenants with them in the large apartment complex and with advocacy the landlord rented to the person. Following a successful first year they had an incident that caused disruption in the building. With support from the landlord and neighbours, with whom they had established relationships, the agency was able to support them through very challenging months. Since that time, they have moved forward with their life.

Example: A young person with a complicated life situation was turned down for several housing opportunities. The agency changed their approach and was able to provide support in developing a personal relationship with a landlord. As a result, the young person was able to sign a lease to rent a house and then to sublet to roommates. Over the past two years that relationship has continued to grow.

Example: A media campaign with a large local property management company was developed and included print and radio ads running simultaneously describing positive experiences they had working with Community Living.

For agencies thinking about changing their service delivery model, have you considered how you can stay aware of private rental options that may become available in your community?

11. Diverse Sources of Funding

The need for the availability of flexible funding while people transition to individual housing arrangements can support the stability of the agency and, similar to number eight, the person's transition to a new housing arrangement. Examples of funding sources can be grants, agency fundraising activities and agency assets that can be leveraged. Also, partnerships with organizations and community groups can lead to resources from service groups, private organizations and associations.

For agencies thinking about changing their service delivery model, have you considered how your operations may be impacted financially?

A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

OVERARCHING CHALLENGES

The DS system and ministry processes play an important role in supporting and accounting for the service delivery models of agencies. Also, agencies have unique strengths and weaknesses that influenced their journey from owning and operating group living residences to providing supportive services to people in individualized arrangements in community settings. The enablers outlined above could each present a challenge to some extent in the agency structure/practices and/or in the DS system. However, the following challenges were over arching and spanned across the experiences of each agency.

1. Mission Ownership

Strategic planning time and resources needed for agencies to support a mission and vision change may be challenging. An awareness and open support from agency leadership, staff, families and Board members are key to moving forward with this service delivery shift. A deliberate decision by agency Boards to revisit and/or amend the agency vision can require resources to support third party assistance to include and gain the support of all key stakeholders through this significant change.

2. Personal Outcomes Measurement Tool

Agencies that do not use a planning tool for the people they serve may be challenged to find the necessary financial resources and time investment required to institute the proper use of a planning tool, agency-wide. An objective and holistic tool to identify a person-directed living arrangement can support the establishment and review of an Individual Support Plan that can continuously guide a person to successfully living on their own. Reliance on the tool can build stakeholder confidence and support. Use of an agency-wide tool with training to support high-quality, competent staff requires more than financial resources and would require prioritization of agency focus in all aspects of business.

3. Staffing

Staffing related challenges exist across the DS sector-wide and shifting a service delivery model for an agency can further exacerbate these challenges. The short supply of people working in the DS sector, not enough accessible educational and training programs and insufficient professional development for existing staff are barriers to attract and retain qualified staff. Tools created through the HR Strategy could support this challenge.

4. Key Relationships

Meaningful agency relationships with a wide variety of stakeholders that may not be traditionally linked to the DS sector, such as business groups, are important for agencies that are shifting people to independent living in community settings. Prioritizing this activity and dedicating the development of agency staff as community connectors can be challenging when resources are strained. Reframing recruitment practices, staff roles, responsibilities and staffing structures would need to be considered since this will impact the agency's structure and overall business.

A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

5. Developmental Services Detail Codes

DS Residential Services and Supports detail codes reflect the services that agencies are contracted to provide and are defined in the Service Description Schedule and prescribed under *Services and Supports to Promote the Social Inclusion of Persons with Developmental Disabilities Act, 2008* (SIPDDA) which reflects traditional residential settings as opposed to unique characteristics of living arrangements or the intensity of support needs. There is a historic assumption that levels of support needs equate to the type of living arrangements -- high needs correlate to congregate settings and low needs correlate to individual living arrangements. This can limit and restrict the type of services and supports that are being offered at the time of the assessment, and limit agencies' ability to think beyond the traditional support options and create unrealistic expectations for people and families.

6. Group Living Asset Disposition

The sale of capital assets – in this case, group living residences – may realize proceeds for the agency or the ministry, depending on whether the ministry is registered on title and its proportionate share. Ministry capital funding (including disposition proceeds) cannot be used towards operating expenditures which may not be considered at the outset of closing a home. This may be a disincentive to pursuing individualized arrangements for people who are no longer best served through group living.

Additional context: Proportionate shares are determined based on the percentage of capital funding contributions made by each party for the initial property acquisition and/or capital project (e.g. construction or renovation at the time of the purchase). This is documented by an Infrastructure Project Agreement or Mortgage Funding Agreement executed at the time of property acquisition. Should an agency plan to dispose of a property for which the ministry has interest registered on title, they must obtain approval from the ministry and follow the TP Capital Policy on the use of the ministry's share of the proceeds.

Upon disposition of a capital asset, proceeds may be reinvested into the sector or returned to the government's Consolidated Revenue Fund (CRF) as per the Office of the Provincial Controller Division's capital policy. Agencies may choose how to reinvest their own share of the proceeds at their own discretion, however, the ministry does not recommend utilizing sale proceeds for operational purposes (including lease costs), as this constitutes one-time funding toward an ongoing need. In the case where ministry proceeds are realized, the full amount must be reinvested into capital or returned to the CRF. Proportionate shares will vary from agency to agency, however, the ministry proactively plans the short/medium/long-term asset management for the TP sector, considering the impacts to associated programs and services.

A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

CONCLUSIONS:

The experiences described in this study come from a limited sample. However, they support findings that can be built upon for further exploration. The study findings describe that:

- People with complex needs can live and be successfully supported in an individual arrangement in a community setting.
- People with complex needs can become more independent and require less supportive services in an individual arrangement in a community setting.
- Available funding can be used to support more people in the DS sector when individuals live in the community and not in agency-operated housing.
- New system capacity can be created and support people waiting for developmental services when agencies shift their service delivery model.
- Non-MCCSS resources are available and accessible to support the housing stability of people with developmental disabilities.

The participating agencies' energy and commitment to changing their service delivery models goes beyond an agency vision or operating principle and extends as a strategy to address the sustainability of the developmental services system. The three agencies have experienced numerous benefits that are underscored with providing respectful service for people to live their best life. Their conviction that this is better for people, their families and the agencies involved is unwavering. This commitment allows any housing arrangement to be continually improved upon to produce the best arrangements and outcomes for people.

They have each, in their communities and professional circles, shared their experiences and encouraged others to consider the positive impacts they, and the people they support, have experienced. Their participation and transparency in this study is consistent with their conviction to promote the benefits for people with developmental disabilities when they are supported to live in individual arrangements, in a community of their choice.

A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

Appendix A:

Case Study: Providing Supportive Services – Interview Questions

1	<p>Describe your Agency?</p> <p>a) Provide a brief history of your Agency?</p> <p>b) How would you describe the people you serve? Level of supports, type of services, etc.</p>
2	<p>Describe your program(s) and how you deliver services to support people to live as independently as possible in an individualized arrangement?</p> <p>Additionally:</p> <p>a) How are people selected for the living arrangement?</p> <p>b) Who can be most successful in this arrangement?</p>
3	Why did your Agency decide to implement individualized living arrangements?
4	How does the program compare to what was previously offered?
5	Can you describe the process your Agency undertook to make the change from a traditional model towards more individualized living arrangements?
6	<p>What were the critical enablers – including but not limited to resources and staff capacity – that supported your Agency’s shift towards individualized arrangements?</p> <p>Some examples could be: Presence to Citizenship project, mentor support for staff, engaged housing developers, etc.</p>
7	<p>How has your community impacted your ability as an Agency to support people in individualized arrangements instead of traditional Group Living arrangements?</p> <p>Points to consider in your response:</p> <p>Size of your community, housing options available, champions in the community, etc.</p>
8	<p>How has the internal environment of your Agency impacted your ability to focus on supporting people in individualized arrangements?</p> <p>Points to consider in your response:</p> <p>Training needed for staff/staff capacity, commitment to the model by staff, leadership and governing Board, etc.</p>
9	What challenges/barriers to success did your Agency experience in implementing a more individualized model? What are the current challenges associated with this model?
10	What has been the financial impact of this change on your Agency – staff, training, services offered, include other relevant costs that may have been impacted such as minor capital, maintenance, food, etc. Include data to support your answer.
11	<p>What has been the financial impact of this change on the people whose living arrangements have changed?</p> <p>Additionally:</p> <p>Please share the operating cost per individual before and after moving to a more individualized living arrangement including a breakdown of direct costs, indirect costs and the value of non-Ministry funded supports related to the individual. Include data to support your answer.</p>
12	Describe the financial implications to your Agency? Include any efficiencies gained and financial pressures that may have occurred as a result of this shift in your Agency.

A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

13	What were the unintended consequences associated with the shift in the model to the: a. Agency? b. People you serve? c. The community?
14	How could the model be improved? What suggestions would you provide to another Agency that is looking to implement a similar model?
15	Please share any additional lessons learned.

A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

Appendix B:

Personal Outcomes Narratives

This information was provided by one of the participating agencies to share the experiences of people who have shifted out of group living. Identifying information has been removed.

The Council on Quality and Leadership uses 21 Personal Outcome Measures to measure quality of life.

Person #1 - Personal Outcome Measures Results

Outcomes that are now present are:

- People experience continuity and security
- People choose where and with whom they live
- People live in integrated environments.
- People perform different social roles.
- People have friends.

As a result, this person's outcomes present have shifted from 11 to 15 during this transition.

This person has a physical disability that creates a need for supports regarding safety, personal care and general movement in their apartment. The family has many concerns about these areas and need to see through lots of experience that supports can look different. We use technology to help with independence, but it has been a slow process. The person now values having privacy to have friends visit and stay and discovering life on their own.

Person #2 - Personal Outcome Measures Results

Outcomes that are now present are:

- People experience continuity and security
- People choose where and with whom they live
- People live in integrated environments.
- People exercise rights
- People choose personal goals
- People have friends.
- People are respected.

As a result, this person's outcomes have shifted from 9 to 16 during this transition.

When living in a group home, person #2's anxiety and frustration showed through actions that resulted in a rights restriction (e.g., use of a psychotropic medication, taken when needed (PRN)) which is no longer needed since moving. They now live with a LifeShare family and feel part of their community, has friends, living in a typical neighbourhood and is seen in a very positive light.

A case study on three Developmental Services agencies that have shifted services from group living to supporting people in individual housing arrangements in a community setting.

Person #3 - Personal Outcome Measures Results

Outcomes that are now present are:

- People experience continuity and security
- People choose where and with whom they live
- People live in integrated environments.
- People choose personal goals
- People participate in the community
- People have friends.

As a result, this person's outcomes have shifted from 12 to 17 during this transition.

This person lived with various people in group living and never felt they had a place they belonged and did not have any real friendships or connections. They often were depressed and not willing or able to participate in community. Since moving in with a LifeShare couple they have developed a deep relationship with the provider, expanded their network, is active in the community and has a positive view of life.

Person #4 - Personal Outcome Measures Results

Outcomes that are now present are:

- People experience continuity and security
- People choose where and with whom they live
- People live in integrated environments.
- People choose personal goals
- People have friends.
- People are safe
- People exercise rights
- People are treated fairly
- People choose where they work
- People use their environments
- People perform social roles

As a result, this person's outcomes have shifted from 5 to 17 during this transition

When person #4 was living in a group home conflicts resulted with staff and housemates due to hoarding. They had numerous rights restrictions, could not access the total home environment and made unsafe choices. Their hoarding was seen by professionals as something that needed to be controlled. Now they are in their own apartment with storage space and a successful small business, valued roles and friends. Now that they are in control of their life, they make good decisions about their life and work.