

# 2023 Strategic Planning – Stakeholder Input

## Foreword

Information in this report was collected on behalf of Community Living Guelph Wellington by HSC Vision Consulting – Gary Sandor and Janice Dusek. It is a synthesis of the results from HSC Vision Consulting’s review, research, and engagement to date, and includes a summary of strategic issues and opportunities and emerging strategic themes.

This information was used by the Board of Directors, Senior Leadership Team, and Strategic Planning Steering Committee to develop CLGW’s upcoming strategic plan.

This report is a summary of more than 175 participants feedback, input, and ideas.

## Contents

Foreword .....	1
Overarching Themes from Stakeholder Data .....	2
Stakeholder Engagement .....	3
SWOT Analysis .....	7
PEST(LE) Summary .....	9
Developmental Services <b>Future</b> Trends .....	10
Basic Demographic Information.....	12
People CLGW Supports .....	12
Guelph Wellington’ areas served compared to Ontario .....	13

## Overarching Themes from Stakeholder Data

In review, these are the themes HCS Vision Consulting pulled out of the stakeholder data.

- Helping people live life to the fullest/exploring opportunities to make the lives of the people supported better.
- A range of responses from families and staff about Day Programs and Community Integration
- A range of responses from families regarding their opinion of the quality of the group homes
- Staffing issues:
  - Recruitment and Retention
  - Turnover
  - Consistency
- Making better use of all its physical facilities (& maintenance of current homes)
- Preparing for an uncertain future
- Strive to be a community leader (inclusion, education, community tables)

## Stakeholder Engagement

- **Staff:** 66 surveys completed; Admin/Supervisors/Managers focus group; SLT focus group; Service Managers focus group
- **Board of Directors:** Regular meeting focus group
- **Family:** 49 surveys; 20 families engaged through focus groups
- **People Supported:** 11 surveys, P4P Focus Group, People Supported Focus Groups
- **External Partners:** select 1:1 interview with Ministry + Community and Sector Leaders

Information in the chart on the following pages is not prioritized, or in any specific order. It is a cross section of input from people supported, families, and staff.

	Key takeaway	Themes	Quotes to note
What is CLGW really good at? What do you like that they do for you?	Strong Staff, Programs, Advocacy, Leadership.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff were well reviewed at a range of supporting activities (cleaning, organizing, interacting, taking out, going for walks, etc.).</li> <li>• Good at providing basics of life (housing, health, daily needs.)</li> <li>• Provides a safe place to go and be with friends and staff.</li> <li>• Quality time, invaluable experiences.</li> <li>• Staff are excellent</li> <li>• Zoom was a good tool and is key. Dedicated, loyal staff – amazing front line workers.</li> <li>• Great job adapting during COVID.</li> <li>• Passport program.</li> <li>• Programs, advocacy, leadership.</li> <li>• Re-opening day programs.</li> <li>• Teamwork</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “They have respect and hope for us all.”</li> <li>• “Trying to get me independent even though it's hard at times.”</li> <li>• “New experiences, prevents boredom and provides interaction.”</li> <li>• “Stability and routine.”</li> <li>• “They don’t give up but keep trying to improve.”</li> <li>• “Continuing to provide support with limited funding.”</li> <li>• “Front line staff’s dedication...even despite burnout.”</li> <li>• “Providing safe, reliable service to people with various disabilities.”</li> </ul>

Stakeholder Input – Continued

	Key takeaway	Themes	Quotes to note
<b>What is CLGW not so good at? What could they do better, take more action?</b>	Staff Turnover & Consistency/Need better communication, transparency/Staff morale and support.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communicating better re. waiting lists.</li> <li>More employment support is vital.</li> <li>Residential Services could improve, especially with better matching housemates.</li> <li>Staff changes are very difficult on clients.</li> <li>Lack in consistent, reliable support, especially for seniors.</li> <li>Need for workshops to come back</li> <li>Need for social interaction, physical programming.</li> <li>Need for outings, various supports</li> <li>Overall lack of communication</li> <li>Staff turnover hurts consistency</li> <li>More modern, innovative.</li> <li>Need to have stronger tools, training, efforts to improve morale, support for staff.</li> <li>Some micro-managing, not enough respect for frontline workers.</li> <li>Show &amp; communicate successes, be transparent about failures.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Get back to allowing us to do things we like.”</li> <li>“Having money for everyone to be allowed to go to day program.”</li> <li>“Limited opportunities to see friends and staff.”</li> <li>“Communication is the biggest weakness in the agency.”</li> <li>“Communicate better.”</li> <li>“Daily exercise, mental stimulation, fresh air.”</li> <li>“Lack of flexibility. Lack of advocacy”</li> <li>“Be honest, transparent, follow through with what they say.”</li> <li>“Increase staffing and improve staff retention, communication.”</li> <li>“Initiating new ideas and thinking out of the box.”</li> </ul>

Stakeholder Input – Continued

	Key takeaway	Themes	Quotes to note
How do you see CLGW in the future? New opportunities?	Strong divide on Day Programs/Better communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Currently, not enough day supports for people - opportunity to reduce isolation.</li> <li>Help to get a volunteer position, job, engaging in the community, trade training.</li> <li>More social events, opportunities to meet people.</li> <li>Adapt to aging population</li> <li>Group fitness, recreation opportunities.</li> <li>More access to facilities, maybe evenings and weekends</li> <li>Provide staff education opportunities</li> <li>Outdoor social activities</li> <li>Widen offerings</li> <li>More housing, person centred care.</li> <li>More spots for day programs.</li> <li>More technology to advance day to day activities.</li> <li>Much better support for staff.</li> <li>Opportunity to communicate much better from management, to frontline, to clients.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>“Giving us back all the activities they took away.”</li> <li>“Love if we could be part of the hiring of new people working with us.”</li> <li>“Need to keep looking for answers in a changing world.”</li> <li>“Bring back the workshops.”</li> <li>“Individualized support for employment, community activity, housing.”</li> <li>“Need to modernize the organization.”</li> <li>“Improve communication, honesty, transparency, vulnerability, consistency, clarity.”</li> <li>“More homes, inc. accessible. More presence in the community for hiring.”</li> <li>“Promote more training.”</li> </ul>

*Stakeholder Input – Continued*

	Key takeaway	Themes	Quotes to note
<b>Final thoughts</b>	Activities are missed; Housing; Transparency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ARC is very missed among respondents, was mentioned by a majority of them.</li> <li>• Desire for more one person housing, and a 1:1 staff ratio.</li> <li>• Desire for more programs that are social, involve the community.</li> <li>• Advocate to gov. for more funding.</li> <li>• Housing will be a key issue going forward as clients age.</li> <li>• Need for day programs, engagement in the community, and embracing tech.</li> <li>• Need to focus on the individual and their specific needs.</li> <li>• Need for more housing, and more staff.</li> <li>• Need to be transparent between all levels, and with families.</li> <li>• Need to rebound strongly after COVID.</li> <li>• Setting measurable milestones that are transparent and agreed upon by all levels.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• “Increase enrolment and hours of operation.”</li> <li>• “Me getting older.”</li> <li>• “Should offer more activities for people to do at the ARC with my friends and out in the community.”</li> <li>• “Improve cooperation and coordination with other groups.”</li> <li>• “Incorporate new ideas, experiences &amp; events that both client &amp; family can participate in.”</li> <li>• “Programs for seniors.”</li> <li>• “Be open, honest, and transparent.”</li> <li>• “Listen to what individuals want.”</li> <li>• “Mental health, staff advocacy, more supportive management.”</li> <li>• “Staff are tired (due to) lack of training.”</li> </ul>

## SWOT Analysis

A SWOT analysis helps organize information into four categories: **Strengths**, **Weaknesses**, **Opportunities** and **Threats**. Strengths are areas where we can continue to build on success. Weaknesses and Opportunities are areas where change and refinement could have big impact. Threats are areas to be aware of and try to plan for, should they happen.

### Strengths

- Providing safe reliable service to people with various disabilities
- Dedication of Frontline support/a great community of support staff/staff go over & above
- Advocates because they are helping others to achieve their lifestyle goals.
- Advocacy helping people live life to the fullest/exploring opportunities to make the lives of the people supported better
- CLGW listens to families/adapted to Zoom and families are happy with it
- Staff work great at integrating the people we support into and within their communities
- CLGW can be very proud of their frontline staff and how they have continued to work tirelessly throughout covid even with high amount of burnout
- Campus Friends - a superb program, very well run, excellent communication with participants and families

### Weaknesses

- CLGW does a lot, but doesn't do the best job at showing off all that it does
- Approach to integration may not be consistent throughout the entire agency
- Consistency with staff support workers/fair amount of turnover
- Real divide among families and some staff about Day Programs and integration into the community
- Real divide on level of satisfaction with group homes (some families praise, others have criticism)
- Preparing supervisors how to lead with a unified vision, and how to solve conflict
- The people we support are aging and our homes are not equipped to handle the physical needs
- Need more accessible housing and a safe "respite" location for those who need more supports
- Many staff seeking more training (e.g. mental health, etc.)
- How the buildings are going to be used for more activities.

*Swot Analysis – Continued*

**Opportunities**

- CLGW could work towards being a sector leader - inclusion first, and modelling a people-first approach
- CLGW is not utilizing the physical spaces it has to better ourselves and our community (rent out the gym? or the kitchen?)
- More housing is needed, but also better upkeep with current properties
- Educate the community about the importance of assisted living for others in need/CLGW could spend more time on clearly identifying what they do and communicating that to the community. CLGW could spend more time on celebrating its successes and communicating progress.
- CLGW could put more effort into planning, engagement, and opportunities to create connections (like networking, family nights, meet your neighbour nights, resource sharing)
- More in-person, all-staff events
- A team focused on pursuing and implementing technology to help support independence

**Threats**

- Preparing for an uncertain future
- Moving out of the pandemic, likely deficits (no increase in base funding), geopolitical situation/new clients, etc. is creating an uncertain future and creates challenges for Community Living Guelph Wellington to prepare
- Size of catchment area – as well as urban/rural difference
- Staffing crisis (not unique to CLGW) & shortage of professionals everywhere
- Family expectations continue to evolve and grow
- Ability to generate funds from other sources



## PEST(LE) Summary

PEST stands for **P**olitical, **E**conomic, **S**ocial, and **T**echnological factors. In some cases, L and E are added to the PEST due to current **L**egal and **E**nvironmental issues to become PESTLE. A PEST analysis was carried out to support an assessment of a range of major external factors that may influence CLGW's operations.

	ISSUE	IMPACT ON ORGANIZATION	RISK
<b>Political</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provincial government majority – could consider cost cutting/efficiencies and privatization</li> </ul>	Unstable environment; potential policy/funding changes	High
<b>Economic</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Post-Covid economy resulting in on-going financial pressures, staffing levels down</li> </ul>	Unstable funding, increased family instability and resulting family pressures Additional challenges in service provision Likely, no base funding increase	High High
<b>Social</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased awareness and demands from families related to service requirements;</li> <li>EDI implications;</li> <li>Emphasis on community integration - some prefer it, while others continue to want congregate care;</li> <li>MCCSS Developmental services advocating for integration into community</li> </ul>	Drives up demand; longer waiting lists, changes in services and/or priorities Demands placed on agency to address EDI internally with Staff, systems and process; as well as client service provision Confusion and perhaps increased request for services	High Medium Medium
<b>Technology</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increasing demand for use of social media and technology in service delivery</li> </ul>	Increased channels to get information; Continued need for Hybrid approach to service delivery	Medium
<b>Legislative/regulatory</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased litigation by client families;</li> <li>Increased legal challenges on info sharing</li> </ul>	Partnership Model in Autism Programs – but not so relevant to CLGW	Medium
<b>Environmental</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greening of society and demands to support efficiency and effectiveness of greening support</li> </ul>	How efficient /green are organizations	Medium

## Developmental Services Future Trends

### Changing needs of the people we support

- Aging/medical needs.
- Those seeking support are changing – in crisis, higher needs (medical or behavioural supports required).
- Those seeking support are asking for different support – ‘walk beside’, want to be more independent, focused on support for community involvement.
- Accessible, affordable housing is becoming unattainable.

### Financial Pressure will continue

- Austerity measures pressure.
- Ongoing increases to operating cost from HR to supplies to general expenses and no increases to annual budgets.
- MCCSS budget management is cumbersome (initial budget doesn’t meet need, annually applying for not guaranteed funds: client pressures funding, capital funding).
- Individualized budgets for people supported will become more frequent/regular as government implements Journey to Belonging.
- Economy concerns (rising interest rates, inflation over projected rates, market rent for people supported, cost of living).

### Staffing

- Not enough people to do the jobs - recruitment – provincial and local initiatives (CLGW involved) are underway to attract people.
- DSP Core competencies have been updated.
- Permanent Wage Enhancement (\$3hr pay bump from pandemic) to front line has caused internal inequity in pay grid; wage compression.

### Social Change

- Changing perceptions of society about disability.
- Inclusion, diversity, and equity (people supported, staff, organization-focus).
- Community development, engagement, and growth.

### Technology

- Expectation of us as an organization to use digital platforms for operations and delivery of service.
- Creates expectation of increased responsiveness.

### **Journey to Belonging implementation**

- Just completed planning stage (a little behind initial timelines).
- Next 2 stages:
  - 2024-2027 change management/readiness
  - 2027-2030 roll out
- Just completed KPMG costing study, 60% of organization participated. Report due Feb 2023 but is now delayed.
- CLGW is aligned in values, practice but what is happening is system change.
- Key commitments:
  - Put people first.
  - Improve service experience.
  - Improve quality and accountability.

## Basic Demographic Information

### People CLGW Supports

Age	
18-24	7%
25-35	24%
35-44	24%
45-54	16%
55-64	19%
65+	10%
	<b>100%</b>

Gender	
Male-identified	58%
Female-identified	41%
Neither/Other	1%
	<b>100%</b>

## Guelph Wellington' areas served compared to Ontario

Demographic	Guelph	Wellington County	Ontario
Overall Population Change (2016-2021)	8.8% growth	8.2% growth	5.8% growth
Age (in general)	All categories similar	All categories similar	All categories similar
Median total income in 2020 (individuals)	\$44,400 (slightly higher than Ontario)	\$44,800 (slightly higher than Ontario)	\$41,200
Median total income in 2020 (households)	\$94,000	\$97,000	\$91,000
Employment (EI benefits)	9.1% of population	8.3% of population	8.9% of population
Low-income	8.1 of population	7.7 of population	10.1 of population
Indigenous population	1.6 % of population	1.6 % of population	2.9 % of population
Immigrant status	23.7 % of population	18.8 % of population	30.0 % of population
Visible minority	25.1 % of population	17.6 % of population	34.3 % of population

### SUMMARY:

- Overall population growth in G-W is larger than the Provincial average
- Many of the categories would follow along what most people would generally think (e.g. higher income, less Indigenous people, less immigrants and visible minorities)

## Engagement and Input Summary

Iterative process – guidance and input from the Steering Committee, Board, and leadership along the way

Building evidence from multiple information sources, including widespread engagement from the following stakeholders: People Supported, Family Members, the Board of Directors, CLGW Leadership and Staff, MCCSS and Community Partners

Additional insight from online surveys – 128 surveys completed. Break down by stakeholder group below.

- Staff Engagement:
  - Attended, Presented and Led Discussion at Staff Appreciation Day – Focus Group
  - Service Managers and Leadership Team – 2 Focus Groups
  - Surveys completed - 66
- Board of Directors (regular meeting) - 10 attendees - Focus Group
- Family Engagement
  - 3 Focus Groups – 20 Family Members
  - Surveys completed - 49
- People Supported
  - P4P - Focus Group
  - 2 People Supported Focus Groups
  - Surveys completed - 11
- External Partners:
  - Select 1:1 interviews – Ministry & community and sector leaders
  - Interviewed MCCSS Program Supervisor

TOTAL = over 175 participants