



An Independent Evaluation of the Safeguards Initiative of Community Living B C

2010

Report Prepared By:

Michael J. Kendrick PhD, Kendrick Consulting Intl

www.kendrickconsulting.org

kendrickconsult@attglobal.net

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
<i>Addendum A: Summary of Recommendations</i>	6
An Independent Evaluation of the Safeguards initiative of Community Living British Columbia	14
Background	14
Terms of Reference: 2010 Independent Review of CLBC’s Safeguards Initiatives from 2006-2010.....	15
Specific Areas of Evaluation Focus.....	16
Educational Efforts.....	16
Materials Development.....	16
Technical Assistance.....	16
Administrative, Programmatic Efficiency and Performance Considerations.....	16
Value to Stakeholders	16
The Key Findings of the Independent External Evaluation	17
A. THE KEY STRENGTHS OF THE SAFEGUARDS INITIATIVE.....	17
B. CHALLENGES AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE SAFEGUARDS INITIATIVE.....	27
B1) The Continuation Of The Safeguards Initiative As An Ongoing Commitment Of CLBC	27
Recommendation One:.....	29
Recommendation Two:.....	30
Recommendation Three:.....	31
B2) The Educational Role of the Safeguards Initiatives.....	33
Recommendation Four:	34
Recommendation Five:.....	35
Recommendation Six:	37
Recommendation Seven:.....	37
Recommendation Eight:	37
Recommendation Nine:.....	39
Recommendation Ten:	39
Recommendation Eleven:.....	41
Recommendation Twelve:.....	42
Recommendation Thirteen:	43
Recommendation Fourteen:	45
Recommendation Fifteen:.....	46
Recommendation Sixteen:	46
B3) The Extent To Which The Safeguards Initiative Furthers The Broad Intentions Of The CLBC 2009-2010 Operational Plan.....	46
#1: Connect individuals and families with supports, services and community opportunities to advance their vision of a good life.....	46

#2: Support the development of welcoming communities to enable citizenship and contribution.	47
#3: Improve services through strengthened relationships and partnerships.	48
#4: Develop a culture of service excellence provided by exceptional staff.	48
#5: Demonstrate effective governance, leadership and fiscal responsibility.	48
#6: Develop data and information management systems that support the work of CLBC and its partners.	49
B4) The Data Base for the Safeguards Initiative and It Role In Demonstrating Impact.	49
Recommendation Seventeen:.....	51
Recommendation Eighteen:	52
Recommendation Nineteen:.....	54
Recommendation Twenty:.....	55
Appendix “A”: Summary of Recommendations	56
Appendix “B”: Safeguards Initiative Publications	61

Executive Summary

The Service Accountability and Safeguards Project was initiated by CLBC in 2006. In 2010, an external evaluation was conducted by Dr. Michael Kendrick, internationally recognized for his expertise in the areas of safeguards and vulnerability of persons with developmental disabilities. This report provides a summary of key findings from that evaluation with the recommendations listed in Addendum A

Background

The Service Accountability and Safeguards Project (hereafter referred to as Safeguards Initiative - SI) was first conceptualized in 2005 and then initiated by CLBC in 2006. Its first and only manager, to this point, has been Jule Hopkins. It is currently located within the Policy and Program Development division of CLBC led by Carol Goozh. Carol was instrumental in conceiving of the initiative and has provided the key oversight and senior management liaison and leadership of the project since its inception.

The SI represents a particularly noteworthy initiative within CLBC in that it is highly unusual for government to take up issues of vulnerability and safeguards at the breadth and level of commitment shown with this project. The SI is province wide, involves multiple players at multiple levels, builds on earlier work in the province, and mobilizes both formal and informal resources in a wide variety of collaborative partnerships. There does not seem to be another example of a government entity attempting anything as relevant on this scale and in such an open ended way in any other jurisdiction, thereby making CLBC and its Safeguards Initiative stand out both as a demonstration of leadership and innovation worthy of both evaluation and commendation.

The Nature and Importance of Safeguards

CLBC has, since it's founding, prioritized an emphasis on recognizing the inherent and potential value of living in community as a source for safeguarding people and their lives. In addition, CLBC has promoted the value of developing and putting in place well targeted safeguards to offset and diminish these vulnerabilities. The SI addressed both formal and informal safeguards. Formal safeguards are those created and maintained by formal organizations whether they are based in governments or the community. For instance, a quasi independent complaint process of an agency might be a formal effort to safeguard individual service user or family voices and concerns about agency conduct. In contrast, informal safeguards are those that may be quite intentional but that occur outside of formal organizations and their control. These could include family advocacy, networks of friends, good community attitudes towards social inclusion, and the like. All play a safeguarding function even though none of them are specifically part of formal organizations.

In recognition of the importance of safeguards, the SI was formulated to act as a catalyst to address the following overarching concerns;

- Raise awareness of the vulnerabilities of persons with disabilities within BC communities;
- Educate people to the role of well targeted and thoughtful safeguards as ways to counter the vulnerabilities of people with disabilities;
- Address the many safeguarding and accountability challenges in the system funded by CLBC including the broader community and the many agencies that CLBC partners with in service delivery;
- Address the many ways that communities can act to safeguard their citizens with disabilities in both formal and informal ways;
- Deepen the understanding of how to create and sustain meaningful safeguards over time; and,
- Serve as a resource for both individuals and groups who have an interest in personal vulnerability and the role of intentional safeguards.

This broad mandate was implemented via annual work plans conducted either directly by the SI or in partnership with others both within and outside CLBC. Though framed as a single project or focus, the SI was really an interconnected series of distinct initiatives involving variable objectives, financing and partners as made intrinsic sense in regards to each activity and its purposes.

Over the course of its history thus far, the SI has led the following projects in support of its mandate:

- Published resources books on a variety of topics including: Building personal support networks, safeguards and planning, resources on rights for self advocates (See Appendix B);
- Conducted the “Start with Hi” initiative;
- Spearheaded the Personal Support Network project in 4 communities;
- Developed and delivered workshops on safeguards, personal supports, and rights to self advocates, family members, service providers, Community Councils, and others as part of conferences, training events, and community meetings;
- Facilitated the development and delivery of a workshop series with Spectrum Society on Building Family and Community Support Networks;
- Supported CLBC policy development on topics including safeguards, standards for non-accredited service providers, and planning; and,
- Developed collaborative partnerships with a variety of community based organizations in support of family leadership on planning, self advocacy, and safeguards.

The SI has also benefitted from the consistent leadership role provided by the Safeguards Advisory Committee. This group, with broad representation from within CLBC and the community, has guided the development of the initiative from the beginning and has played an ongoing role in developing and reviewing its annual work plan, advised on key matters of

content and strategy, suggested methods, priorities and opportunities as seemed useful at a given moment. The Advisory Committee saw itself and acted as a kind of internal champion and advocate for the SI and its work which was ultimately a critical role for a newly formed initiative seeking to establish itself.

Methodology

The external evaluation of the project resulted from discussions initiated with the Safeguards Advisory Committee in 2008. Given his recognized expertise with the subject matter of vulnerability, safeguards, and evaluation, Dr. Michael Kendrick of Kendrick Consulting Intl. was contacted to conduct the evaluation. Terms of reference were finalized in 2009 and the evaluation completed in early 2010. Dr. Kendrick employed a qualitative research model using loosely structured, guided interviews. Interviews were extensive: 35 in total, encompassing 56 individuals. Those interviewed included self advocates, family members, service providers, advocates, and employees of CLBC. The interviewees represented a wide variety of kinds of roles and relationships to the project including:

- CLBC Board member
- CLBC Directors, Managers, Facilitators and Analysts
- Community Council Chairpersons
- Safeguards Advisory Committee members
- Independent community members
- Provincial advocacy organizations representing families and individuals
- Contracted agencies providing services
- Provincial government employees outside of CLBC.

Interviews occurred in the Lower Mainland, on Vancouver Island, and in the Okanagan and incorporated both individual and group conversations. All those interviewed had specific contact or involvement with the SI.

Key Findings of the Independent External Evaluation

1. The Safeguards Initiative was extremely effective at raising awareness with a wide variety of people regarding the nature of personal vulnerability and the role of intentional safeguards to thoughtfully address the needs of individuals.

In the past four years, as many as 10,000 people have been influenced through the SI project, not including the "Start with Hi" initiative. The Personal Support Network project, and its off shoots, has alone reached at least 3500 people. Publications of the SI have been widely distributed and well received. A variety of presentations and workshops were developed and delivered to a diverse cohort of audiences demonstrating the remarkable effectiveness of the SI in appealing to a wide mix of people with quite different levels of interest and knowledge about the topic of safeguards.

2. The Safeguards Initiative has been extremely competent in making the complex subject matter involved in matters of safeguarding and vulnerability very accessible to a diverse range of people including self advocates, families, community members, support staff, clinicians and professionals, administrators and civil servants.

Communication was targeted, accessible, and provided in different formats. "Start with Hi" initiative was a popular, media project focusing on the participation of individuals with developmental disabilities in community based relationships. The manager of the project is to be specifically commended for her deeply held and actively demonstrated ethic of developing thoughtful and adaptive responses to the topic of vulnerability.

3. The Safeguards Initiative was impressively proficient at partnering with a wide range of people operating at all levels within CLBC and throughout the community, thereby heightening the reach and impact of the initiative, gaining collaborators and supporters across the expanse of the sector, and doing so in such a way as to magnify the impact of the resources of the project.

Partnerships included Family Support Institute, service providers, Community Councils, self advocacy and advocacy organizations throughout the province. The project specifically modeled both informal and formal community based partnership and demonstrated that it could successfully generate new safeguarding initiatives alongside a diverse array of partners.

4. The Safeguards Initiative is a highly innovative and internationally significant demonstration of how a government agency can meaningfully engage and address a vital community concern.

The SI is proactive rather than a reactive catalyst in regards to matters of vulnerability thereby encouraging a form of developmental and preventative safeguarding mentality. "Start with Hi" has broken new ground in public education. In a recent Mustel marketing group study in April 2010, based on two earlier surveys in 2009, a fourfold increase in support of the idea of inclusion of people with disabilities in community was noted as a result of exposure to "Start with Hi".

5. The personal credibility, substance, respect and skillfulness of the Safeguards Initiative's staff leader has made this initiative, in all likelihood, the most highly regarded, admired, and welcomed initiative originating from the CLBC head office, particularly in the broader community of BC.

Jule Hopkins has generated significant goodwill on behalf of CLBC and interest in the topic of vulnerability through her leadership and explicit focus on community linkages and collaborative strategies. Jule is seen as being very knowledgeable about both vulnerability and safeguards and demonstrates strengths in mobilizing activities. The SI has developed an unusual level of credibility for a government initiative and there are no other CLBC provincial projects that hold comparable standing.

6. The Safeguards Initiative has demonstrated extensive competency in illustrating, through a wide variety of methods, how the thoughtful use of intentional safeguards can adaptively help to address vulnerability in a wide range of circumstances.

The subject matter involved in vulnerability and safeguards can be abstract for some audiences. The SI focused on deliberate strategies to make the topic relevant and accessible. The SI was adept in linking the conversation about safeguards to the growing interest across BC in “person centred” options.

7. The Safeguards Initiative was largely successful at meeting or exceeding its own ambitious internal annual work plan goals.

Annual work plans were challenging and often expanded to incorporate other opportunities throughout the year. The SI manager actively took up promising opportunities to enhance the value and scope of the work in addition to broad goals established for each year.

The project was also able to further the broad intentions of the CLBC 2009-2010 Operational Plan in two key areas. The SI actively worked to connect individuals and families with supports, services and community opportunities to advance their vision of a good life, and supported the development of welcoming communities to enable citizenship and contribution.

Recommendations and Conclusion

The full list of recommendations is included as an appendix to this summary, however, the primary and perhaps most significant result of the evaluation is a confirmation of both the success of the SI and an established consensus that the work of service accountability and safeguarding should be continued as a key initiative of CLBC. It has been specifically recommended that the project be confirmed for a further 5 years and subsequent external evaluations be performed to continue the documentation and retain the valuable lessons from this innovative, popular, and influential initiative. The SI represents a commitment to social change and proactive social policy development on the part of CLBC that has inspired confidence and validity in both the topic and the capacity to respond proactively to a vital aspect of promoting good lives in welcoming communities for individuals with developmental disabilities.

Addendum A: Summary of Recommendations

(Categorized according to the broad areas of consideration for future work.)

The Continuation of the Safeguards Initiative as an On-going Commitment of CLBC

Recommendation One: It is recommended that CLBC authorize the continuation of the Safeguards Initiative for a minimum of a further five year period.

Recommendation Two: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative be further externally and independently evaluated in five years time (e.g. by early to mid 2016).

Recommendation Three: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative be authorized to expand its focus and annual work priorities to act as an internal CLBC resource to explore, with other sections of CLBC, the various ways that safeguarding systems could be strengthened so that they could provide greater benefit for the people with disabilities and their families that CLBC supports.

- a) Further, that in this regard, that the Safeguards Initiative be authorized to develop joint internal projects or initiatives with any division, regional or local office, Community Council, governing board or other element of CLBC that is involved with the execution of any formal safeguarding system of the CLBC that would potentially strengthen any of these internally operated safeguards.
- b) Though there may often be merit in the executive leadership requesting that each such administrative entity of the CLBC undertake a joint safeguards strengthening project in conjunction with the Safeguards Initiative, it is not necessarily the case that these would or should be a priority in a given year. Consequently, this determination can be determined annually as to its possible merits by the Safeguards Initiative and the specific administrative section and subsequently included into their mutual annual work plans as appropriate.

Rationale for recommendations: The evaluation indicated that there was consensus that the SI has established itself as a distinct, innovative, and broad based initiative with considerable influence and engagement and should therefore be continued as an ongoing element of CLBC's overall work. The SI serves to promote CLBC's vision and values through partnerships that reduce vulnerability. The work is inherently long term in nature and a 5 year scope of work supports both long and short term planning. Evaluation is essential to reflections on the value and success of the work. Targeted internal and external safeguarding projects, specifically considered for their feasibility and timing, would allow the organization to build capacity across its various component parts while emphasizing the inherently inter-related nature of considerations regarding both formal and informal approaches to reducing vulnerability.

The Educational Role of the Safeguards Initiative

Recommendation Four: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative continue its ongoing program of short outreach oriented trainings and educational events involving various partnering groups throughout the province on themes related to safeguarding and vulnerability.

Recommendation Five: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative expand its own educational offerings and those it supports, to include a variety of more “in depth” treatments of safeguards and vulnerability subjects that would also allow for better targeting of subject matter to the needs of interested groups in the province that have highly specific interests.

Recommendation Six: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative expand the variety and extent of targeted introductory trainings on safeguards and vulnerability issues to self advocates, families and CLBC and community service organization staff such that more choices are available that might better suit the specific needs of sub groups of these large groups.

Recommendation Seven: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative expand the use of training and technical assistance options in terms of helping self advocates, families and CLBC and community service organization staff learn how they can personally become more proficient at designing and managing safeguards that are well targeted and effective in terms of managing the vulnerabilities they encounter.

Recommendation Eight: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative contribute to the content regarding the adaptive management of vulnerability and personal safeguards in any proposed or eventual “core” training program that the CLBC may develop in coming years for its staff as well as support community agencies with this subject matter in any of their own “core” trainings for staff and possibly others.

Recommendation Nine: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative continue to expand its publication efforts and those of others in regards to subject matter related to safeguards and vulnerability that emerge as important priorities in terms of resource development.

Recommendation Ten: It is recommended that the SI establish a five year plan to gradually strengthen its capacities to engage and address matters of vulnerability and safeguards in the context of the many minority languages and cultures that are now established as part of the communities of British Columbia and this be done in cooperation with interested leaders from these minority communities.

Rationale for the recommendations: A key and prominently successful role of the SI has been its educational role and overall leadership on the topic of safeguards. Short educational and training events have built interest in the topic and should be continued while building on deeper learning from initial exposure to the subject. Key would be targeting and packaging of new learning experiences and materials

so as to be intentionally suited to a variety of audiences who should and will play a key role in community based safeguarding work. Specific attention should be paid to expansion of the use of training and technical assistance options that promote a person centered focus, as well as considerations that ensure that the topic of adaptive management and personal safeguards be included in any “core” training devised for CLBC staff and community service providers. Attention to the diversity of the BC population demonstrates respect and proactivity in advancing the conversation about safeguards.

Recommendation Eleven: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative continue to address the many values issues that may underlie the diminishment or accentuation of vulnerability in the lives of people with disabilities. In doing this, it should seek in cooperation of others interested in values based leadership, to further strengthen a coordinated and proactive program and vehicle to intentionally encourage positive values based leadership and subsequent approaches that can beneficially affect the lives of people with disabilities.

Recommendation Twelve: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative explore and initiate on a periodic basis, based upon its ongoing priorities, the establishment of various formal and informal ties between itself and the academic community and organizations in BC and elsewhere that may have some specific advantage in strengthening the capacity of people within the province to better address questions of vulnerability and safeguards and to take appropriate advantage of any such ties that already exist between CLBC and academic centers.

Recommendation Thirteen: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative explore and initiate, with varying agency and other parties, intentional initiatives aimed at identifying and positively altering environmental conditions within services that contribute to the vulnerability of persons receiving services and that it continue to expand its similar work involving adaptively reshaping conditions of life in communities that add to the vulnerability of people with disabilities.

Rationale for the recommendations: The emergence of better practices and attitudes in the disability field has occurred as a result of focused, intentional, and proactive leadership in awareness building and analysis of values and their impact on people’s lives. Consideration should be given to mounting some sort of on-going and systematic values based awareness, training and engagement effort in BC. Linkages between the academy and non-academic sectors should be explored to promote research, affiliation projects, curricula development and other projects to give greater credibility and standing to the many issues involved in the focus on vulnerability, and continue the leadership shown thus far through diverse partnerships. Further work on the part of the SI should be targeted on both service change and community change where the focus is on the environmental conditions that are generating vulnerability with both services and communities.

Recommendation Fourteen: It is recommended that CLBC and the Safeguards Initiative continue with the “Start With Hi” initiative and take it into its next phase and that this next phase of the campaign address both the question of what should happen after “Hi” has started things going at the level of personal relationships, as well as how people with disabilities might begin to occupy valued social roles within relationships and in community life more broadly.

Recommendation Fifteen: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative, as a component of the Policy and Program Development division, and the Communications divisions negotiate and finalize an ongoing working agreement as to how the SWH campaign should be managed as an ongoing initiative of CLBC. This working agreement should cover expectations, aims, roles, decision-making, internal and external communications, the process for the resolution of disputes, and the ways that coordination is to be pursued.

Recommendation Sixteen: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative be expanded in the scope of its work as per the recommendations in this report, but that any such growth in work obligations is supported by additional resources, particularly for the internal work of the Safeguards Initiative itself.

Rationale for the recommendations: The “Start with Hi” initiative was a successful social marketing experiment that advanced the message of friendship and community presence for people with developmental disabilities. The initiative should be continued with careful consideration given to the messages considered to promote valued social roles. Further, a negotiated working agreement between the SI and Communications division will serve to assist with the successful coordination and management of a continuation of the initiative. Implementation of the recommendations emerging from the evaluation will appropriately require expanded resources to honour the demands associated with increased responsibility to continue the leadership and excellence demonstrated thus far.

Documenting and Demonstrating the Impact of the Safeguards Initiative

Recommendation Seventeen: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative, in consultation with interested parties and with the advice of competent evaluators and researchers, prepare a set of key impact priorities for the work of the SI that it believes would be worth researching, evaluating and documenting seek ways in which these may be pursued subject to both the feasibility to undertake them and the availability of resources at a given moment to do so.

Recommendation Eighteen: It is recommended that CLBC through the Safeguards Initiative and other divisions work together to develop an adjustable appraisal of who in BC is might be considered to be persons or groups who are most endangered by the vulnerabilities they are encountering in their lives. This appraisal should be seen solely as guidance for those involved in CLBC and its service partner organizations making policy and priority decisions. This use is in contrast to its possible employment as a pre-emptive and prescriptive rote checklist adjudication of who should get priority attention.

Rationale for recommendations: The work of the SI has demonstrated success in advancing the conversation about, and importance of, both formal and informal safeguards. As a longer term initiative, the SI should identify specific areas of activity with a view to deliberately assessing impacts from targeted activity, keeping in mind that there is a distinction between impacts that have discernible scale and those that are seminal and provide leadership over the long term. Documentation of these impacts will advance shared learning. Identification of those persons considered most vulnerable and linking this to the work and role of the SI, will assist CLBC is becoming more adept at managing vulnerability in ways that have the best possible outcomes for individuals and their families.

Recommendation Nineteen: It is recommended that the CLBC and the Safeguards Initiative undertake a review and possible revision of the Safeguards Advisory Committee's role, terms of reference and member composition to as much as possible bring it in line with its future mission and that this be done with as much input from the varied constituencies that are integral to the emerging mission of the SI. This could include scheduled and periodic consultations with key constituencies at timely intervals on a regular basis.

Recommendation Twenty: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative undertake further planning about how it could expand its presence and the presence of the key messages of its many partners in the various media that will have influence on various populations within British Columbia that the Safeguards Initiative hopes to influence.

Rational for the recommendations: The Advisory Committee has played a pivotal leadership role in the history of the SI thus far. Continuation of the SI provides an opportunity to examine the optimal configuration of the Committee in order to best support the challenges associated with the ongoing evolution and operation of an established initiative. Further planning with respect to the role of the SI with the broader media will expand upon the catalytic role the initiative has played in influencing people within the CLBC system and the broader community.

Appendix "C": Summary of Recommendations

Recommendation One: It is recommended that CLBC authorize the continuation of the Safeguards Initiative for a minimum of a further five year period.

Recommendation Two: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative be further externally and independently evaluated in five years time i.e. by early to mid 2016.

Recommendation Three: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative be authorized to expand its focus and annual work priorities to be an internal CLBC resource to explore, with other sections of CLBC that operate these formal safeguards. The intention would be to explore the various ways that these safeguarding systems could be strengthened so that they could provide greater benefit for the people with disabilities and their families that CLBC supports.

- c) Further, that in this regard, that the Safeguards Initiative, be authorized to develop joint internal projects or initiatives with any division, regional or local office, Community Council, governing board or other element of CLBC that is involved with the execution of any formal safeguarding system of the CLBC that would potentially strengthen any of these internally operated safeguards.
- d) Though there may often be merit in the executive leadership requesting that each such administrative entity of the CLBC undertake a joint safeguards strengthening project in conjunction with the Safeguards Initiative, it is not necessarily the case that these would or should be a priority in a given year. Consequently, this determination can be determined annually as to its possible merits by the Safeguards Initiative and the specific administrative section and subsequently included into their mutual annual work plans as appropriate.

Recommendation Four: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative continue its ongoing program of short outreach oriented trainings and educational events involving various partnering groups throughout the province on themes related to safeguarding and vulnerability.

Recommendation Five: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative expand its own educational offerings and those it supports, to include a variety of more "in depth" treatments of safeguards and vulnerability subjects that would also allow for better targeting of subject matter to the needs of interested groups in the province that have highly specific interests.

Recommendation Six: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative expand the variety and extent of targeted introductory trainings on safeguards and vulnerability issues to self advocates, families and CLBC and community service organization staff such that more choices are available. That might better suit the specific needs of sub groups of these large groups.

Recommendation Seven: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative expand the use of training and technical assistance options in terms of helping self advocates, families and CLBC and community service organization staff learn how they can personally become more proficient at designing and managing safeguards that are well targeted and effective in terms of managing the vulnerabilities they encounter.

Recommendation Eight: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative contribute to the content regarding the adaptive management of vulnerability and personal safeguards in any proposed or eventual “core” training program that the CLBC may develop in coming years for its staff as well as support community agencies with this subject matter in any of their own “core” trainings for staff and possibly others.

Recommendation Nine: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative continue to expand its publication efforts and those of others in regards to subject matter related to safeguards and vulnerability that emerge as important priorities in terms of resource development.

Recommendation Ten: It is recommended that the SI establish a five year plan to gradually strengthen its capacities to engage and address matters of vulnerability and safeguards in the context of the many minority languages and cultures that are now established as part of the communities of British Columbia and this be done in cooperation with interested leaders from these minority communities.

Recommendation Eleven: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative continue to address the many values issues that may underlie the diminishment or accentuation of vulnerability in the lives of people with disabilities. In doing this, it should seek in cooperation of others interested in values based leadership, to further strengthen a coordinated and proactive program and vehicle to intentionally encourage positive values based leadership and subsequent approaches that can beneficially affect the lives of people with disabilities.

Recommendation Twelve: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative explore and initiate on a periodic basis, based upon its ongoing priorities, the establishment of various formal and informal ties between itself and the academic community and organizations in BC and elsewhere that may have some specific advantage in strengthening the capacity of people within the province to better address questions of vulnerability and safeguards and to take appropriate advantage of any such ties that already exist between CLBC and academic centers.

Recommendation Thirteen: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative explore and initiate, with varying agency and other parties, intentional initiatives aimed at identifying and positively altering environmental conditions within services that contribute to the vulnerability of persons receiving services and that it continue to expand its similar work involving adaptively reshaping conditions of life in communities that add to the vulnerability of people with disabilities.

Recommendation Fourteen: It is recommended that CLBC and the Safeguards Initiative continue with the “Start With Hi” initiative and take it into its next phase and that this next phase of the campaign address both the question of what should happen after “Hi” has started things going at the level of personal relationships, as well as how people with disabilities might begin to occupy valued social roles within relationships and in community life more broadly.

Recommendation Fifteen: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative, as a component of the Policy and Program Development division, and the Communications divisions negotiate and finalize an ongoing working agreement as to how the SWH campaign should be managed as an ongoing initiative of CLBC. This working agreement should cover expectations, aims, roles, decision-making, internal and external communications, the process for the resolution of disputes and the ways that coordination is to be pursued.

Recommendation Sixteen: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative be expanded in the scope of its work as per the recommendations in this report, but that any such growth in work obligations is supported by additional resources, particularly for the internal work of the Safeguards Initiative itself.

Recommendation Seventeen: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative, in consultation with interested parties and with the advice of competent evaluators and researchers, prepare a set of key impact priorities for the work of the SI that it believes would be worth researching, evaluating and documenting seek ways in which these may be pursued subject to both the feasibility to undertake them and the availability of resources at a given moment to do so.

Recommendation Eighteen: It is recommended that CLBC through the Safeguards Initiative and other divisions work together to develop an adjustable appraisal of who in BC is might be considered to be persons or groups who are most endangered by the vulnerabilities they are encountering in their lives. This appraisal should be seen solely as guidance for those involved in CLBC and its service partner organizations making policy and priority decisions. This use is in contrast to its possible employment as a pre-emptive and prescriptive rote checklist adjudication of who should get priority attention.

Recommendation Nineteen: It is recommended that the CLBC and the Safeguards Initiative undertake a review and possible revision of the Safeguards Advisory Committee’s role, terms of reference and member composition to as much as possible bring it in line with its future mission and that this be done with as much input from the varied constituencies that are integral to the emerging mission of the SI. This could include scheduled and periodic consultations with key constituencies at timely intervals on a regular basis.

Recommendation Twenty: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative undertake further planning about how it could expand its presence and the presence of the key messages of its many partners in the various media that will have influence on various populations within British Columbia that the Safeguards Initiative hopes to influence.

An Independent Evaluation of the Safeguards initiative of Community Living British Columbia

Background

The Service Accountability and Safeguards Project was first planned for in 2005 and then initiated by the CLBC in 2006. Its first and only manager, to this point, has been Jule Hopkins. The Service Accountability And Safeguards Project, herein entitled the Safeguards Initiative, or SI as its acronym, has been a province wide initiative of Community Living British Columbia i.e. CLBC which is a crown agency of the government of British Columbia. It is currently located in the Policy and Program Development division of CLBC, led by Carol Goozh. Carol Goozh was instrumental in conceiving of the initiative and has provided the key oversight and senior management liaison and leadership of the project since its inception. CLBC has, since it's founding, prioritized an emphasis on recognizing the inherent and potential value of living in community as a source for safeguarding people and their lives providing this capacity was fostered and supported. The SI was formulated to act as a catalyst to address the following overarching concerns;

- Raise awareness of the vulnerabilities of persons with disabilities within BC communities.
- Educate people to the role of well targeted and thoughtful safeguards as ways to counter the vulnerabilities of people with disabilities
- Address the many safeguarding and accountability challenges in the system funded by the CLBC including the broader community and the many agencies that CLBC partners with in service delivery.
- Address the many ways that communities can act to safeguard their citizens with disabilities in both formal and informal ways.
- Deepen the understanding of how to create and sustain meaningful safeguards over time.
- Serve as a resource for both individuals and groups who have an interest in personal vulnerability and the role of intentional safeguards.

This broad mandate was implemented in such a way that the SI would have the capability of developing annual work plans to be conducted either directly by the SI or in partnership with others both within and outside CLBC. Though framed as a single project or function, it was really an inter connected series of distinct initiatives involving variable objectives, financing, and partners as made intrinsic sense in regards to each initiative and its purposes. Notwithstanding this mosaic of activities, it is also important to recognize that the SI was still a coordinated project, as all initiatives were chosen to conform with the mission of the SI.

The third party that has played a consistent leadership role in the SI has been the Safeguards Advisory Committee. This group has guided the development of the initiative from the

beginning and has played an ongoing role in developing and reviewing its annual work plan, advised on key matters of content and strategy, suggested methods, priorities and opportunities as seemed useful at a given moment. The Advisory Committee, with broad representation from within CLBC and the community, and has been meeting regularly since the initiative was first launched. It saw itself and indeed acted as a kind of internal champion and advocate for the SI and its work, which was ultimately a critical role for a newly formed initiative seeking to establish itself.

In mid 2008 discussions were initiated with the Safeguards Advisory Committee concerning an eventual evaluation of the SI and preliminary Terms of Reference for such a proposed independent external evaluation were explored. In late 2008, Carol Goozh approached Michael Kendrick of Kendrick Consulting Intl about his availability to conduct such an evaluation given his extensive experience with the subject matter of vulnerability and safeguards. The timing for the evaluation was set for early 2010. The precise Terms of Reference for the evaluation were finalized in 2009 and are listed below.

Terms of Reference: 2010 Independent Review of CLBC's Safeguards Initiatives from 2006-2010

Overall Purpose: This review is intended as an assessment of the impact to date and the value of some of the major CLBC Safeguards Initiatives within the Safeguards and Service Accountability Project work plan from 2006-2010 in terms of:

- 1) Furthering the broad intentions of the CLBC 2009-2010 Operational Plan.
- 2) Its contribution to the reduction and better management of the vulnerability of persons with disabilities supported by the CLBC in terms of both the formal and informal exercise of safeguards in response to vulnerability.
- 3) It's strengthening of the capacities of persons in BC, both within and outside of CLBC, to play a positive role in safeguarding the vulnerability of persons with disabilities.
- 4) Its role in highlighting, stimulating and pursuing areas where leadership can be exercised on behalf of issues that impact the vulnerability of persons with disabilities within BC, both within the community at large and within services.
- 5) Generating recommendations to the CLBC as to what the future directions of the Safeguards Initiative should be and how it might improve its ability to impact on the vulnerabilities of persons with disabilities supported by CLBC.

Note: In this evaluation report the terms "informal" and "formal" safeguards will be used. For purposes of definition, formal safeguards are safeguards created and maintained by formal organizations whether they are based in governments or the community. For instance, a quasi independent complaint process of an agency might be a formal effort to safeguard service user

or family voices and concerns about agency conduct. Informal safeguards are safeguards that may be quite intentional but that occur outside of formal organizations and their control. For instance family advocacy, friendship, and good community attitudes towards social inclusion all might have a safeguarding function even though none of them are specifically part of formal organizations. It should be noted that there are many informal safeguards at work in formal organizations, but they have no formal standing with that organization nor are they a reflection necessarily of organizational involvement or intent. A good example of these might be positive values held by many staff that do not necessarily owe their existence to organizational actions or a positive disposition amongst managers to first look to socially inclusive community resources. Both may be beneficial from a safeguarding point of view, yet not be a part of the formal organization's self conscious commitments.

Specific Areas of Evaluation Focus

Educational Efforts

- a) The review will focus on generating, collecting and summarizing all of the feasibly available self report evaluations of any of the CLBC Safeguards Initiative educational efforts delivered to both persons within and outside of the CLBC.

Materials Development

- b) The review will evaluate the impact on, and value for, end users of resource materials developed by CLBC for addressing matters related to vulnerability and safeguards.

Technical Assistance

- c) The review will evaluate the value of the various types of technical assistance given by the CLBC Safeguards Initiative to both CLBC and non CLBC parties relevant to and vulnerability and safeguards.

Administrative, Programmatic Efficiency and Performance Considerations

- d) The review will focus on the comparative efficiency of how the Safeguards Initiative executed its mandate in terms of quality of organization, communication, partnering, leadership, budget economy and methods.

Value to Stakeholders

- e) The review will sample stakeholder views as to their perception of the overall merit and limitations of the CLBC Safeguards Initiative and their views as to its possible future.

A report addressing these terms of reference was to be compiled based on these terms of reference and submitted to CLBC when completed. The "on site" portion of the evaluation was completed in two phases in January and February of 2010. This involved

extensive interviews in the Lower Mainland, Vancouver Island, and the Okanagan with a wide variety of persons who had had specific contact or involvement with the SI or whose organizations had had such contact. (See Appendix B for the names of the person's interviewed). These interviews served as the basis for the findings and many of the recommendations presented in this report.

The Key Findings of the Independent External Evaluation

A. THE KEY STRENGTHS OF THE SAFEGUARDS INITIATIVE

- **The Safeguards Initiative was extremely effective at raising awareness with a wide variety of people regarding the nature of personal vulnerability and the role of intentional safeguards to thoughtfully address the needs of the person.**

The SI has reached many thousands of people across British Columbia in the past four years through a wide variety of means. It has provided important insights and messages about the vulnerability of people with disabilities and the value of developing and putting in place well targeted safeguards to offset and diminish these vulnerabilities. Almost without exception, those interviewed for this evaluation, remarked on how effective the SI had been in bringing these concerns to the attention of a very large number of people and keeping them there. It is difficult to estimate the precise numbers of people who may have been cumulatively reached by the SI over these four years, but a very conservative estimate would be at least 5,000 and possibly as many as 10,000, not including those exposed to the "Start with Hi" initiative or SI publications. The Personal Support sub-initiative, and its offshoots, have alone reached at least 3500 people.

We are speaking here specifically of persons who had some sort of direct personal contact with an educational event of the SI. While there most certainly would be persons who had multiple exposures to SI initiatives, they would be a minority. In 2007-2008 alone, there were thirty-five Community Inquiry Sessions on safeguards, fourteen presentations to Community Councils, eleven presentations to Quality Service Analysts as well as representation at various other community meetings, conferences, and so on. In the 2008-2009 year, there were five presentations to Community Councils, twenty five sessions on safeguards (estimated attendance 810 people) and 16 sessions on building personal support networks (estimated attendance 520 people).

These numbers speak to the remarkable effectiveness of the SI at being able to reach out and interest not only large numbers of people, but to respond to a very diverse range of people across the province. Audiences have included self-advocates, families, members

of Community Councils, CLBC staff in all roles and at all levels in the organization, direct support staff in community agencies, advocates, board members, persons from other government departments, and members of the general community. Responding to this diversity represents a sizable accomplishment when one considers that the subject matter of vulnerability and safeguards is not necessarily easy to communicate about nor is it necessarily of significant interest to all people equally. Hence the SI faced a challenge of having to appeal and communicate to a wide mix of people with quite different starting points in terms of their level of interest in the subject matter.

Not only was the reach of the project exceedingly impressive, its reception by almost everyone has been strikingly positive. Many have particularly commented on the amount of goodwill generated by the project manager and the benefit of creating yet more interest in the subject of vulnerability and safeguards even where it had not existed before.

Various factors contributed to these positive outcomes. One was the high relevance of the subject matter itself once it was clarified as to what was involved in addressing vulnerability well. Related to this was the ability of Jule, and others who assisted with various sub-initiatives of the SI, in clearly articulating how thoughtful safeguarding could be of significant benefit to people with disabilities and those who care about their lives. Another was the extent to which people were enabled to better imagine what a wide range of safeguards might look like in practice and how they could work in concert with each other. These educational efforts highlighted a great many interesting and relevant issues that those in attendance believed were worthwhile to discuss and explore. It also tapped into people's concerns about the vulnerabilities that people with disabilities have to manage on a daily basis and provided them with a sense that they could do something proactive in response. The Safeguards Initiative manager was suitably recognized for her great competence and credibility in being able to deal well with the substance of these issues, her ability to communicate complicated material, and her capacity to clearly perceive and respond to people's specific concerns and address them effectively.

While there was a distinctly positive impact for those persons who have had direct involvement with SI, there are also a good number of people, perhaps many thousands, who have some indirect contact with the SI through the mass media campaign as well as the opportunities to participate on Twitter and Facebook.

Additionally, many people have also been influenced by the SI via its prominently available publications which can be found in most community agencies supported by

CLBC as well as in the various offices of CLBC throughout the province. In fact, there over 10,000 copies of the safeguards and vulnerability publication printed and distributed. This highlights the effectiveness of the SI initiative at reaching out to people and the sophistication array of ways it has selected for doing so in a relatively brief period of time. The end result of this has been that the SI has become a key catalyst, and point of influence, in stimulating interest and action on a concern that is central to a wide variety of stakeholders in the province. It is also important to note that the timing of the initiative was potential a factor in its success; the message landed on fertile ground responding to what appears to be a cyclical aspect to conversations about personal supports, safeguards, and vulnerability that the community and families are ready for. As an example, the SI materials and presentations resonated very well with families involved with the Personal Support Initiative.

- **The Safeguards Initiative has been extremely competent in making the complex subject matter involved in matters of safeguarding and vulnerability very accessible to a diverse range of people including self advocates, families, community members, support staff, clinicians and professionals, administrators, and civil servants.**

The SI has quite usefully and creatively developed a wide range of targeted ways to communicate with people in regard to their actual or potential concerns about vulnerability in the lives of persons with disabilities. Many of those pathways were developed specifically with particular audiences in mind. For instance, the Rights publication was intentionally developed for self advocates, much as the Personal Support initiative was developed for people with an interest in people with disabilities having more friends and relationships. In a similar way, the “Start with Hi” initiative was tailored to reach a general community audience just as the family trainings on safeguards were principally intended to be for families and the planning and vulnerability publication was designed with service planners in mind. The evaluation confirmed that targeted approaches such as these were extremely useful.

Many people commented that they found that the SI had been notably attentive to making its publications for self advocates both accessible and user friendly. Though the SI was not always successful in doing so to the degree that may have been desired, it was clear that this intention was a prominent consideration in the process of reaching out to people. In particular, there was considerable praise for the abilities of the Safeguards Initiative manager for succeeding in making the thinking behind safeguards clear and accessible to the person by personalizing the content to address individual concerns. Part of this is due to Jule Hopkins’s many gifts as a communicator as well as the SI’s commitment to an ethic of trying to make the potential of thoughtful and

adaptive responses to vulnerability come alive for people. Further, this was accomplished without distorting or diluting the actual substance of the material being addressed.

- **The Safeguards Initiative was impressively proficient at partnering with a wide range of people operating at all levels within CLBC and throughout the community, thereby heightening the reach and impact of the initiative, gaining collaborators and supporters across the expanse of the sector, and doing so in such a way as to magnify the impact of the resources of the project.**

It has already been noted that the SI was quite effective at opening up specifically targeted pathways to better respond to the distinct needs and interests of various individuals and groups in relation to the broad topic of vulnerability and safeguards. The strategy for accomplishing this displayed an impressive commitment to promoting and establishing suitable partnerships to ensure a successful outreach with the particular group that was the focus in a given instance. For example, it made a great deal of sense for the SI to partner with the Family Support Institute in developing a safeguards related curriculum and trainers much as it was valuable to work with contractors who had personal experience and credibility with the subject matter being discussed. It also made good intrinsic sense to partner with self advocacy leaders and organizations in terms of proceeding with several SI initiatives such as the “Start with Hi” initiative and the Rights and Safeguards booklet, a plain language Guide for Self Advocates. It is notable that this booklet, from its inception, was developed with self advocates who identified the rights concerns that they and their fellow self advocates cared most about. In some instances, multiple partners were integrated for greater effect such as in the example of the Self Advocate and Friend Summit. This event turned out to be not only very “people” friendly, addressing very important content on developing personal support networks, with “friends” who had committed to support people after the summit was over.

The overriding practical strength of this “targeted partnering” strategy was that it made it both feasible and easier for the specific initiative to be completed successfully by joining forces with people interested and committed to the initiative. It also meant that the SI could tap into additional talents, resources, and networks supportive of its own while also locating like minded people who could serve as long term allies on important subjects of shared interest. This strategy also further expanded the numbers of people identified engaged with issues of vulnerability and safeguards and linked them into the other networks of the SI, doing so at minimal expense to the SI.

Partnership, as a key value and component for advancing social change and providing leadership, is also representative of members of the Safeguards Advisory Committee. The Committee was formed as an intentional partnership and enhanced its influence through the many partnerships that its members were involved in as did the manager of the Safeguards Initiative. It is fundamental to the success of the SI that these highly collaborative strategies were used so thoughtfully.

The formal partnering involved most of the Community Councils, multiple community agencies or organizations, family groups and networks, local, regional and head offices of CLBC, self advocacy organizations, advocacy organizations, and a variety of informal partnering. "Informal" partnering refers to collaborations that either was not formalized or was en route to manifesting eventually either as specific initiatives or some other form of cooperative effort based upon the relationships of those involved. Events associated with or involving the SI were held in almost all major communities within the province thereby making the SI a truly province wide, community based, grassroots effort even though its base was located in the head office of a crown agency of government. These partnerships remain ongoing and should provide a platform for future initiatives provided that the effort is sustained in coming years. Similarly, the networks shaped by the SI are provide an important and tested resource that can be drawn upon to support other concerns which will emerge in coming years relative to safeguards and vulnerabilities.

- **The Safeguards Initiative is a highly innovative and internationally significant demonstration of how a government agency can meaningfully engage and address a vital community concern**

The concerns regarding people with disabilities and the vulnerabilities they may have to contend with in terms of their lives are pervasive throughout many elements of the community in both BC and other jurisdictions worldwide. In most instances, these concerns do not get addressed directly and explicitly by agencies and governments, particularly on an organized and systemic level such as is the case currently in BC. It is also true that issues such as vulnerability may get some "one off" or relatively narrow incidental attention, however, it is quite rare to see these issues get taken up both in this breadth and as part of an ongoing effort. The CLBC initiative is province wide, involves multiple players at multiple levels, takes up many sides of the vulnerability question as opposed to a single aspect, builds on earlier work, and mobilizes both formal and informal resources in a wide variety of collaborative partnership initiatives. There does not seem to be another example of a government attempting anything as relevant on this scale and in such an open ended way in any other jurisdiction thus making CLBC and its Safeguards Initiative stand out as both a leader and innovator.

It is notable that the CLBC Safeguards Initiative is, by definition, a proactive rather than reactive catalyst in regard to matters of vulnerability. Thus it does not principally act in response to a failure to safeguard vulnerability after the fact. Rather, it attempts to generate interest and thoughtful safeguarding work *in advance of* situations being allowed to degrade to a point where worrisome consequences begin to show themselves. As a consequence, the SI may be thought of as encouraging a form of preventive and developmental safeguarding such that remedial safeguards might never be required. This is in contrast to the culture of many governments and agencies that lament that they are unduly crisis driven.

The Safeguards Initiative, given its outreach into an extensive number of communities within BC, as well as its credibility and capacity to exert influence on this issue, has enabled the themes of this initiative to be embraced as a shared priority of both community and government. This too represents an important distinction. The SI impact supported community to address its concerns about vulnerability and safeguards in ways that suited their needs, as well as highlighting the ways that governments interact with these questions, whilst allowing for these quite different players to be partnered in the same work in multiple but distinct ways. While productive partnerships between governments and communities are not unheard of, it is truly innovative for these to be linked at so many levels and involving so many parties simultaneously.

The “Start with Hi” initiative has broken new ground in public education in promoting the social inclusion of people with disabilities via an ongoing government sponsored multi level media program. Though governments have historically attempted to influence the public on a wide variety of issues through various public education campaigns, particularly as it relates to public attitudes towards people with disabilities, these have largely focused on a single campaign using largely singular methods. The “Start with Hi” initiative has extended these efforts and linked them in a multi-level approach of ensuring that a consistent message is conveyed in multiple media and through multiple points of influence. Additionally, it also expanded its efforts into the newly influential social networking media such as Facebook which had 2700 persons linked to “Start with Hi” as well as more prominent and traditional media such as the national newspaper, the Globe and Mail. “Start with Hi” was conceptualized, by its design team, as being deliberately about the long term building of constituencies between CLBC and the broader community sector. One such constituency would be around its central message.

As was the case with the Rights and Safeguards booklet, the “Start with Hi” initiative had its roots in lengthy discussions amongst self advocates about their lives and concerns. In fact the slogan and concept “Start with Hi” was created by a self advocate. The specific message conveyed by the initiative directly addressed the widely perceived loneliness and social isolation of people with disabilities, and the potential to reduce it were the public to get to know people with disabilities better. Hence, the “ice breaker” advice of “Start with Hi”. As a parent of a person with disabilities and a leader in CLBC shared, “Start with Hi” is good because being friendly is good for everyone. As such, the message resonated with many people as appropriate overall, and though some sub elements of it left at least a few people uneasy, the overwhelming majority found the message acceptable and helpful.

Nonetheless, the initiative was innovative and prepares the ground for future, follow up efforts. When one consider the multiple media used, such as the rather economical use of 30 local papers, it would then be reasonable to call this initiative multi-level. A recent Mustel Marketing Group study in April 2010, (based on a survey done in February of 2010 in BC and in contrast to two earlier surveys in 2009), noted a fourfold increase in support of the idea that people with disabilities should be made to feel more included in community amongst those who were exposed to the “Start with Hi” initiative. In absolute terms this meant that support for this idea went from 4% to 17% of those exposed. While this may not seem like a sizable increase, in comparative terms, the change represents a major shift in perspective.

- **The personal credibility, substance, respect and skillfulness of the Safeguards Initiative’s staff leader has made this initiative, in all likelihood, the most highly regarded, admired, and welcomed initiative originating from the CLBC head office, particularly in the broader community of BC.**

It is quite unusual to hear consistent praise for a government initiative, as there is always a tendency for government programs to be viewed critically. It is less uncommon for to hear praise for given government officials, but even this commendation is typically rather sparse. The SI has somehow managed to draw favorable attention in both respects, thereby placing it in a special category in terms of positive image and reputation. It was difficult to identify another CLBC provincial initiative that had comparable standing.

The principal reason for this positive reputation was the many perceived strengths of the current SI staff manager. These are many but particularly include her perceptiveness at seeing and noting people’s strengths. She is widely viewed as having extremely positive and progressive values and personal integrity. She is also respected

because of the extensiveness and quality of her past community work experience, and her ability to provide leadership and build collaborative working relationships by facilitating connections between people and groups. She is perceived as being both “in and of” the community, with a particular gift for being able to recognize and draw upon community leadership, much of which may otherwise go unrecognized. Further, the SI manager is seen as being very affirming and supportive as well as hugely responsive, at all hours! In a substantive sense she is seen as being very knowledgeable about both vulnerability and safeguards with specific strengths in mobilizing and seeing the value of informal safeguards. She is appreciated for being good at reading what people want and need, and developing it with their cooperation. She has strengths in outreach to potential partners, and has well developed historical and current connections & credibility with self advocates. She is hardworking, passionate, and responsible with follow through. She is seen as good to work with, good at sharing and not micro-managing, and astute at bringing the right people into particular projects. The manager has a great reputation due to her principled nature, her respectful, straightforward and direct manner, her ability to communicate, and her obvious prowess at taking on and leading a pioneering project of this scale and relevance.

The personal goodwill generated by the SI project’s manager is quite real and represents an asset that CLBC has initiated and sustained with the Safeguards Initiative having become an ongoing project with multiple community partners. Even so, it is also notable that the project itself is seen by virtually everyone interviewed as successfully addressing the issues of vulnerability and safeguards very well and that this will, in time, make people with disabilities less vulnerable as a consequence. Though many people only knew of some of the SI initiatives, usually the ones that they had contact with, there was a more generalized sense that the overall issue of vulnerability and safeguards was a very real issue that needed to be engaged and effectively addressed. This validates the project’s conceptual origins as being legitimate and important. It is also the case that the SI was not seen as being principally a government initiative, but rather a community project housed within government, but deeply connected to the community and its concerns nonetheless.

- **The Safeguards Initiative has demonstrated extensive competency in illustrating, through a wide variety of methods, how the thoughtful use of intentional safeguards can adaptively help to address vulnerability in a wide range of circumstances.**

The subject matter involved in vulnerability and safeguards is not trivial in any sense as it deals with human vulnerabilities of all kinds and the many interactive variables that contribute to its lessening or worsening. However, this subject can be abstract and obscure. The SI was able to avoid this through its deliberate attention to making the content as accessible as possible. The SI, and the people associated with it, was generally perceived to be knowledgeable, authoritative, and very dependably helpful at explaining and clarifying the many issues associated with this subject. Two groups in particular should be noted in this regard. These were persons with disabilities, particularly those with intellectual disabilities, and families.

Both groups noted the efforts of the SI to address the question of making the subject matter “people friendly” and accessible. Though not every effort of the SI was successful in this regard, what was noted was the capacity of the SI to recognize when it fell short and to seek improvements on the next occasion that would address these shortcomings. Similarly, it also recognized instances where sound strategies would be beneficial and intentionally used them. For instance, in the family trainings, it was noted that the SI deliberately tried to use families themselves as trainers. In the instance of the Rights and Safeguards booklet, it was rigorously field tested with self advocates as to whether it would be accessible for them. Continuation of the project’s work with families will, in part, be facilitated through family members, now internal trainers with the Family Support Institute.

The Personal Support initiative is also instructive in highlighting the many challenges and complexities involved in building and sustaining personal support networks. Those involved quickly discovered that network development required specific skills and also learned not to make assumptions about the breadth of individual’s networks. These lessons emerged in a “*post hoc*” process of sharing between the varied partners in the short demonstration projects supported by the SI.

The lessons which emerged from the demonstration projects were gleaned through a methodology that emphasized shared learning. Those involved reported on the strategies of personal network building that had been employed learning that simple measures were often very impactful and even short term efforts could be very worthwhile. Like many others they also concluded that friendships and relationships are a safeguard for people in terms of reducing social isolation. These are all important and substantive insights and they reveal the exploratory value of the SI in generating deeper understandings of how issues of vulnerability can be influenced.

Like in many locales, there is a growing interest in BC in establishing what might be called by many “person centered” options. This development emerged independently of the SI, however the project served to illuminate the link between person centered options, greater or lesser degrees of vulnerability, and what safeguards might be relevant to this new class of options. This type of realization is consistent with the SI track record of having been able to find a diversity of ways in which the subject matter of safeguards and vulnerability can be helped to “come alive” in ways that are meaningful for those involved. While not all of these insights can be directly attributed to the SI, the project clearly served as a catalyst to generate them.

For instance, one participant in several of the SI initiatives and a member of the Safeguards Advisory Committee, discovered the potential to affect the conditions of community life that might generate vulnerabilities through becoming a member of a public safety commission. This type of insight, namely that communities could be influenced with respect to lessening vulnerability, was shared and demonstrated widely by the SI. In another instance, a local CLBC manager noted that many families were better able to see how they could manage vulnerabilities through targeted safeguards, without relying on a 24/7 staffed option. This manager noted that though safeguards’ training was a relatively new priority until very recently within CLBC, and more broadly, it had already demonstrated an impact for families who had had exposure thus far. Many presumed a ripple effect from the SI’s efforts, though it was hard to know the precise extent of this.

The SI has also been praised for both responsiveness and the quality of its technical assistance support to a wide variety of people seeking guidance on matters related to safeguarding and vulnerability. This has not been inconsequential as many people have remarked on how helpful the manager of the initiative, and the various resource people it has used, have been when it comes to “hands on” insight and technical problem solving quite apart from the inspiration and moral support also provided.

- **The Safeguards Initiative was largely successful at meeting or exceeding its own ambitious internal annual work plan goals.**

The SI, with the active involvement of the Safeguards Advisory Committee, has established a challenging, annual work plan since the outset of the initiative. In almost all instances, the work that was chartered was completed and typically exceeded by additional work that was taken on in the interim. The reason for this appears to be that the manager of the SI would typically encounter many promising opportunities during the course of the year that, if acted upon promptly, would likely have considerable value. This meant that the agenda of activities for the project overall were updated quite

regularly during each year of operation to seize promising opportunities as they emerged. It should be emphasized that this additional activity added to the sheer volume of work and demands on the project. Nonetheless, it is very notable that the project consistently performed beyond expectations.

B. CHALLENGES AND RECOMMENDATIONS REGARDING THE SAFEGUARDS INITIATIVE

B1) The Continuation Of The Safeguards Initiative As An Ongoing Commitment Of CLBC

The SI has now been operating for several years and has established itself as a distinct, innovative, and broad based initiative with considerable influence and engagement given its size. CLBC now faces the question of whether the SI should continue, and if continued, what should be its key features. Up to this point the SI has not been seen as an ongoing project of the CLBC and its work on vulnerability and safeguards has been largely focused on informal safeguards. This raises the question of the precise status of the SI, and its incorporation into CLBC's ongoing operations, as well as whether it should play some kind of role relative to formal safeguards both internally and externally to CLBC.

It was noteworthy that the SI was seen by everyone interviewed as making a valuable contribution to the many other priorities and responsibilities of CLBC. The question was not framed in the Terms of Reference for this evaluation as to relative importance of the SI in comparison with other CLBC functions, as the primary focus has been on its impact. (See question #1, #5 and "e" in terms of reference). Nonetheless, most people praised the SI as being highly worthwhile. Further, not a single person interviewed recommended that the SI be discontinued. As such the consensus was that the SI continues as an ongoing element of CLBC's overall work.

The reasons for this near unanimous view appeared to rest on the premise that the SI was addressing a key and non trivial dimension of the well being of the lives of the people with disabilities and their families in an extremely effective way. Since the SI is so unique, it was difficult for people to contrast its performance with other like projects. It was also the case that the scope of the issues addressed by the SI was so broad that many only knew of the components that they had encountered and were thus reluctant to address the performance of the SI overall.

The second major reason was a complex one as it addressed the opinions of those interviewed on the role of community. Many recognized that the character of life in the community could create or fail to create the conditions of living that would reduce the vulnerability of persons with disabilities. Consequently, it was generally viewed as important that a concerted effort be made to address these conditions of living in community in ways that would benefit persons with disabilities. Though not spoken of in legalistic terms, it was seen that CLBC's mandate to pursue good quality community living options for the people it serves required that it embed people and their lives within community. Further, this meant that communities could also be a

potentially valuable source of safeguards in people's lives. As such, there was a role for many people and organizations in the community to support this mandate, and further that there was a distinct community development duty and responsibility for CLBC to contribute to strengthening communities in regard to matters associated with vulnerability and safeguards.

In seeing this potential to strengthen communities, it was recognized by many that informal safeguards (i.e. safeguards embedded in the everyday life of people and communities), constitute a key element in how communities can play a vital and irreplaceable role in helping people with disabilities not only be present, but also to thrive. It was seen as important that CLBC be a support and partner with community in order to reduce vulnerability and to better manage safeguards that could make a positive contribution.

It is notable as well that those interviewed, including those within CLBC itself, agreed that CLBC had a public duty to understand and mitigate the vulnerabilities of persons with disabilities. They also saw the value of supporting and partnering with other independent parties in the community, such that both governmental and non-governmental initiatives were linked and coordinated for better effect. The precise ways that this should be accomplished were not always clear to people either inside or outside CLBC, though the principle itself seemed to resonate with them.

It was striking that when there were complaints about CLBC it often stemmed from a sense that CLBC was too remote from community and not attuned well enough to the realities of life within communities. This, of course, would be a general and widely held criticism of many government agencies so in that regard CLBC was not being particularly singled out. Nonetheless, what such criticisms seem to imply is a desire on the part of those in communities for governments to better understand and work well with them. This perception, in turn, opens up the possibility for a wide variety of conceivable partnerships to be formed depending upon the priorities in a given community or component thereof. Hence, the assumption would be that multiple safeguarding and community development opportunities might exist and be usefully pursued involving various combinations of partners on a project by project basis.

It also was noted that CLBC itself organizes its own formal, "internal to the system" safeguards in relation to the lives of people with disabilities and that the effectiveness and impacts of these, both intended and unintended, is or should be a source of both community and governmental concern. This would apply in terms of their own intrinsic effectiveness, as well as how they act in conjunction with other formal and informal safeguarding initiatives of both government and community. Naturally, this raises several questions of how the SI, as a component of CLBC, could or should be integrated with CLBC's own overall safeguarding efforts in a systemic sense. These questions include: Are the safeguards that are directly operated by CLBC properly joined up such that they work optimally in terms of each other? Further, how do they work alongside the safeguards originating within the community? Does CLBC partner with the community in both developing and evolving its own safeguarding systems? Similarly, does CLBC partner with community in establishing safeguards that will operate at the community level?

There are essentially two dimensions of safeguards functioning that need attention from a developmental point of view. The first is who is or could be involved in creating safeguards. The second is how might this task be managed and coordinated through various kinds of partnerships within and outside of CLBC. The graphic below illustrates various ways and means by which safeguards have been and could be created, managed, and coordinated. Given this pattern, it is then useful to ask what the most constructive role of the SI might be given the nature of each option. (See diagram below).

Graphic One: Types of Safeguarding Initiatives and their Pattern of Establishment and Coordination

Independently Generated And Managed Community Safeguards
The Establishment Of Community Safeguards Jointly Generated And Coordinated By The Community And CLBC
Community Safeguards Coordinated On An Ongoing Basis By Both CLBC And Community
CLBC Internally Operated Safeguards Coordinated With Each Other
CLBC Internally Operated Safeguards Not Coordinated With Each Other
The Establishment And Evolution Of CLBC Safeguards In Conjunction With The Community

The SI has focused to-date principally on safeguards that are located within communities much more than it has addressed matters related to the quality of CLBC’s own internal safeguards, such as their relevance, effectiveness, and strategic evolution, with the possible exception of the internal evaluation policy that it spearheaded. Since the jurisdiction over the various internal, formal safeguarding systems of the CLBC are spread across all of its key divisions, and made operational in a number of diverse bureaucratic arrangements, it is not surprising that a systemic approach by the CLBC to its own safeguarding measures has not yet occurred given all of the other developmental challenges that CLBC has been required to address in its formation. The matters involved are necessarily complicated and would require considerable internal consensus to address meaningfully. Nonetheless, there appears to be a good deal of goodwill available to take these up and address them in the short and mid-term time period.

Recommendation One: It is recommended that CLBC authorize the continuation of the Safeguards Initiative for a minimum of a further five year period.

Discussion: The Safeguards Initiative has won a sizable constituency of support for its work and it would be damaging to that work to discontinue the project at this point. A great deal of

positive momentum has been built and the benefits of this would be dissipated if there is no continuity of the work that has been started. In particular,

- It has been able to demonstrate that it can successfully support the generation of new community safeguarding initiatives alongside many diverse community partners,
- It has effectively raised consciousness and educated thousands both within the broader community and CLBC on key matters related to vulnerability and safeguards,
- It has mobilized interest in further work on these subjects, developing an unusual level of credibility for a government initiative,
- It has benefited many people seeking “hands on” technical assistance demonstrating that it can create results throughout the province and the many communities this represents.
- It has produced promising numbers of resource people through various “train the trainer” and mentoring approaches and has provided leadership and initiative that has meant that it has repeatedly exceeded even its own rather ambitious annual work plan and goals.

The SI’s work is inherently long term in nature. Merely extending its mission for several more years would drive it to focus solely on short term matters rather than the more demanding long term capacity building that is required to really reduce vulnerabilities. Hence, a five year scope of work allows for *both* long term and short term efforts to carry on. Even so, that does not mean that the SI should not continue beyond a further five years. Rather, that decision should be made based upon whether the SI continues to be an effective investment in coming years.

Recommendation Two: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative be further externally and independently evaluated in five years time i.e. by early to mid 2016.

Discussion: The Safeguards Initiative is an unusual governmental initiative that has broken new ground in many ways. It can be presumed that its continuation will further deepen these effects. Consequently, it is useful to begin thinking now about how its work might be evaluated over a longer term period with a more extensive track record. Given the value of “before and after” viewpoints on complex initiatives such as this, there is great value in getting organized early to begin to capture the current period as being a baseline against which the next five years can be measured. Of particular importance would be to better appraise the extent of the impact of the project. This is very difficult to do when much of its work has different audiences, different agendas and partners, and quite different timelines. This timeline would also allow for a mix of evaluation methods to be deployed including surveys, participatory action research, focus groups, specific sub project reviews, accumulation of statistical data, and so on.

It is also the case that the Safeguards Initiative is by no means 'fast frozen' into a static initiative. It is still evolving and would benefit enormously from a continuation of many of the reflective and evaluative explorations that have already characterized its work and that of its Advisory Committee. Thus, there is value in building upon this strong foundation by using the next five years to continue to evolve the thinking in regard to how the SI might yet contribute in helpful ways.

Most social scientists, as well as pragmatic activists, would agree that social change requires steady investments over time in order to yield any meaningful results. Trying to become more effective collectively with a challenge like safeguards and vulnerability is not a goal that can easily be achieved in the short run. Consequently, the best option in terms of influencing beneficial outcomes would need to be a blend of both short and long term work.

Recommendation Three: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative be authorized to expand its focus and annual work priorities to be an internal CLBC resource in exploring with other sections of CLBC that operate these formal safeguards. The intention would be to explore the various ways that these safeguarding systems could be strengthened so that they could provide greater benefit for the people with disabilities and their families that CLBC supports.

3a) Further, that in this regard, that the Safeguards Initiative, be authorized to develop joint internal projects or initiatives with any division, regional or local office, Community Council, governing board or other element of CLBC that is involved with the execution of any formal safeguarding system of CLBC that would potentially strengthen any of these internally operated safeguards.

3b) Though there may often be merit in the executive leadership requesting that each such administrative entity of the CLBC undertake a joint safeguards strengthening project in conjunction with the Safeguards Initiative, it is not necessarily the case that these would or should be a priority in a given year. Consequently, this determination can be determined annually as to its possible merits by the Safeguards Initiative, and the specific administrative section, and subsequently included into their mutual annual work plans as appropriate.

Discussion: CLBC has demonstrated considerable leadership in creating and supporting this initiative. Much has been accomplished as a result, including a heightened awareness of the potential value of thoughtful safeguards to address the various vulnerabilities that people with disabilities will encounter. The Safeguards Initiative work would have considerable merit even if it continued with annual work priorities and a focus much as it has now, given that the community safeguards challenge, on its own, is a massive, multi-year task.

Nonetheless, there is at least some obvious interest in and considerable scope for further work on safeguards within CLBC in its role as a provider of formal safeguards, though this interest

and priority necessarily competes with other pressing workload demands upon the system. It is also true that these safeguarding systems have quite different administrative locations and oversight, histories, priorities, development and operational strategies, and theories. Thus, it would be unwarranted to think of them as operating systemically with respect to service user vulnerability.

More specifically, CLBC faces several interrelated challenges to its own efforts at safeguarding.

- a) It does not, at present, have an obvious way to ensure that its various safeguarding mechanisms and systems are as intrinsically effective as they might be. As such, their quality, impact, and strategic worth are relatively unknown at this point as is their potential to improve.
- b) It does not have an overt means by which these safeguards are presently coordinated with each other, and with community based safeguards, and no means has as yet been put in place to plan how this might be accomplished.
- c) It has not, as yet, incorporated appropriate involvement from the community to help it analyze the character of its current formal safeguards with respect to their effectiveness in managing the vulnerability of the people its supports.

These preceding tasks are challenging and may not necessarily be a priority on a simultaneous basis for each of the safeguarding systems currently in place. Further, CLBC has not, as yet, taken up the challenge of harmonizing and coordinating its internal safeguards in a planned way. In all likelihood, an overall coordination plan would need to extend 5-10 years into the future as it is difficult to make these kinds of systems changes quickly. This is why it is important to recognize that what is being proposed for safeguards enhancement and strengthening is, in reality, a mix of measures to be applied to quite different historical attempts at safeguards development. In essence, this would be a nuanced and targeted multi-year effort that will likely require the creation of an ongoing, internal task group to shape and coordinate the work, in order to build the kind of consensus that is usually required to bring disparate actors into a shared approach.

This kind of organized reshaping and rethinking work would not stand alone as it would have to accommodate all of the varying pressures and priorities that are typically part of government based problem solving. This is why it is unlikely that effective solutions work can solely be imposed from above, as there is value in building common agreement first as to what the nature of the problems are and what strategies have the greatest promise in terms making headway. This lends itself to a variety of linked initiatives being undertaken each year, with each potentially having a quite different focus, much as the work on community safeguarding has had different aims, audiences and partners.

The role of the current SI would not change very much relative to its internal partners within CLBC, but the scope of its work would expand to include assisting the other relevant parts of CLBC with whatever safeguards enhancement work is targeted both annually and over longer

periods of time. This would have resource implications for the SI as it is already over taxed. A change would be that the SI would have an opportunity each year to partner internally with other interested sections of CLBC to generate and proceed with projects of safeguards enhancement that are feasible at that point. The results of these internal agreements would be work plans in which other players within CLBC could join with the SI in making progress on matters that are important and shared between the parties. In some instances, these partnerships could also include people from the community should the specific safeguarding initiative under consideration have a community component. It is unlikely that the timing of efforts within CLBC, and between CLBC and the community on a given project, can be expected to always easily converge. Thus, it is important to have these located in some sort of overall multi-year effort.

CLBC has only been in existence a relatively short period of time and is still working its way through many, long standing safeguarding and vulnerability issues. Not surprisingly, it has yet to develop its own overall coherent vision for what it might yet do concerning the provision of leadership on a whole range of matters that have substantive safeguarding dimensions. So, it can be easily anticipated that this concern of attempting to develop and strengthen increasingly more coherent strategies and vision concerning safeguarding vulnerability, will continue for many decades to come whether CLBC acts or not on these issues solely in the near term. However, if it does foresee its work on such matters extending well into the future, it will be much more likely to develop an approach that is proportional to the challenge.

B2) The Educational Role of the Safeguards Initiatives

A key and very crucial role of the SI has been its educational, training, and overall leadership role. There are essentially three dimensions of this role: educational or training events, publications, and the “Start with Hi” initiative. It has managed its educational events both through the direct involvement of SI staff in a variety of educational events and through the use of other parties to conduct educational events on its behalf. As has been stated earlier, it has managed many of these events in cooperation with partners both within and outside of CLBC depending upon the specific aims of the training itself. Its publications have principally been “in house”, self-publication efforts, though it has indirectly supported the emergence of other related publications such as the www.101ways.ca web-based newsletter on personal support networks published by the Spectrum Society for Community Living. The “Start with Hi” initiative is essentially an initiative directly managed by CLBC itself.

Short educational and training events have been the SI’s most significant form of influence and impact and the means by which the majority of people will have had some engagement with the themes of vulnerability and safeguards. The activities themselves have been a combination of events that the SI has sponsored either directly or in concert with other partners, organized events, but in which SI staff or others acting on their behalf have played a role. This balance has meant that the SI has been able to create a presence for its concerns in many localities in the

province reaching quite differing target audiences. This has been helpful, both for reaching new groups of people and for addressing specific group needs, and should be continued.

Recommendation Four: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative continue its ongoing program of short outreach oriented trainings and educational events involving various partnering groups throughout the province on themes related to safeguarding and vulnerability.

The SI has been very proactive in reaching out to many groups in the province and has subsequently developed significant interest in the themes of safeguards and vulnerability as can be seen by the large numbers of persons attending events. In some instances, SI's involvement has had to be somewhat spontaneous and opportunistic as many events arise on relatively short notice and cannot always be incorporated into an annual work plan many months ahead of the event. Advance planning and scheduling is much more manageable if the events are foreseen. Nonetheless, there will always be a need for flexibility in taking advantage of useful opportunities that arise unexpectedly, but offer strong, initial indications of being worthwhile.

There are several limitations of short trainings of this kind. The first is that they are usually quite brief and this creates inevitable constraints on the depth and content of what can be covered. This is not meant to suggest that they are superficial, but rather that a half-day or one-day time frame will limit content delivery to what might be thought of as comparatively introductory level examinations of specific subjects. This limitation will also mean that only some aspects of a subject can be covered. Thus, the exploration and discussion of aspects that may not be of general interest to a large number of people is limited even though they might be important in and of themselves as well as a of greater significance to people with quite specialized interests. For instance, not everyone is interested in the effect of brain injury on vulnerability, however this topic can be extremely important in the instance of a small number of individuals affected by such injuries and the people that support and care for them.

A second limitation on short trainings is that their impact will be more diluted than training or educational experiences that have more time to penetrate people's consciousness, attitudes, and conduct. This factor is important if what is intended is that those in attendance will be engaged and challenged by the messages such that they subsequently alter their outlook or conduct. The quality of the educational experience is dependent on more factors than just the length of it, but length does serve as a proxy for these other qualitative factors. By deepening and broadening the variety of educational experiences, it also allows for greater differentiation of content such that there is ample time to examine matters that are challenging, sophisticated, and complex.

A third limitation is that an exclusive reliance on short training experiences may not be as strategic in reaching targeted audiences as would having available a mix of events that allows a better match between what is needed by people and what is both available and effective relative to what is needed. This point can be seen more clearly if one thinks about what people may *then* need after they have had a brief introductory exposure to a subject. Obviously, it would be

subject matter that builds upon the original introduction but that goes further and extends the participant's capacities. This allows for a variety of sequential trainings that give the participant further advantages at each stage of the training, similar to the structure of most advanced education methods in both academic and operational contexts.

There are many ways that depth, sophistication and challenge can be built into learning experiences. For instance, the use of source reading materials, think tanks, special study sessions and mini conferences, practicum experiences, analytic and evaluative experiences, and so on are widely used in human services today, though not typically used for general, short, introductory experiences. It is also possible to plan for more in depth events well ahead of time thereby allowing for strategic targeting of content, audiences, learning sequences, scheduling, and so on. In the instance of the SI, it is unlikely that it will be able to hold many audience's attention if subsequent events offer only a repetition of what they learned in their first exposure. However, if new messages and learning are nuanced to take this into account, the SI could build upon its previous work and help support a growing depth of understanding and commitment on a quite wide range of specialized interests related to vulnerability and safeguards. It is also true that this could be accomplished in a more planned and strategic sense, thereby making a better use of scarce resources.

Recommendation Five: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative expand its own educational offerings and those it supports, to include a variety of more "in depth" treatments of safeguards and vulnerability subjects that would also allow for better targeting of subject matter to the needs of interested groups in the province that have highly specific interests.

Obviously, not all people in the province of British Columbia are as equally interested in specific questions of vulnerability or safeguarding. For instance, while there are a small number of people extremely concerned with health safeguards, these same people may be less interested in safeguards for non-verbal persons or persons with challenging behavior or the worries that confront people from a minority culture or language. Consequently, it is important to recognize that safeguarding concerns will vary as should the response to them to address the basis of this variation in interest. This will require understanding of the specialized concerns of people and the value of addressing this specificity as directly as possible.

The SI has quite successfully reached out to people who were interested in vulnerability and safeguards both within the community and within CLBC. Nonetheless, many of those interviewed indicated that a good number of staff people both within CLBC and in community organizations, seemed to remain quite unaware of some of the key messages being conveyed by the SI despite the availability of the publications and many training opportunities. Further, many specifically commented on the apparently patchy support and understanding of these issues in various CLBC local offices. In some instances, they expressed a sense of confusion as to how some elements of CLBC could be so divergent from others in their interest and commitment to addressing vulnerability related issues.

These sorts of observations seem to be premised on the assumption that CLBC should simply mandate or require some kind of compulsory adoption of sound safeguarding practice. This conclusion may be both premature and inconsistent with normal patterns of capacity building because it would presume that there is agreement on what the underlying challenge is and what would best address it. This kind of well developed consensus simply does not exist as yet in British Columbia, like many other jurisdictions, so requiring of people that they perform on an issue that is still relatively new to them would be unreasonable. It would also be premature in the sense that it presumes that the issues involved are well understood and accepted to such a degree, by a significant majority of employees, that CLBC could realistically require people to do in their work roles what they already have mastered at a prior point. This is obviously not the case, as there are no such specific trainings available in the field that is regularly available to large numbers of people. In fact, the SI effort is groundbreaking in its impressive attempt to both alert people to these issues and to provide guidance on managing vulnerability in constructive ways. It has done this using an approach based on voluntary interest in the subject matter, so people attended have trainings or read the publications principally as the opportunities arose and their level of interest dictated. This approach avoids compulsion and is thus much less likely to make people feel forced into something.

A different question is whether enough has been done to reach out to people working within both CLBC and the community part of the system. The answer to that question would be “not yet”, as there is still plenty of scope and likely interest in some sort of ongoing introductions to safeguarding and vulnerability for staff, families, and self advocates. Even within these sub-groups there is scope for further targeting of material at an introductory level. Further, while there seems to be an ample supply of copies of the SI publications distributed throughout the province, there is probably further scope for a series of events that would require participants to specifically engage the material contained in them. The key would be the targeting and packaging of new learning experiences and materials such that it was well suited to the role and interests of given segments of this population. That has been the strategy to-date and a further evolving and refining of even more choices by way of exposure and learning will help reach greater numbers of people, with potentially even more effectiveness than that achieved thus far.

Most governments and community agencies are criticized on occasion for their weak performances with questions of vulnerability and safeguarding. Much of this critique presumes a much too unrealistic level of expectation of what such organizations can reliably promise and deliver. Nonetheless, what is true is that most organizations can typically do much better with even a small amount of encouragement and support. Meeting the criticism that CLBC is not doing enough to ensure that its staff are properly responsive to matters of vulnerability and safeguards might be to build these topics into a “core” orientation training for all CLBC staff. No such training exists at the moment however “core” orientation trainings are widespread in the human service field, so it would not be all that difficult for CLBC to begin now to create such a resource at a modest initial level.

An area where there has already been some promising beginnings by way of training opportunities has been the crucial area of assisting people with devising personalized safeguards for given individuals. This involves identifying the person's specific vulnerabilities they encounter and constructing or strengthening precisely devised safeguards that would offset these. This is, of course, a person by person matter and in many cases may involve deeply personal or private subjects. As such, considerable sensitivity and discretion is involved in order for the process to be handled appropriately. Nonetheless, there are a variety of ways that the inherent issues and subject matter could be managed within some training events as well as by using common technical assistance strategies such as mentoring, consultation, peer advice, sharing of resource materials, and some demonstrations and trial exercises. It is possible to make this kind of assistance more readily available through various "train the trainer" efforts such as have been already used with resource parents in the context of the Family Support Institute's work in regards to safeguards and vulnerability. It is also the case that the SI has experimented with helping people find ways to devise personally targeted safeguards with good effect.

Recommendation Six: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative expand the variety and extent of targeted introductory trainings on safeguards and vulnerability issues to self advocates, families, and CLBC and community service organization staff such that more choices are available that might better suit the specific needs of sub groups of these larger constituencies.

Recommendation Seven: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative expand the use of training and technical assistance options in order to of assist self advocates, families, and CLBC and community service organization staff learn how they can personally become more proficient at designing and managing safeguards that are well targeted and effective in terms of managing the vulnerabilities they encounter.

Recommendation Eight: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative contribute to the content regarding the adaptive management of vulnerability and personal safeguards in any proposed or eventual "core" training program that the CLBC may develop in coming years for its staff, as well as support community agencies with this subject matter in any of their own "core" trainings for staff and possibly others.

The SI has generated very positive attention for its ground breaking efforts to popularize understanding of the issues involved in managing vulnerability and safeguards adaptively through the use of innovative publications that tackle various themes and in varied ways. This strategy has proven to be a good supplement to its educational efforts and can be pursued further with good results. The array of possible publications are conceivably many, so it is important that the SI target and prioritize publications that build upon the work already done,

address highly relevant subject matter for large numbers of people, and that can be targeted for specific uses deemed important. This could take many forms including a compendium of material.

For instance, as has already been mentioned, many families and front line workers are interested in becoming better able to design and put into place personalized safeguards. The SI has already published a small text on planning and safeguards targeted to facilitators within CLBC. That specific publication may not be optimal for all groups interested in this question, so there may be scope for several more publications that are helpful and supportive on this subject. As an example, families have apparently devised many quite interesting and effective safeguards that inspired and instructed others when shared. It might be useful for these to be captured and shared in some form that families and others would find useful.

Similarly, considerable interest exists in the province regarding devising personal lifestyles that are socially inclusive. The SI has addressed this, in a global sense, already with a publication on community and belonging. Obviously, if socially inclusive lifestyles are to emerge and thrive, it will be necessary to find ways to manage vulnerability that strengthen rather than weaken the likelihood of this occurring. At the root of at least some segregated lifestyles for people with disabilities may be fears associated with vulnerability. These stem from an inability to imagine ways that individuals, thought to be highly vulnerable, could be well supported in a responsible manner but within a socially inclusive rather than restrictive and segregated lifestyle. It is not hard to see that many staff and families may benefit substantially by having their awareness raised as to other options for safeguarding that are socially inclusive.

Another area for attention concerns not only supporting families, staff, and service users to become more aware of and proficient at understanding vulnerability and safeguards, but enabling them to act on safeguarding matters jointly in a constructive way. This is a deeply challenging goal as the ideological, practical, ethical, and emotional issues involved in coming up with good solutions in a collaborative way should not be underestimated. For instance, people's fears and lack of understanding of options may have more to do with their selection of safeguards than the effectiveness of the safeguards in any objective sense. Similarly, people need to trust each other in order to collaborate well together and establishing such a "right relationship" involves many challenges.

Another example where both new publications, and trainings based upon them may prove helpful, would be in regard to the developmental rather than preventive or ameliorative role of safeguards. Many people do not have difficulty understanding the proposition that one can use safeguards quite successfully to prevent bad things from happening. Less obvious is that intentional safeguards can and have been developed with the specific intent that the probability of good things happening is increased. A good example of this would be where a support circle sets out to find ways that the focus individual is enabled to have more new experiences in their life with the hope that such "horizon broadening" will unearth new and interesting interests that might genuinely appeal to the individual. Such pro active safeguards would be

developmental in the sense that they can potentially bring about growth and development in a given person's life. Even so, it is often the case that the concern with preventing bad things usurps the available energy that might be more optimally used to ensure that good things happen.

The SI and CLBC need not always be the self publisher of such proposed publications. There is scope for others to publish on this subject matter as has occurred with the book (published by Spectrum Society) called 101 Ways To Make Friends. This is an instructive example of how the SI has acted as a catalyst to inspire new options and resources.

Recommendation Nine: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative continue to expand its publication efforts, and those of others, with respect to subject matter related to safeguards and vulnerability that emerge as important priorities in terms of resource development.

The current demographic composition of the population of British Columbia is strikingly more multicultural and multilingual that it was even a generation ago. This is most pronounced in the lower mainland area in terms of the composition of the population though it is by no means restricted to only this part of the province. Thus it can be seen that the overall numbers of people with disabilities and their families will reflect this cultural and linguistic diversity. Consequently, an English only or single or dominant culture approach to supporting the lives of people with disabilities may prove to be quite shortsighted if it does not respond with some relevance to what might be needed by families and individuals whose language and heritage may differ from many in the majority culture of the province. The SI's publications are solely in English at the moment as are the majority of its educational efforts. This limitation will inhibit its ability to play as useful a role in relation to these other cultural groups of people as it might otherwise have been able to do.

Recommendation Ten: It is recommended that the SI establish a five year work plan to gradually strengthen its capacities to engage and address matters of vulnerability and safeguards in the context of the many minority languages and cultures that are now established as part of the communities of British Columbia and this be done in cooperation with interested leaders from these minority communities.

Fortunately, there is a great deal of experience in both BC and Canada regarding how to work effectively in a multicultural and multilingual context. It is also realistic to assume that the SI could strengthen its capacities with respect to cultural responsiveness overall as well as in relation to specific minorities. This capacity building will inevitably take some time to begin to bear fruit, but it can progress incrementally once a commitment is made to invest in doing so.

The emergence of better practices and attitudes in the disability field owes a great deal to the role of positive values and their application to the lives of persons with disabilities. As people

and their values have been challenged regarding beliefs, conduct, and systems related to how people with disabilities are supported to live, significant social changes have occurred and spread. These include deinstitutionalization, social inclusion in schools and elsewhere, the rise of advocacy and other key protections, valued social roles within community life, person centered support and lifestyle options, supported employment, empowerment, and so on. These are often brought about by what are called social movements; they have at their core strong value preferences as to how people with disabilities should be treated.

These key transforming values are not always as clear at the outset as they become in retrospect. It is also usually the case that a good deal of discussion, persuasion and dissent will precede any eventual adoption of such values by large numbers of people. Nonetheless, such values have historically proven to be a catalyst for positive change. It would be unwise to overlook them as a source of safeguards for people and their vulnerability, as values are typically quite operative in both contributing to vulnerability and alleviating it. The way that these values get examined and eventually resolved could have considerable impact on what lives people with disabilities get to live, thus it is important that there be increased awareness of these links and a sense of options if people with disabilities are to maximize their potential and avoid damaging effects of poor values in their lives.

In many localities, this question of awareness building and analysis of values and the ideologies and theories that influence them, has quite deliberately not been left to chance. Instead many people, agencies, and systems have attempted to provide proactive leadership on values engagement by involving large number of people in discussions, trainings, readings, conferences, and other events that intentionally bring a focus on the role of values and their impact on people's lives. Not uncommonly the means to accomplish this involve the creation of mechanisms designed to deliberately support such work. And, not uncommonly, government based projects and resources make a contribution to such work. In many ways, the SI fits into this pattern in the intentionality of its role as a catalyst to help ensure that people are mindful of the vulnerabilities that they encounter and some positive ways impact these vulnerabilities. It is also clear that the methods used by the SI are congruent with other efforts at values based training, engagement, and awareness.

Even so, the SI cannot be expected to, nor does it have the resources to take up all of the many values questions that impact on people's lives. However, by its extensive success at partnering with like minded and similarly interested people in the province it already has, in a "*de facto*" sense, joined an informal network of people and organizations that share a common interest in values based leadership. At present, that has not as yet materialized into a self conscious network of interested individuals and organizations that are willing to mount some sort of ongoing and systematic values based awareness, training, and engagement effort within BC.

Nonetheless, many elements of it are apparent both within CLBC and the broader community. Thus, there is some scope for it to emerge and it is conceivable that the SI could not only be an element of such a broader program and effort at thoughtful change, but actively support

bringing this about. In its educational, consciousness raising, networking, and other work the SI is already doing a great deal. The essential question would be whether this might be taken to yet another level in conjunction with other initiatives within and outside government such as the CLBC's now extensive efforts at supporting innovation, the Family Support Institute's work on family leadership, and the work of individuals and organization with respect to personal support networks.

Such independent efforts may be more productive when they can fashion overarching agreements to work together to develop capacity building measures that will eventually result in leadership development and sustenance on important quality of life issues for people with disabilities. Such joint efforts to develop further capacity may well result in new, values based, leadership development entities emerging to address overall or specific gaps providing enough investment is made in order to develop the necessary consensus as to what might be needed and to then create it.

Recommendation Eleven: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative continue to address the many values issues that may underlie the diminishment or accentuation of vulnerability in the lives of people with disabilities. In doing this, it should seek the cooperation of others interested in values based leadership, to further strengthen a coordinated and proactive program and vehicle to intentionally encourage positive values based leadership and subsequent approaches that can beneficially affect the lives of people with disabilities.

There are aspects of the question of vulnerability and safeguards that overlap extensively with research, writing, and teaching within academic settings in both British Columbia and elsewhere. Much of this work is not necessarily known to a non academic audience, nor is it currently available in a fashion that would be easily accessed and absorbed by non academics. Similarly, there are many academics and students that would benefit from practical engagements in the examination of ways in which vulnerabilities could be better managed, offset, and understood. The SI has not yet explored its potential to positively contribute to both drawing upon and making available the resources of the academy to non academic group nor how it might influence academic teaching, writing, research, and academic partnering with communities in regards to seeing improved responses to vulnerability. This is an area that the SI could impact upon as it has many of the attributes needed for such partnering.

The CLBC has already shown leadership with this kind of partnering, so the emphasis would be *on* further development appropriate to a safeguards and vulnerability focus. The kinds of partnering options available to the SI are many and would include: practicum experiences; literature searches; arranging for various kinds of research and studies; influencing university and community college curricula; the creation of special conferences, articles, papers, monographs and books, lecture and seminar series; debates; dissemination of academic publications; preparation of summaries and synopses on specific subjects; advertising of academic conferences and request for papers; specific consultations; the conduct of evaluations;

special affiliation agreements with interested BC university programs; and so on. These are, of course, simply varied means to an end and these ends could be defined annually by the SI based on its programmatic and strategic priorities. Clearly, this kind of partnering will give greater credibility and standing to the many issues involved in the focus on vulnerability.

Recommendation Twelve: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative explore and initiate on a periodic basis, and based upon its ongoing priorities, the establishment of various formal and informal ties between itself and the academic community and organizations in BC and elsewhere. These affiliations will have some specific advantage in strengthening the capacity of people within the province to better address questions of vulnerability and safeguards and to take appropriate advantage of any such ties that already exist between CLBC and academic centers.

The framing of the question of vulnerability is often made in a fashion where the impression is given that either it is only people with disabilities who experience and encounter vulnerabilities or that people with disabilities are, in an overall sense, entirely vulnerable people. Both these formulations have partial merit but they are nonetheless quite misleading. In reality, vulnerability is a universal human experience and people with disabilities may, at any point, find themselves to be either less vulnerable than their fellow citizens or living lives of enhanced or heightened vulnerability. In essence, the degree of vulnerability is quite dependent upon circumstance and culture and both of these can change, sometimes quite quickly.

The targeting of a given individual's vulnerabilities with the intent to lessen or offset them is a quite valid strategy and one that is used widely by all human beings at one time or another. However, this is not the only way that vulnerabilities might be lessened or offset both for individuals and groups of individuals. It is often the case that vulnerability will arise from the contexts and conditions of living, and when these are changed, the nature of the vulnerabilities of people will change as well. Thus there are many safeguarding strategies that could be thought of as either situational change or even community change strategies aimed at influencing the conditions of life of a given person with disabilities. For instance, it is generally accepted that the less socially isolated a person is the less intense will be their vulnerabilities. Hence, the value of relationships, belonging, and supportive networks. Similarly, individuals with disabilities who are largely embedded or entrenched in segregated settings are more likely to be vulnerable to the shortcomings of services and professionals given that so much of their lives are shaped by such persons.

Consequently, in both of these examples, it is apparent that strategies that reduce social isolation, and changes to services that will make the person less dependent upon staff and professionals, will offset the vulnerabilities associated with these lifestyle circumstances in both micro and macro senses potentially. The SI has demonstrated how community development approaches can be harnessed to benefit specific individuals. Less work has been done in formulating how the SI might be able to explain and nurture strategies from the vantage point of changing contexts and conditions in community that entrench vulnerabilities, if left

unchanged, but could effectively reduce or eliminate some vulnerabilities, if they are carefully changed. This is essentially the thinking behind some of the work the SI has already done with groups such as the Langley Society for Community Living and their “People Gotta Have Friends” Conference or the Personal Support pilot projects and subsequent follow up.

This initial work has been useful at trying to identify how communities can change. Thus, it points to the value of the SI pursuing further work where the focus is on the environmental conditions that are generating vulnerability within both services and communities and the way that these could be changed for the better. The link between agency capacity, support provided, and degree of vulnerability is a potential area for attention. Focusing on various strategies to support agency change would be valuable in altering the pattern of vulnerability for those individual’s served.

At present, the SI has quite instructively explored a small number of initiatives in which community change was sought for intentionally reducing or altering vulnerability. Though it is implied in much of the educational work of the SI, often quite directly, the SI has not yet tried to formulate specific change initiatives that focus upon agencies and their conduct, including CLBC itself. There are ample leadership opportunities that could be explored. Part of this challenge was addressed with respect to strengthening formal safeguards; however, there still remains a vacuum regarding initiatives that would involve agencies and the SI, and possibly others, in addressing how environmental patterns and conditions in services could be adaptively altered to the advantage of people with disabilities.

These sorts of safeguarding initiatives are complicated, but they do offer the advantage of being able to work on vulnerability at another level but without having to take on systems change at a grand scale. Obviously, there are agencies in British Columbia that share the vision and hope of the SI that people’s lives in the community and in services can be enriched, and that harmful approaches to vulnerability can be better managed. Thus, it is conceivable that a few select partnerships oriented to this kind of community or service change can be established for the purpose of learning how to better address vulnerability as a function of pervasive environmental factors that may be able to be constructively changed. It may also be the case that initiatives such as these involve a variety of the SI’s strategies including education, technical assistance, community development and so on.

Recommendation Thirteen: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative explore and initiate, with varying agency and other parties, intentional initiatives aimed at identifying and positively altering environmental conditions within services that contribute to the vulnerability of persons receiving services and that it continue to expand its similar work involving adaptively reshaping conditions of life in communities that add to the vulnerability of people with disabilities.

The “Start with Hi” (SWH) initiative began as an experimental initiative in public education, mounted by a provincial government agency, that has accomplished much more than could have been foreseen. It has created curiosity and good will within many elements of the community and gained distinction as an innovative effort at delivering a message on community engagement that is consistent with CLBC’s long term mandate and interest in community living and its quality for people with disabilities. Obviously, if one looks at the messaging, the public is being encouraged to start a relationship with people with disabilities and do so in a friendly and welcoming way. It is equally obvious that relationships can move on from just saying “hi” thus creating a logical uncertainty as to what is or should be encouraged by way of the next phases of both personal relationship and possibly valued social roles within community life being attained by people with disabilities. If the initiative is not to end with such questions going unanswered, a decision will need to be taken as to whether it will continue and what will be the new core messages.

Thus far, the rationale for the initiative has revolved around the theme that people with disabilities would be largely better off, and much less vulnerable, if they had friends, committed relationships, and by implication a greater presence within community life. In the first instance, there is not likely to be very much dispute with the intent to educate the public as to their capacity to appropriately and normatively befriend people with disabilities. It is also true that the intent that people belong to and with their communities is not likely to meet with a great deal of opposition either from within the field or by the general public.

Nonetheless, it is not very clear yet precisely what these messages need to be and how they should be conveyed, as there are often unintended results from even well aimed messages. As an example, the SWH message has aroused, in at least some people with disabilities, a fear or at least anxiety that “Just say Hi” might be mistaken by some people as giving permission to strangers to be intrusive in their lives in unwanted ways. Obviously, this was not an intended part of the messaging, but one can understand that the assumption that this message could be taken wrongly is not without merit.

The acquisition of valued social roles is important in the eventual thinking about the messaging challenge, as it is quite possible for people to begin relationships with people with disabilities that are friendly, genuine and warm, but which place people with disabilities into roles that are devaluing rather than respectful simply due to unchallenged and unhelpful stereotypes they may unconsciously hold about them. As a result, considerable thought needs to be given to what the roles are that are either explicitly being conveyed by the messaging as being desired and helpful in the lives of people with disabilities. It is very important that this facet of the messaging be carefully appraised alongside the “after saying Hi” advice to the public as the two issues are interwoven.

There is a great danger in public campaigns of this magnitude, and potential for influence, that they may err in containing messages that are detrimental or that may make at least some people uneasy because of the possible implications these messages may have. Even the SWH campaign

has had a few of these. One which left a variety of people uneasy was the “someone like” phrasing that seemed to denote the persons portrayed as being “other than ourselves”. Though there was no intention of doing so, best intentions do not predict the reception and interpretation of messages. This then underlines why CLBC should bend over backward to tease these difficulties out well in advance of committing to future messages.

Recommendation Fourteen: It is recommended that CLBC and the Safeguards Initiative continue with the “Start with Hi” initiative and take it into its next phase and that this next phase of the campaign address both the question of what should happen after “Hi” has started things going at the level of personal relationships, as well as how people with disabilities might begin to occupy valued social roles within relationships and in community life more broadly.

The “Start with Hi” initiative has been highlighted for its innovation and multi level nature. It is, simultaneously many things including: a “branding” and public relations vehicle for CLBC, a public attitude education campaign, and a means by which CLBC communicates its mission and vision to a broader community. These purposes can complement each other, however it must be noted that each of these would have distinct end points at a given moment in time that might lead to quite different points of focus and priority. The SI essentially has, as its core priority, an interest in the public attitude change dimension of SWH. The other uses and purposes shaping the SWH campaign should normally reflect overall CLBC priorities at a given moment.

The SWH campaign is a jointly managed internal initiative involving various divisions of CLBC; the two, day-to-day major players being Communications and the Policy and Program Development divisions of CLBC. As with all initiatives that involve joint governance, it is not always easy to get consensus on all points, as the mission of the participating divisions are distinct and bring with them differing responsibilities, priorities, experience, and identities. In the instance of the SWH initiative, the clarity of roles, how decisions should get made, and how disputes that may arise should be treated and resolved are inevitably potential points of friction. In the instance of SWH, an untested, new initiative with a lot of unknowns involved, the progress of the SWH campaign has been quite remarkable. This attests to the collaboration skills of those principals involved, but also the many others who played briefer roles.

If the initiative were simply a “one time” effort, then it might not matter quite as much as to whether there is sufficient clarity on important aspects of how the initiative is designed, governed, and evaluated. However, should SWH continue as a multi-phase, public attitude and education campaign, then it is worth the investment to establish some ongoing working arrangements between the two principal divisions governing the initiative as well as between them and others who may get involved from both within CLBC and the community. The main items for which clarity would be important to achieve are: expectations; aims; roles; decision-making; internal and external communications; and the process for the resolution of disputes.

The complexity of issues that the principals face in balancing multiple factors is sizable and these are better addressed when the context for doing so is clear to those involved.

Recommendation Fifteen: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative, as a component of the Policy and Program Development division, and the Communications division negotiate and finalize an ongoing working agreement as to how the SWH campaign should be managed as an ongoing initiative of CLBC. This working agreement should cover expectations, aims, roles, decision-making, internal and external communications, the process for the resolution of disputes, and the ways that coordination is to be pursued.

The recommendations offered here will undoubtedly add to the scope of the work of the SI and this will mean that an already overtaxed effort would then have even more work to get completed. Some of that additional work could be managed through strenuous limiting of overall work through rigorous priority setting, but this strategy may simply mask that there is more work to be done than there are people to do it. It is certainly the case that the SI has magnified and leveraged the value of its funding through its partnering strategies, but again this strategy would also be limited in effect depending upon the full scope of expansion of the work. Consequently, it would be irresponsible to call for more work but not also recommend that this work expansion be proportionately resourced.

Recommendation Sixteen: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative be expanded in the scope of its work as per the recommendations in this report, but that any such growth in work obligations be supported by additional resources, particularly for the internal work of the Safeguards Initiative itself.

B3) The Extent To Which The Safeguards Initiative Furthers The Broad Intentions Of The CLBC 2009-2010 Operational Plan

The Operational Plan has several overarching components followed by sub sections underneath these. The broad intentions are encapsulated in the six overarching aims of the plan. These will be taken up separately with respect to the congruence of the work of the SI with these broad intentions.

#1: Connect individuals and families with supports, services and community opportunities to advance their vision of a good life.

The SI has not actively engaged service users directly on questions as to CLBC's specific responsiveness to their needs and concerns as this was not part of the mission of the SI. Nonetheless, SI events and activities were replete with opportunities for individuals to express any number of concerns regarding CLBC and other systems. To the extent that the SI represents

CLBC on such occasions, it could be said that any concerns raised would have been acknowledged even if specific issues could not be addressed by the SI on behalf of CLBC.

It is clear that for at least a small number of families that were able to attend SI events (both those specifically directed to families and more general presentations) that there was likely some family leadership benefit gained. It is also true that the publications of the SI may have also added to this effect. The SI itself did not have an explicit family leadership component identified, though it did target families directly regarding vulnerability and safeguards issues through its work with the Family Support Institute, Community Councils, and through open registration to its more general events on the subject. The work with the FSI was the element of the SI's work that most directly took up the question of personal leadership of families regarding safeguards.

The SI's task was not to directly reshape the services provided or supported by CLBC, though as a result of this evaluation it is recommended that the SI take on (going forward) selected elements of service change as it relates to safeguards and vulnerability. What was in the mandate of the SI was its ability to draw out concerns around the vulnerability of people and the potential role of good safeguards in their life. This kind of examination occurred countless times throughout the training sessions offered by the SI and is addressed in its publications. Clearly, the SI has additional contributions that it could make relative to service improvement, but it will first need a more explicit mandate as to how this might be accomplished.

It has already been raised in this report that the SI has some scope for further broadening its capacities to respond to the distinct cultural and linguistic needs of people in British Columbia from minority cultures. It should be noted that the manager of the SI was praised by the aboriginal advisor for her personal qualities and how much they were appreciated by the aboriginal people that she met with on various occasions. There is obviously scope for the SI to utilize people in resource roles who also have qualities that are responsive in relationship to the needs of persons from linguistic and cultural minorities.

#2: Support the development of welcoming communities to enable citizenship and contribution.

Promoting community inclusion has clearly been a prominent aspect of the SI's work. This work has not been done in a half hearted way, but with great passion, authority, and insight into the ways that community life could be improved for people with disabilities. In fact, the SI has taken up the question of the quality of life of persons with disabilities from a wide range of angles and has deepened the debate on numerous issues with an extremely wide range of people. It has initiated and advanced much needed critical thinking as to what about community life needs strengthening so as to not look at community life in overly rosy ways. Its extensive work on personal relationships and networks is also strikingly consistent with this broad intention. The SI has been a consistently visible and well received presence in the work of

Community Councils, as well as other efforts to promote good quality community living, and in engaging the real needs of people with disabilities and their families more effectively. The SWH initiative, in particular, has been a hugely visible way that the SI has engaged people in the broader community in regards to at least some aspects of the lives of people with disabilities within BC.

#3: Improve services through strengthened relationships and partnerships.

As mentioned earlier, there has been no expectation that the SI would involve itself in the many formal relationships involved within the service system beyond the educational role it has played thus far. This is not meant to mean however, that there might not be merit in the SI being asked into situations where such relationships may be highly significant in either creating or lessening the vulnerabilities experienced by people with disabilities. An enhanced role would still need to be selective, though could be extremely beneficial nonetheless in terms of promoting better outcomes for the lives of people who are dependent upon these intra and inter service relationships being more fulsome in their effects.

#4: Develop a culture of service excellence provided by exceptional staff.

The SI has not been asked to attend to most matters related to employee performance and job satisfaction. The area where it was asked to play distinct role was principally with respect to the performance of staff as it related to their management of questions of vulnerability and thoughtful safeguards. It is apparent that the amount of work that the SI has done on this question has been extensive and systematic, though it has been limited only to staff that have voluntarily shown an interest in such matters. Given that the SI has chosen to respond to those who voluntarily indicate an interest in safeguards and vulnerability, it is evident that the SI can, at best, only exert an indirect influence on staff who don't show an interest in its work. Even so, the effects of the SI's emphasis on quality and integrity, in response to vulnerability, undoubtedly adds to the "culture of excellence" aim of the CLBC given the extent of positive feedback received from those interviewed.

#5: Demonstrate effective governance, leadership and fiscal responsibility.

The SI was not asked to directly address issues of governance and fiscal responsibility and in leadership terms was to address only leadership as it related to questions of vulnerability and safeguards. Even so, the way it operates does provide an internal model for CLBC of transparency, accountability, and sound practice when it comes to the use of resources. In terms of the latter, the "yield" from the monies spent by the SI is both commendable and significant from a "cost benefit" perspective and it has greatly enhanced the image and reputation of CLBC as spending money on "the right things." This fact of extremely meaningful engagement with issues of important concern to the people being served does meet a very high test for good governmental practice. It is also important to recognize that the credibility of other leaders at

CLBC that have supported the work of the SI has been enhanced as they are given quite deserved credit for their steadfast support of this initiative.

The integrity of the SI's key leader was consistency referenced by those interviewed. This is exemplary and is what one would hope for from a government initiative as is the sense that so many people have that the work is being taken up with an authentic sense of service to others. These characteristics of the SI, and its manager, represent a moral asset for CLBC contributing in a significant way to the sense that CLBC is paying attention to what people most want to see from a government agency. On a more operational level, the presence of a very engaged, exceedingly skilled, and well motivated Advisory Committee adds to the sense that the SI is subject to meaningful oversight and receives substantive rather than token direction on its work. Transparency and accountability have been exemplary from the outset, both through independent reviews of the work of the SI and the role played by the Advisory Committee.

#6: Develop data and information management systems that support the work of CLBC and its partners.

The SI is largely uninvolved with the world of data management and data managements systems within CLBC. As a casual user of some of those systems, roles in this realm are decidedly outside of its purview. The exception would be in regard to data generated from its own work; a point taken up later in this report.

B4) The Data Base for the Safeguards Initiative and It Role In Demonstrating Impact

The SI has a great deal of activity under its belt; much of it is very difficult to measure in terms of its impact. It is important to note however, that the observations of many people do converge in ways that triangulate in a convincing fashion to support and validate the work done. Nonetheless, it would be advantageous for the SI, as a longer term initiative, to intentionally identify the areas to be documented for the purposes of formally demonstrating impact. This is not an easy challenge to address, as the kind of insights and conduct the SI might usefully promote may undoubtedly take time to impact on practice and systems change. As an example, the SI is being asked to act as a catalyst to reduce harmful vulnerabilities, to promote insight into vulnerability, to equip people to be more competent at creating safeguards, to encourage leadership on these issues, and to reach out the entire community on changes in community life which might impact beneficially on the lives of people with disabilities.

As desired global outcomes these are certainly of merit, but putting these into operation will need their concretization into specific initiatives that are easier to measure in terms of impact. It will also require that these impacts be measured across all of the SI activities so as to be able to assess overall consistency of results, difficult to do unless the same measures are used for such an appraisal. For instance, it would be very difficult to evaluate similar areas of impact if all course evaluation forms were idiosyncratic to each course.

Having said that, there are some circumstances where highly specific intentions targeted for activities or events would need to be taken up on their own merits, as they may be central to the rationales for that given event. For instance, in an event designed solely for parents to become better at designing safeguards for their family member, it would be useful to explore feedback as to what helped or did not. Such data may be very specific to families and may not always be consistent with the difficulties other groups may face with a similar task however. And, in a broader sense, the results of that course evaluation may be even more distant from events focusing on personal support networks, self destructive conduct, or service malpractice irrespective of their common threads of vulnerability and safeguards.

This raises the possibility that at least some initiatives might merit special study. For instance, the “SWH” initiative is a very broad-based, public campaign that might appeal differently to different audiences. Thus, there would be value in a survey review of the campaign that had the capacity to target feedback from different demographic groups of interest to CLBC. Similarly, in terms of deeper and more nuanced feedback it might also be possible to use an “in person”, open ended interview format or possibly focus groups aimed at sub samples of the major demographics of interest. With respect to personal network development there may be a number of dimensions of this work that bear examination. These include increased knowledge and awareness of support networks, a better or more positive appreciation of their value, greater sophistication in understanding how they work or their limitations, differential impacts on self advocates, families, workers, managers, community people, persons actually involved in intentional networks, their role relative to services and so on.

It is a given that the SI does not have the resources to investigate all impacts and all sub-initiatives equally, thus it will be essential to set priorities for developing data. At present, there has been no determination of what these might be. It is also true that there would be a variety of different interests that would need to be accommodated in any eventual consensus given the breadth of circumstances that have vulnerability and safeguards implications. It is not necessarily the case that the SI would have to finance such evaluative work itself as there may be other parties interested in the evaluations for other reasons such as: researchers in other areas of government, private think tanks and research bodies, graduate students doing thesis work, academics pursuing special research interests, and special grants for documenting innovative work to name a few. The attempt to gauge the effect of the SWH initiative, though narrowly cast, is an example of this kind of tracking of the impacts of SI’s work.

There is a distinction between impacts that have discernible scale and impacts that are seminal and substantive, but remain small in number irrespective of their intrinsic worth and significance. The latter are typically leadership and pioneering impacts because their presence acts as “seed” for future developments. The essential substantive corners have been turned, in terms of leadership and innovation, by these pioneers and thus, the longer term question becomes one of measuring innovation adoption by larger numbers of people. This kind of “*post hoc*” study of innovation adoption curves is well known to social scientists and researchers. As such the question would be more one of noting or documenting relatively new instances of

substantive leadership that have been catalyzed by the SI in various ways and why this is so. Obviously, the SI cannot claim to have had long term results at this stage, so the focus necessarily needs to be on shorter term impacts, particularly instances of leadership actions, leadership development, and innovative initiatives.

It can be argued that documenting instructive or inspiring “stories” may be a misleading indicator of overall progress and impact. This would be a valid observation in the case of aggregate impacts. Nonetheless, simply in social change terms, it is important that their power as emblems or symbols of what might constitute desired and needed progress, as well as being illustrative of new learning and theory about how problems can be approached in innovative ways, be recognized and documented. In many instances, such pioneering examples do become overhyped creating illusory claims of progress. Is it then essential that impact be studied by distinguishing what is real from what is simply embellishment in order to draw deserved conclusions from pioneering and leadership examples.

Another dimension of documentation of the SI’s work is the value to be had in shared learning. If what is learned by the SI is not documented and made accessible to others, than there is a very real chance that its impact will be much reduced compared to what may be achieved through the effective presentation and dissemination of what is learned. This might take many forms, as there are many potential audiences for such learning, including many outside of BC whose essential interests overlap with those of the SI. It is also important to recognize that the SI as presently configured, is itself an innovation of note and sharing its example with others may also have benefits well beyond simply getting recognition for its innovative nature. For instance, government departments of all kinds worldwide have immense responsibility for countless people in vulnerable circumstances. There may be value to them in studying the pros and cons of what something like the SI can potentially contribute on a variety of levels.

Recommendation Seventeen: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative, in consultation with interested parties and with the advice of competent evaluators and researchers, prepare a set of key impact priorities for the work of the SI that it believes would be worth researching, evaluating and documenting seek ways in which these may be pursued subject to both the feasibility to undertake them and the availability of resources at a given moment to do so.

B5) It is *not* the case at present that there is any definitive appraisal available to CLBC by which it can make an informed determination of what groups of people in British Columbia, from among the people now supported by CLBC, might be considered amongst the people who are most significantly endangered by current conditions in both services and the broader community. The absence of such a determination obviously means that CLBC and its service agency partners in the community cannot streamline their work and systems to better address such needs with respect to the heightened vulnerability they may be encountering. This kind of attempt by CLBC to shape priorities in terms of addressing vulnerability necessarily will involve a role for all parts of CLBC as well as CLBC’s many partners in the community.

Nonetheless, the work of carrying out this task will need to be assigned as a specific responsibility to one or more parts of the organization if the work is to get done. It is not uncommon that service systems may have designated funding priorities for purposes of managing wait lists and other such indicators of unmet demand for access to services. Nonetheless, it is important to not confuse these sorts of system priorities with measures of vulnerability, as there may be many people who are already being served but who remain vulnerable for any number of reasons. It is also the case that there are degrees of vulnerability and it is valuable if those who are most imperiled could be identified as it helps in focusing on their situation. Further, if those who are both immediately and urgently vulnerable could be distinguished from those whose situations are not so close to catastrophe, it then allows for the kind of informed, triage decisions that all systems end up having to make, but with the advantage of being able to make decisions based on well developed consensus and factual information rather than reactive surmises.

Recommendation Eighteen: It is recommended that CLBC through the Safeguards Initiative and other divisions work together to develop an adjustable appraisal of who in BC is might be considered to be persons or groups who are most endangered by the vulnerabilities they are encountering in their lives. This appraisal should be seen solely as guidance for those involved in CLBC and its service partner organizations making policy and priority decisions. This use is in contrast to its possible employment as a pre-emptive and prescriptive rote checklist adjudication of who should get priority attention.

This question of identifying the most “at risk” has implications as well for the SI, given that its work should also be tailored to helping the CLBC system become more adept at managing vulnerability in ways that have the best possible outcomes for people with disabilities and their families. In fact, the SI could play a significant role in the formulation of such guidance as well as support in pursuing the follow up to such determinations. Admittedly, if such an identification of those who are comparatively most vulnerable is done poorly, without any thought to the social image damage such designations can engender, then what may start out as a well intentioned effort to address vulnerability may inadvertently compound this state by adding new harm in the form of reinforced negative stereotypes. Notwithstanding this concern, it is still advantageous for the CLBC and the SI to work with improved understandings of who is vulnerable in British Columbia. An unduly formulaic and unthinking application of such an appraisal would inhibit the kind of highly nuanced judgment calls that are needed and should prevail in very complex situations that may have life defining consequences. Hence, the purpose of this kind of determination is to advise, inform, and aid in understanding not tie the hands of people close to such situations.

B6) A key player in the formulation and eventual progress of the SI has been its Advisory Committee, though at times the committee does not feel as engaged or as influential in a day to day sense as they might prefer. Nonetheless, the Committee itself is rich in talent, experience in the field, and commitment to the aims of the SI. They also need to be recognized as being

instrumental in supporting the SI into existence and through all of the usual challenges of getting established. The standing of its members has brought considerable credibility to the work of the SI and the Committee has been a stalwart champion of the SI.

The SI has now moved from its infancy and so it is timely to examine what the role and contribution of the Advisory Committee should be in the next phase of its work as well as how the committee might be optimally configured. It is not always the case that a government initiative will have an Advisory Committee, but the wisdom of doing so in this instance is quite real in that the committee has most certainly added value in terms of adding oversight, analysis, and challenge to the work of the SI. The Advisory Committee has also been important in its role of constructively “second guessing” the SI, thereby adding depth and vantage points that might otherwise might have been missed.

An interesting question, that is relevant to the SI’s identity, is whether a project like this, extensively involved in matters in the community, might be better positioned outside of government and placed under typical community governance. There are many examples of organizations that have extensive government financing and involvement that governments have elected to not operate directly. If that positioning was seen as preferable then the key questions would be focused more on what kind of governance board was optimal for the SI’s mission. It is conceivable that such a question may arise in the future, particularly if the community comes to identify with the SI as being more appropriately located outside of government.

Another option would be some form of mixed governance arrangement, similar to CLBC’s initial Board of Directors, which has had a mix of community and governmental representation. Both of these kinds of boards have not been considered to date, as it would mean reconfiguring the SI as an entity on its own and therefore distinct from CLBC itself, irrespective of extensive CLBC presence and participation. There seemed to be no interest in such options amongst those interviewed. Though some people were intrigued by the prospect of exploring such possibilities, there seemed to be no urgency in doing so.

That essentially has left the Advisory Committee as the key external influence of the SI for the short term, though it is conceivable that the governance/distinct identity option may arise under other circumstances that favor it. The challenges facing the SI are no longer those of start up. In fact, the SI is now one of CLBC’s longest running initiatives, even though it has not yet reached the five year mark. Thus, it will be important for the Advisory Committee to turn its attention to the challenges associated with the ongoing evolution and operation of an established initiative. These might typically involve defining the emerging mission and role of the SI (given its original mission and the progress to date), the identification of areas where the performance of the SI could be improved, mobilizing support for the work of the SI, and acting as guides and consultants on matters of substance. Regardless of whether it is these specific roles that are assigned to the Safeguards Advisory Committee, it is most certainly timely that its role be revisited, clarified, and updated.

A key element in considerations of the role of the (updated) Safeguards Advisory Committee will be who might be ideal members and why. Much of that thinking has already been done in the selection of the current committee, but it is nonetheless timely to at least consider an updating of committee composition. The rationales for this revisiting of the question of optimal committee membership are common but valid. They include the need to bring on fresh perspectives, the need to match the talents of those on the committee with the *current* challenges it faces, the need for leadership that is pertinent to challenging and defining the priorities and focus of the SI so that its ongoing relevance will be assured, the elimination of parties with worrisome conflicts of interest, and ensuring that all important constituencies are reflected in the composition of the advisory committee in coming years as well as the presence of people and representative constituencies that will ensure that the SI has sufficient influence where it might matter.

Recommendation Nineteen: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative undertake a review and possible revision of the Safeguards Advisory Committee's role, terms of reference, and member composition to as much as possible bring it in line with its future mission and that this be done with as much input from the varied constituencies that are integral to the emerging mission of the SI. This could include scheduled and periodic consultations with key constituencies at timely intervals on a regular basis.

The SI's principal role is that of a catalyst for change with respect to influencing people in the CLBC service system and the broader community regarding searching for better ways to manage and safeguard vulnerability. A good deal of this work will necessarily happen in ways that do not draw notice to itself, as can be seen by the fact that many people interviewed only knew of a portion of the work of the SI. This could be taken as an inevitable outcome that simply must be lived with, however this may be shortsighted in the sense that there may be value in crafting the role and work of the SI to have more of presence in the various media both within the CLBC and the broader community.

This need not take the form of simply publicizing such work, but rather that the sharing of the work may actually help further the educational and change aims of the SI. There are many such media that could be a pathway for sharing examples of the work and thinking that the SI has fostered, even if this does not always mean that it is the SI doing the actual sharing. This has already occurred in that many activities that have had SI involvement have emerged under varying authorship in multiple media, only some of which have had CLBC involvement. For instance, some of the work on personal support networks has appeared on an independent community organization website, independent commentary on the SWH emerged on Facebook, and family leadership on safeguards has appeared on the Family Support Institute website. There are many ways to broaden the impact of the SI. These could include local, provincial and national newspapers, newsletters, journal articles, social networking media, television, radio, web sites, blogs, CLBC's own media and so on. It is not the media selected for a given purpose that is as important as it is the kind of communications that are made through them. The SI has

began to craft a role for itself in supporting and encouraging useful communications through these channels, but does not as yet have an organized plan for doing so.

Recommendation Twenty: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative undertake further planning about how it could expand its presence, and the presence of the key messages of its many partners, in the various media that will have influence on various populations within British Columbia that the Safeguards Initiative hopes to influence.

Appendix "A": Summary of Recommendations

(Categorized according to the broad areas of consideration for future work.)

The Continuation of the Safeguards Initiative as an On-going Commitment of CLBC

Recommendation One: It is recommended that CLBC authorize the continuation of the Safeguards Initiative for a minimum of a further five year period.

Recommendation Two: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative be further externally and independently evaluated in five years time (e.g. by early to mid 2016).

Recommendation Three: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative be authorized to expand its focus and annual work priorities to act as an internal CLBC resource to explore, with other sections of CLBC, the various ways that safeguarding systems could be strengthened so that they could provide greater benefit for the people with disabilities and their families that CLBC supports.

- a) Further, that in this regard, that the Safeguards Initiative be authorized to develop joint internal projects or initiatives with any division, regional or local office, Community Council, governing board or other element of CLBC that is involved with the execution of any formal safeguarding system of the CLBC that would potentially strengthen any of these internally operated safeguards.
- b) Though there may often be merit in the executive leadership requesting that each such administrative entity of the CLBC undertake a joint safeguards strengthening project in conjunction with the Safeguards Initiative, it is not necessarily the case that these would or should be a priority in a given year. Consequently, this determination can be determined annually as to its possible merits by the Safeguards Initiative and the specific administrative section and subsequently included into their mutual annual work plans as appropriate.

Rationale for recommendations: The evaluation indicated that there was consensus that the SI has established itself as a distinct, innovative, and broad based initiative with considerable influence and engagement and should therefore be continued as an ongoing element of CLBC's overall work. The SI serves to promote CLBC's vision and values through partnerships that reduce vulnerability. The work is inherently long term in nature and a 5 year scope of work supports both long and short term planning. Evaluation is essential to reflections on the value and success of the work. Targeted internal and external safeguarding projects, specifically considered for their feasibility and timing, would allow the organization to build capacity across its various component parts while emphasizing the inherently inter-related nature of considerations regarding both formal and informal approaches to reducing vulnerability.

The Educational Role of the Safeguards Initiative

Recommendation Four: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative continue its ongoing program of short outreach oriented trainings and educational events involving various partnering groups throughout the province on themes related to safeguarding and vulnerability.

Recommendation Five: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative expand its own educational offerings and those it supports, to include a variety of more “in depth” treatments of safeguards and vulnerability subjects that would also allow for better targeting of subject matter to the needs of interested groups in the province that have highly specific interests.

Recommendation Six: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative expand the variety and extent of targeted introductory trainings on safeguards and vulnerability issues to self advocates, families and CLBC and community service organization staff such that more choices are available that might better suit the specific needs of sub groups of these large groups.

Recommendation Seven: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative expand the use of training and technical assistance options in terms of helping self advocates, families and CLBC and community service organization staff learn how they can personally become more proficient at designing and managing safeguards that are well targeted and effective in terms of managing the vulnerabilities they encounter.

Recommendation Eight: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative contribute to the content regarding the adaptive management of vulnerability and personal safeguards in any proposed or eventual “core” training program that the CLBC may develop in coming years for its staff as well as support community agencies with this subject matter in any of their own “core” trainings for staff and possibly others.

Recommendation Nine: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative continue to expand its publication efforts and those of others in regards to subject matter related to safeguards and vulnerability that emerge as important priorities in terms of resource development.

Recommendation Ten: It is recommended that the SI establish a five year plan to gradually strengthen its capacities to engage and address matters of vulnerability and safeguards in the context of the many minority languages and cultures that are now established as part of the communities of British Columbia and this be done in cooperation with interested leaders from these minority communities.

Rationale for the recommendations: A key and prominently successful role of the SI has been its educational role and overall leadership on the topic of safeguards. Short educational and training events have built interest in the topic and should be continued while building on deeper learning from initial exposure to the subject. Key would be targeting and packaging of new learning experiences and materials so as to be intentionally suited to a variety of audiences who should and will play a key role in community

based safeguarding work. Specific attention should be paid to expansion of the use of training and technical assistance options that promote a person centered focus, as well as considerations that ensure that the topic of adaptive management and personal safeguards be included in any “core” training devised for CLBC staff and community service providers. Attention to the diversity of the BC population demonstrates respect and proactivity in advancing the conversation about safeguards.

Recommendation Eleven: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative continue to address the many values issues that may underlie the diminishment or accentuation of vulnerability in the lives of people with disabilities. In doing this, it should seek in cooperation of others interested in values based leadership, to further strengthen a coordinated and proactive program and vehicle to intentionally encourage positive values based leadership and subsequent approaches that can beneficially affect the lives of people with disabilities.

Recommendation Twelve: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative explore and initiate on a periodic basis, based upon its ongoing priorities, the establishment of various formal and informal ties between itself and the academic community and organizations in BC and elsewhere that may have some specific advantage in strengthening the capacity of people within the province to better address questions of vulnerability and safeguards and to take appropriate advantage of any such ties that already exist between CLBC and academic centers.

Recommendation Thirteen: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative explore and initiate, with varying agency and other parties, intentional initiatives aimed at identifying and positively altering environmental conditions within services that contribute to the vulnerability of persons receiving services and that it continue to expand its similar work involving adaptively reshaping conditions of life in communities that add to the vulnerability of people with disabilities.

Rationale for the recommendations: The emergence of better practices and attitudes in the disability field has occurred as a result of focused, intentional, and proactive leadership in awareness building and analysis of values and their impact on people’s lives. Consideration should be given to mounting some sort of on-going and systematic values based awareness, training and engagement effort in BC. Linkages between the academy and non-academic sectors should be explored to promote research, affiliation projects, curricula development and other projects to give greater credibility and standing to the many issues involved in the focus on vulnerability, and continue the leadership shown thus far through diverse partnerships. Further work on the part of the SI should be targeted on both service change and community change where the focus is on the environmental conditions that are generating vulnerability with both services and communities.

Recommendation Fourteen: It is recommended that CLBC and the Safeguards Initiative continue with the “Start With Hi” initiative and take it into its next phase and that this next phase of the campaign address both the question of what should happen after “Hi” has started things going at the level of personal relationships, as well as how people with disabilities might begin to occupy valued social roles within relationships and in community life more broadly.

Recommendation Fifteen: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative, as a component of the Policy and Program Development division, and the Communications divisions negotiate and finalize an ongoing working agreement as to how the SWH campaign should be managed as an ongoing initiative of CLBC. This working agreement should cover expectations, aims, roles, decision-making, internal and external communications, the process for the resolution of disputes, and the ways that coordination is to be pursued.

Recommendation Sixteen: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative be expanded in the scope of its work as per the recommendations in this report, but that any such growth in work obligations be supported by additional resources, particularly for the internal work of the Safeguards Initiative itself.

Rationale for the recommendations: The “Start with Hi” initiative was a successful social marketing experiment that advanced the message of friendship and community presence for people with developmental disabilities. The initiative should be continued with careful consideration given to the messages considered to promote valued social roles. Further, a negotiated working agreement between the SI and Communications division will serve to assist with the successful coordination and management of a continuation of the initiative. Implementation of the recommendations emerging from the evaluation will appropriately require expanded resources to honour the demands associated with increased responsibility to continue the leadership and excellence demonstrated thus far.

Documenting and Demonstrating the Impact of the Safeguards Initiative

Recommendation Seventeen: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative, in consultation with interested parties and with the advice of competent evaluators and researchers, prepare a set of key impact priorities for the work of the SI that it believes would be worth researching, evaluating and documenting seek ways in which these may be pursued subject to both the feasibility to undertake them and the availability of resources at a given moment to do so.

Recommendation Eighteen: It is recommended that CLBC through the Safeguards Initiative and other divisions work together to develop an adjustable appraisal of who in BC is might be considered to be persons or groups who are most endangered by the vulnerabilities they are encountering in their lives. This appraisal should be seen solely as guidance for those involved in CLBC and its service partner organizations making policy and priority decisions. This use is in contrast to its possible employment as a pre-emptive and prescriptive rote checklist adjudication of who should get priority attention.

Rationale for recommendations: The work of the SI has demonstrated success in advancing the conversation about, and importance of, both formal and informal safeguards. As a longer term initiative, the SI should identify specific areas of activity with a view to deliberately assessing impacts from targeted activity, keeping in mind that there is a distinction between impacts that have discernible scale and those that are seminal and provide leadership over the long term. Documentation of these impacts will advance shared learning. Identification of those persons considered most vulnerable and linking this to the work

and role of the SI, will assist CLBC is becoming more adept at managing vulnerability in ways that have the best possible outcomes for individuals and their families.

Recommendation Nineteen: It is recommended that the CLBC and the Safeguards Initiative undertake a review and possible revision of the Safeguards Advisory Committee's role, terms of reference and member composition to as much as possible bring it in line with its future mission and that this be done with as much input from the varied constituencies that are integral to the emerging mission of the SI. This could include scheduled and periodic consultations with key constituencies at timely intervals on a regular basis.

Recommendation Twenty: It is recommended that the Safeguards Initiative undertake further planning about how it could expand its presence and the presence of the key messages of its many partners in the various media that will have influence on various populations within British Columbia that the Safeguards Initiative hopes to influence.

Rational for the recommendations: The Advisory Committee has played a pivotal leadership role in the history of the SI thus far. Continuation of the SI provides an opportunity to examine the optimal configuration of the Committee in order to best support the challenges associated with the ongoing evolution and operation of an established initiative. Further planning with respect to the role of the SI with the broader media will expand upon the catalytic role the initiative has played in influencing people within the CLBC system and the broader community.

Appendix "B": Safeguards Initiative Publications

"Responding to Vulnerability – A Discussion Paper about Safeguards and People with Developmental Disabilities" April 2007

A document developed by CLBC for discussion with Self Advocates, Families, Service Providers, Caregivers and other concerned people

"Rights and Safeguards - A Plain Language Guide for Self Advocates" April 2007
"Belonging to One Another: Building Personal Support Networks"

A Resource booklet that is meant to inspire and stimulate your heart and head in consideration of how to support friendships, make social connections and build broader networks for adults with developmental disabilities.

"Addressing Personal Vulnerability Through Planning"

A Guide to Identifying and Incorporating Intentional Safeguards when Planning with Adults with Developmental Disabilities and their Families.

All booklets are available on-line at CLBC website under publications
www.communitylivingbc.ca