

Creating Excellence Together Accreditation Levels 1 and 2

Self-Study Guide

2008 Guide to Changes from 2005 Self-Study Guide

ACDS has made a few changes to the 2008 Self-Study Guide with the goal of making this document more complete, easier to use and more efficient to reference. These changes are described below.

1. Instead of three categories of information gathering systems, the revised guide now has four categories. The major changes involve former category 3 and new category 4.

1. On-Site

The service provider is not required to submit anything in relation to these indicators. Like all the other indicators, on-site indicators will be confirmed through conversations, observations, file review, and documentation review during the site-survey.

2. Overview

For each of these indicators, there is space in the guide for the service provider to write a short description of its practice relative to the indicator. **Please print or type.** If the overview is printed or typed on a separate piece of paper instead of in the space provided, please attach that document to the guide along with any other documentation that describes the organization's practices in relation to the indicator. The indicator's reference number must be written in the top right corner of any attached documents (e.g., **(O1)**). If the organization has policy that relates to the indicator, then please **cross-reference the policy and/or page number** after the indicator in the Self-Study Guide.

3. Attachment

The service provider is required to submit applicable documentation (e.g., demo forms) along with the Self-Study Guide for each of these indicators. Please write the indicator's reference number on the top right corner of attached documents (e.g., **(A2)**).

4. Policy

The service provider is expected to have policy and procedure in place to address each of these indicators. Please **do not** photocopy and insert policy into the Self-Study Guide. Instead, just include one copy of the organization's Policy and Procedure Manual with the completed Self-Study Guide, and then **cross-reference the correct policy and/or page number** within the Self-Study Guide (e.g., **(P#25.6)**, **(P#33)**).

2. The 2008 Self-Study Guide also contains an Overview of the Organization section (which is not related to the category called "Overview") that the service provider can use to record information about its organization. This information will give the surveyors a better understanding of the organization prior to the site survey and it will be used as the basis of the Overview section of the Final Report document.
3. Since Standard 15 and Scenario 1 of Standard 20 request written policy and procedure, the related indicators for these two standards are now included in the Self-Study Guide just before the Organizational Framework standards.
4. At the back of the Self-Study Guide is an Index to Attachment table that service providers can use to record their attachments. This table is meant to expedite the process for referencing attachments.

Creating Excellence Together Accreditation Level 1

Standards Manual

2008 Guide to Changes from 2005 Manual

A number of changes have been made to the former 2005 *Creating Excellence Together/Striving for Quality* (CET/SFQ) Standards manual, the most obvious being the name change from The Alberta Association of Rehabilitation Centres to the Alberta Council of Disability Services.

In addition to the name change, there are two other major changes to the manual.

1. The term “Certification” has been changed to “Accreditation Level 1” (AL1).¹
2. A new Standard 43 was added the Organizational Framework section to address the service providers’ strategies for establishing and maintaining data collection systems that are capable of supporting outcome monitoring, evaluation, and quality improvement efforts.

We have made other basic changes to the manual that are meant to:

- a. clarify the intent and content of the standards;
- b. change “rehabilitation” organizations or services to “community disability services”;
- b. streamline the wording and make it consistent; and
- c. ensure that the standards for service quality reflect our current understanding of excellence in the field.

A decision was made to delete all Quality of Life indicators that contain the wording “The individual expresses satisfaction” because these were considered too subjective and too dependent on how the individuals may be feeling on that particular day. As well, since the standards also have indicators that address whether the individuals feel their preferences or choices have been honoured, these indicators are seen to already gauge the individuals’ satisfaction, making the “express satisfaction” indicators redundant.

We changed the cover page this year to feature our new logo colours and to match documents being published by other departments within ACDS. In addition, we have “cleaned up” the overall appearance of the manual and have reduced the total number of pages by revising the formatting (e.g., deleting many of the decorative features such as lines and angled headings) and by having the indicators follow directly after the preamble instead of placing them on a separate page.

Since 2005, we had changed bulleted indicators into numbered and lettered indicators and sub-points, although organizations with older manuals will still have bulleted indicators. We have chosen to continue with the revised format, and have even separated some of the longer indicators into indicators with lettered sub-points.

Finally, we have added a number of footnotes throughout the manual to show where the reader can find further information in the Appendices.

The balance of this Guide to Changes document describes, in greater detail, the major changes and some of the more significant minor changes to the former 2005 CET Manual.

¹ AL1 is an abbreviation used in this document only. This abbreviation is not part of the revised manual.

Introduction to the Standards

Organization Framework

1. Paragraph 3, “In 1998 ...” (page iv): added “which are under the ministry of Alberta Seniors and Community Supports” after the reference to Persons with Developmental Disabilities.

Use of Language

1. Paragraph 1: added “trustees” to the list of people who may be included in the term “individuals.”

Introduction to Accreditation Level 1

1. This section underwent a considerable re-write to describe the accreditation level and to add clarity.

Quality of Life and Quality of Service Standards

The *Quality of Life* and *Quality of Service* standards are grouped together since they are applied together during the surveys.

Standards 1 & 13 – Homes

Standard 1

1. Preamble changed:
 - a. to give a better definition of what a “home” should be;
 - b. to show what the key elements regarding “home” are; and
 - c. to make it clear that individuals need to be given options regarding who they may choose to live with.
2. Indicators 5 to 8:
 - a. Former Indicator 7 is now Indicator 5. Reason: puts the indicators that refer to observations about the individual’s home together.
 - b. Former Indicator 5 (i.e., establishing day-to-day routines) is new Indicator 6.
 - c. Former Indicator 6 (i.e., accessing the home) is now Indicator 8.
 - d. Former Indicator 8 (i.e., forming and practising traditions) is now Indicator 7.

Standard 13

1. Preamble: added the idea that “individuals should be free to access private areas ... as well as the common areas of their homes.” Additional text included examples.
2. Indicator 5: changed “daily activities” to “day-to-day routines.” “Day-to-day routines” was subsequently removed from AL1 Indicator 6. Reason: to reduce redundancy.

Standards 2 & 14 – Decision Making

Standard 2

1. Indicator 2:
 - a. added “balanced” to “information”;

- b. brought in the idea of outcomes having a positive or negative impact; and
 - c. added the idea that all of this is so the individual can make informed decisions.
2. Indicators 4 and 5 (i.e., included in the decision-making process, have made decisions): combined into Indicator 4 to reduce redundancy. Also deleted the accompanying instruction to give examples of decisions the individual has made.

Standard 14

1. Preamble:
 - a. Paragraph 3: added “balanced” to “information.”
 - b. Paragraph 4: edited example (i.e., the risk associated with using public transportation) to make it sound more positive than negative.
2. Indicator 1: reworded to emphasize that staff are knowledgeable about the individual’s preferences that relate to everyday matters. Added examples of everyday matters.
3. Indicator 3: changed “The service provider has and implements strategies to provide information” to “Staff provide the individual with balanced information.”
4. Indicator 4: changed “deal with” (choices that involve risk) to “oversee.”

Standards 3 & 15 – Relationships

Standard 3

1. Preamble, paragraph 1:
 - a. edited to only outline what “relationships” can mean, not dictate what they have to be; and
 - b. removed the reference to “frailties” being accepted within relationships.
2. Indicator 1:
 - a. changed “close friends” to “friends”; and
 - b. added the idea that “friends” are something more than just “acquaintances.”
3. Indicator 5:
 - a. changed “reciprocal relationships” to “relationships”; and
 - b. reworded so that only the individual’s perspective is sought and not “each person’s.”
4. Former Indicator 6 (i.e., individuals have advocates): deleted from Standard 3 and moved to Standard 5.

Standard 15

1. Former Indicators 1, 2 and 3: combined to form new Indicator 1:
 - a. put family and friends in the same indicator;
 - b. deleted the reference to supporting arrangements to meet with family and friends;
 - c. deleted “in private”;
 - d. left in the idea that meetings should be appropriate to the setting;
 - e. added the idea that meetings should be appropriate to the situation; and
 - f. added examples of “situation” and “setting.”
2. Former Indicator 4 (i.e., supporting development of relationships):
 - a. renumbered as Indicator 2; and
 - b. deleted “that are of the individual’s choosing.” Reason: the individual’s choices are not always in their best interest.

3. Former SFQ Indicator 1 (i.e., planned strategies to help individuals develop friendships): moved to become AL1 Indicator 3.

Standards 4 & 16 – Rights

Standard 4

1. Preamble: edited considerably to add clarity as to what it means to be treated with dignity and respect.
2. Indicator 1:
 - a. merged two sentences into one sentence with the ideas from the second sentence changed into examples; and
 - b. changed “treated as an adult” to “treated age appropriately.”
3. Former Indicator 2: deleted. Reason: being treated “fairly” is just one part of being treated with “dignity and respect” (Indicator 1).
4. The balance of indicators was renumbered.
5. Indicator 2 (formerly Indicator 3): expanded to include the concept that “others” (and not just “staff”) respect the individual’s privacy and confidentiality.
6. Former Indicator 4: deleted. Reason: the idea of “who” provides personal care is covered in Indicator 3 (former Indicator 5) (i.e., “in a manner that respects her dignity”).

Standard 16

1. Indicator 3: changed focus on staff seeing individuals as having “gifts or “skills to contribute” to staff presenting individuals as persons “with worth and value.”

Standards 5 & 17 – Rights

Standard 5

1. Preamble: removed separation between legal rights and human rights. Reason: individuals receiving service are frequently not familiar with the differences between the two.
2. Indicator 1:
 - a. now addresses both human rights and legal rights;
 - b. inserted additional examples of these rights; and
 - c. added examples of staff support.
3. Indicator 3: added examples of staff support.
4. New Indicator 4 (e.g., individuals have advocates): moved from Standard 3.
5. Former Indicator 4 (i.e., restriction of rights): now Indicator 5.

Standard 17

1. Preamble: removed separation between legal rights and human rights.
2. Indicator 1:
 - a. now addresses both human rights and legal rights; and
 - b. inserted additional examples of these rights.
3. Indicator 2: expanded on examples of individual’s rights.
4. Indicator 4: added examples of the rights of an individual “receiving service.”

5. Indicator 5: added “effective” to “strategy.”

Standards 6 & 18 – Personal Control

Standard 6

1. Preamble: reworded to add a more positive “spin” to the idea of helping individuals achieve independence.
2. Indicator 1: added “given her personal circumstances.”
3. Indicator 2: reworded to expand on the purpose of providing training to individuals (i.e., “to develop skills to function more independently”).

Standard 18

1. Preamble: added the idea that “the service provider needs to help individuals attain as much personal control in their lives as possible, feel emotionally healthy and resilient, and learn how to deal with problems effectively.”
2. Indicator 1: changed the focus from providing “encouragement” to having “supports and/or training” in place to help individuals “develop skills and to function as independently as possible.”
3. Former Indicator 2: deleted. Reason: “training” has become part of Indicator 1. The balance of indicators has been renumbered.
4. Indicator 2 (i.e., overcoming barriers to achieving personal control): added “positive behaviour management” to the list of examples.

Standards 7 & 19 – Community Inclusion

Standard 7

1. Preamble rewritten:
 - a. to give a better description of inclusive involvement in the community; and
 - b. to emphasize that involvement can be with disabled or non-disabled persons according to the individual’s choice.
2. Indicator 1: deleted “everyday” and “on a regular basis.” Reason: these concepts do not necessarily support what the individuals want or are comfortable with in regards to community involvement.
3. Indicator 2: added examples of how individuals interact meaningfully with community members.
4. Indicator 3: added examples of how individuals contribute to their community.
5. Indicator 4: deleted “is supported to.” Reason: it seemed more relevant in this indicator to simply ask if individuals participate.
6. New Indicator 5 reads: “The individual has access to whatever information or opportunities he needs to be involved in his community to the extent that he desires and is capable of.”

Standard 19

No major changes.

Standards 8 & 20 – Work and Community Options

Standards 8 & 20

1. Standard 8 preamble, paragraphs 3 and 4: edited considerably to add clarity or examples. None of the changes alter the intent of the preamble.
2. Standard 20 preamble, paragraph describing the scenarios: edited considerably to add clarity and examples.

Standard 8 Scenario 1

1. Changes made to emphasize that this scenario is about competitive employment only.
2. Edited the subtitle to add “competitively” to “employment.”
3. New Indicator 1 reads: “The individual is employed to the greatest extent possible.” Subsequent indicators were renumbered.
4. Indicator 3: changed “fair compensation” to “competitive remuneration.”

Standard 20 Scenario 1

1. Edited the subtitle to add “competitively” to “employment.”
2. Indicator 1: moved to become Indicator 5. The subsequent indicators have been renumbered.
3. Indicator 2 (i.e., supporting development of relationships): made into “if” statement with addition of “if she desires to do so.”

Standard 8 Scenario 2

1. Combined indicators that contained similar ideas:
 - a. Indicator 1 reads: “The individual has a plan for gaining employment that is based on his personal preferences, interests and skills.”
 - b. Indicator 2 reads: “The individual is being given effective support (e.g., job search support, emotional support, training, skill development) in his search for employment.”
 - c. Indicator 3 reads: “If the individual has experienced frequent changes in employment, he is supported with any issues that arise from frequent changes in employment, and new training and employment options are explored.”

Standard 20 Scenario 2

1. Former SFQ Indicator 2 (i.e., training): combined with former CET Indicator 3 (i.e., support) to create new Indicator 2. The balance of indicators renumbered.
2. New Indicator 5 reads: “The individuals’ employment goals are regularly reviewed and evaluated, and they are revised as appropriate.”

Standard 8 Scenario 3

1. Changes made to emphasize that this scenario is not about employment, but about productive or skill development activities (including volunteering).
2. Edited the subtitle to add the words “not to be employed but.”
3. Indicator 1: changed “skills” to “abilities.”
4. Former Indicator 3 (i.e., fair volunteer benefits): deleted.
5. Former Indicators 4 and 5: combined and reworded to become Indicator 3: “The individual negotiates her schedule of activities as well as the extent to which she is involved in them.”

Standard 20 Scenario 3

1. Changes made to emphasize that this scenario is not about employment, but about productive or skill development activities (including volunteering).
2. Edited the subtitle to add the words “not to be employed but.”
3. Former SFQ Indicator 1 (i.e., process for identifying productive and skill development activity options): moved to become new Indicator 1. Balance of indicators renumbered.
4. Former Indicator 3 (i.e., support development of relationships): moved to become Indicator 7.
5. New Indicator 6 reads: “Staff ensure that volunteer placements do not replace paid positions.”

Standard 8 Scenario 4

1. Edited the subtitle to change “personally meaningful activities” to “daily-living activities.”
2. Indicator 1:
 - a. added “skill-maintaining” to “activities”;
 - b. changed “variety of options” to “selection of options”; and
 - c. changed “skills” to “abilities.”
3. Indicator 5: deleted “is supported to.” Reason: to match the wording of similar indicators in other scenarios.
4. Former Indicator 6 (i.e., enjoys how his time is spent): deleted. Reason: too subjective.

Standard 20 Scenario 4

1. Edited the subtitle to change “personally meaningful activities” to “daily-living activities.”
2. Added “skill maintaining” to “activities” throughout.
3. Former SFQ Indicator 1 (i.e., process for responding to individual’s unique circumstances, etc.) now Indicator 6.

Standards 9 & 21 – Leisure

Standard 9

1. Preamble:
 - a. removed the negative definition of “free time”; and
 - b. removed references to leisure time taking place “in the community.” Reason: community involvement is covered in Standards 7 and 19.
2. Indicator 1: deleted “in her community.”
3. SFQ Indicator 2 (i.e., understands implications of choices):
 - a. moved to become Indicator 3; and
 - b. reworded: “The individual understands the variables that could affect her leisure time choices (e.g., requiring money, support, or transportation).”
4. SFQ Indicator 1 (i.e., understands what free time is and chooses from options):
 - a. moved to become new Indicator 4; and
 - b. reworded: “The individual has been exposed to a variety of inclusive options and environments that are related to her leisure interests.”

Standard 21

1. Preamble:
 - a. removed the negative definition of “free time”;

- b. removed references to leisure time taking place “in the community”; and
 - c. added a sentence to introduce the idea of “contingency plans.”
2. Indicator 2: changed “activities that are compatible with her interests” to “activities that may be of interest to her.”
 3. New Indicator 7: “The service provider has developed contingency plans to address unexpected changes to the individual’s scheduled leisure activities.”

Standards 10 & 22 – Health and Safety

Standard 10

1. Former SFQ Indicator 1 (i.e., individual aware of health or physical needs):
 - a. moved to become L1 Indicator 1; and
 - b. deleted “expresses satisfaction” part of indicator.
2. The subsequent indicators have been renumbered.
3. Indicator 3d: added “medication-related” to “emergency.”

Standard 22

1. Former Indicator 1 (i.e., assessing and monitoring health concerns, being aware of specific needs): divided into new Indicators 1 and 2. The subsequent indicators have been renumbered.
2. Indicator 4 (former CET Indicator 3): added examples of aspects of health care.
3. Former CET Indicator 4 (i.e., facilitating appointments): moved to become Indicator 6.
4. Indicator 5: wording changed from “The service provider gives the individual information on the importance of a healthy lifestyle, and supports him in his efforts to achieve this to the extent that he chooses” to “Staff support the individual’s emotional well-being by promoting healthy options (e.g., exercise, healthy diets), while still respecting the individual’s choices.”

Standards 11 & 23 – Health and Safety

Standard 11

1. Indicator 1: removed the idea that supports are in place only if individuals are not able to provide for their own safety.
2. Indicator 5: removed “verbally and/or through her conduct expresses that she.” Reason: this qualifier is not part of other indicators.

Standard 23

1. Former CET Indicators 3 and 4: switched order.
2. Indicator 4: wording changed from “Appropriate safety equipment is present in the individual’s environment, and it is in good working order” to “Staff are aware of and familiar with the safety equipment that is present in the individual’s environment as well as the maintenance schedule that is in place to ensure the equipment is in good working order.” Reason: to take the onus off of staff to ensure that safety equipment is installed and maintained.

Standards 12 & 24 – Health and Safety

Standard 12

1. Preamble:
 - a. did considerable re-write to eliminate reference to “research shows” because citation not readily available; and
 - b. the final paragraph, final bulleted item: added “indiscriminately” to “removing.”
2. Former SFQ Indicator 1 (i.e., individual has participated in meaningful training about abuse): now Indicator 5. Reason: Standard 12 is about protecting individuals from abuse; therefore, all of these indicators are considered Level 1 indicators.
3. Former Indicator 4 (i.e., expressing satisfaction with how abuse was resolved): deleted. Reason: too subjective.
4. Subsequent indicators have been renumbered.

Standard 24

1. Preamble: considerable re-write to eliminate reference to “research shows.” Reason: citation not readily available.
2. New Indicator 3 reads: “If the individual or others have reported that the individual was abused, staff took steps to protect the individual from mitigating situations (e.g., alternative temporary placement, staff suspension, separation of roommates).” Subsequent indicators have been renumbered.
3. Former Indicator 5 (i.e., implementing restrictive procedures according to Standard 32): deleted. Reason: this is covered in Standard 32.

Organizational Framework Standards

Standard 25 – Honouring Rights of Individuals

1. Added instruction: “Note: If a service provider is providing services to just one individual with no intention of accepting additional individuals into service, then this standard is not applicable.”
2. Former SFQ Indicator 1 (i.e., providing applicants an information package):
 - a. moved to become Indicator 1. The subsequent indicators have been renumbered; and
 - b. reworded considerably and added “comprehensive” to “information.”
3. Indicator 2: deleted “comprehensive.” Reason: the adjective was added to Indicator 1.
4. Former Indicator 3:
 - a. moved to Indicator 6; and
 - b. changed “service” to “an additional or change in service.”

Standard 26 – Honouring Rights of Individuals

1. Preamble:
 - a. Paragraph 1: added “human and legal” to “rights.”
 - b. Added a second paragraph about obtaining informed consent from individuals who will be participating in survey conversations.
2. New Indicator 4 reads, “The service provider has an inclusive process for developing a Rights of Individuals statement that includes appropriate stakeholders.”

Standard 27 – Honouring Rights of Individuals

1. Preamble, paragraph 1:
 - a. deleted the first sentence (i.e., “The service provider must have clear procedures to address...”); and
 - b. added “complaints or disagreements” to the second sentence.
2. Indicator 2: changed into an “if” statement: “If a formal dispute has been lodged ...”
3. Indicator 5: changed “clearly understand the appeal process and can appeal any decision” to “express their understanding of the appeal process and know that they can ...”

Standard 28 – Honouring Rights of Individuals

1. Preamble, paragraph 2: added “In addition, before individuals are placed in a support home environment, service providers must ensure that appropriate screening has been completed for all residents of the home.”

Standard 29 – Honouring Rights of Individuals

1. Preamble: extensive re-write to add clarity. Content and intent remains intact.
2. Indicator 1 (i.e., confidentiality): added “and any electronic and physical information pertaining to the individuals.”
3. Indicator 5: broken up into lettered sub-points.

Preamble to Standards 30 – 32

1. Changed section title to read: “Standards 30 to 32 is about the service provider’s process for addressing the individuals’ immediate and future safety and well-being in relation to situations or behaviours of concern”
2. Throughout this section, changed “predictable” and “unpredictable” to “anticipated” and “unanticipated.” Other editing changes made to add clarity.
3. Sub-title C. Planned Restrictive Procedures in Response to Anticipated Situations or Behaviours of Concern: reworded to describe when a Planned Positive Procedure alone is not sufficient.

Situations and/or Behaviours of Concern Chart

1. The layout of the chart changed to improve the look and readability of it.
2. Some of the wording was edited; however, the content and intent are intact.

Standard 30 – Honouring Rights of Individuals

1. Preamble paragraph 3 (i.e., using restrictive approaches): added “to prevent major property damage” at the end of the first sentence.
2. Indicator 1 (i.e., content of policy): broke up into lettered sub-points.
3. Indicator 5 (i.e., review of the incident):
 - a. added examples “support network and guardians” for “others”;
 - b. broke up into lettered sub-points;
 - c. Indicator 5c: changed “planned positive procedure or planned restrictive procedure” to “planned positive procedure or planned positive procedure with a planned restrictive procedure.”

Standard 31 – Honouring Rights of Individuals

1. Just after Indicator 2: added “Note: The following indicators apply to stand-alone planned positive procedures only.”
2. Indicator 3e: broke into two parts:
 - a. “an implementation plan” (3d); and
 - b. “a strategy for evaluating effectiveness” (3f)The previous Indicator 3d has become the new 3e.
3. Indicator 6: added “documented” to “informed consents.”

Standard 32 – Honouring Rights of Individuals

1. Preamble:
 - a. Added new introductory sentence to explain that planned restrictive procedures may be implemented “simultaneously” with planned positive procedures. The last part of paragraph 1 is now paragraph 2.
 - b. Paragraph 2: added the idea of “medications to influence behaviour” to the definition of a planned restrictive procedure.
 - c. Paragraph 4, sentence 1:
 - i. added “if positive procedures prove unsuccessful” after “planned restrictive procedures are needed”; and
 - ii. added “or to prevent major damage to property” at the end of sentence 1.
 - d. Paragraph 5:
 - i. changed “The use of a drug that is not required to treat a medical or psychiatric diagnosis, but to influence behaviour is considered to be a planned restrictive procedure” to “In addition, using medications that influence behaviour (i.e., psychotropic medications) in the absence of a medical or psychiatric diagnosis, and not for the purpose of treating one of these diagnoses, but rather to alter or influence behaviour, is considered restrictive and would require a planned restrictive procedure.”; and
 - ii. added the line: “When the service provider is responsible for determining when the medication is to be administered (i.e., *pro re nata* [PRN]), a restrictive plan must be in place.”
2. Indicator 1 (i.e., policy describes how and when planned restrictive procedures will be used):
 - a. added “or in conjunction with” to “the use of planned restriction procedures”; and
 - b. deleted the last line of the indicator and made it into a separate note (i.e., “If restrictive procedures are not permitted, the service provider’s policy indicates this and Indicators 2 to 8 are Not Applicable”).

3. Indicator 4 (i.e., full involvement and documented informed consent): added “to the extent they desire (e.g., the amount of contact they receive regarding changes to the procedure).”
4. Indicator 5 (i.e., functional assessment):
 - a. broke up into sub-points; and
 - b. added two sub-points, with the qualification “if required,” that read:
 - i. “an environmental assessment” (5f); and
 - ii. “a communication assessment” (5g).
5. Indicator 6 (i.e., written documentation): added 2 sub-points that read:
 - a. “restrictive procedures to be included in the plan” (6c); and
 - b. “an implementation plan” (6d).

Standard 33 – Health and Safety

1. Preamble:
 - a. Paragraph 2: added examples of assistive technology; and
 - b. New paragraph 5 reads: “Historical and current documentation regarding the intent, use and maintenance of AT-EI must be readily available and accessible, and informed consent must be present where required.”
2. Indicators 3 and 4: switched. Reason: to put similar items together.
3. New Indicator 4 reads: “If AT is used in a way that could restrict the individuals’ rights or negatively impact their welfare, then the use of the device follows the guidelines on restrictive procedures.”
4. Indicator 6: changed “Staff can describe the purpose of and the techniques of using any AT-EI that is in place, as well as how to assist the individuals in its use” to “Staff are trained in techniques for using the AT-EI that are in place.”
5. Indicator 7 (i.e., staff describing guidelines): added the phrase, “that specific individuals use.”

Standard 34 – Health and Safety

1. Subtitle: changed from “The service provider has a process to assist individuals to identify and address personal safety risks in their daily lives” to “The service provider has a process to manage risk.”
2. Preamble: completely rewritten. Reason: the new focus of this standard is on “managing risk.” Moved text surrounding “personal health, safety, and well-being” to Standard 35.
3. Re-wrote most of the indicators:
 - a. Indicator 1: addresses what written policy and procedure includes;
 - b. Indicator 2: addresses risk analysis of hazards;
 - c. Indicator 3: addresses emergency response plans;
 - d. Indicator 4: addresses safety training for staff, individuals and guardians as well as staff awareness of their roles and responsibilities in managing risks;
 - e. Indicator 5: addresses staff’s knowledge regarding emergency situations;
 - f. Indicator 6: addresses inspection reports;
 - g. Indicator 7: addresses whether licenses (e.g., facility, vehicles) are current;
 - h. Indicator 8: addresses recommendations in inspection reports; and
 - i. Indicator 9: addresses documentation that outlines safety practices.

Standard 35 – Health and Safety

1. Subtitle: changed from “The service provider has a process to promote the health and well-being of the individuals” to “The service provider has a process to assist individuals to identify and address their personal health, safety, and well-being.”
2. Preamble: completely rewritten. Reason: to change the focus from just promoting health and well-being to assisting individuals address their health, well-being, AND personal safety.
3. Re-wrote most of the indicators:
 - a. Indicator 1: addresses staff training in regards to illness, distress, or changes in behaviour; method for reporting, and follow-up action;
 - b. Indicator 2: addresses staff training in regards the individuals’ needs;
 - c. Indicator 3: addresses giving understandable information about healthy lifestyles and supporting their efforts;
 - d. Indicator 4: addresses the design and function of the individuals’ physical environment;
 - e. Indicator 5: addresses staff practising safety in all aspects of their work;
 - f. Indicator 6: addresses transporting individuals in safe vehicles; and
 - g. Indicator 7: addresses the storage of hazardous materials.

Standard 36 – Health and Safety

1. Preamble: edited considerably. Reason: to expand on the use of psychotropic medications and when the use of such medications requires a restrictive procedure.
2. Former Indicator 4 (i.e., regarding policy): enhanced and moved to become Indicator 1.
3. Former Indicator 3 (i.e., regarding not administering medication):
 - a. moved to become Indicator 2;
 - b. deleted “which is understood by staff”;
 - c. deleted “Strategies are in place to assist individuals to take prescribed medication on an *ad hoc* basis”; and
 - d. moved the note in parenthesis (i.e., indicators 4 to 11 not being applicable to service providers that have policy stating they don’t administer medications) to a separate note below Indicator 2. The note reads: “If this policy exists and is practised, then indicators 3 to 12 are Not Applicable.”
4. Former Indicator 2 (i.e., processing for monitoring medications, etc.):
 - a. renumbered as Indicator 3; and
 - b. added “including PRN medications.”
5. Former Indicator 1: moved to become Indicator 4.
6. New Indicator 5 reads: “The service provider has clearly defined procedures that outline staff’s responsibilities related to providing medication reminders or assistance, or for administering medication to individuals.” Subsequent indicators have been renumbered.
7. Indicator 7 (i.e., a qualified person for training): deleted “as defined in the service provider’s policy.” Reason: policy may not accurately define “qualified person.”

Standard 37 – Human Resources

1. Removed separation between CET and SFQ indicators. Reason: there were formerly only two CET indicators. Because the current staffing crisis has meant many service providers couldn’t meet Indicator 1, thereby not meeting Standard 37, it was felt this unfairly penalized

service providers that were doing everything possible to meet the needs of individuals receiving service despite staff shortages.

2. Indicator 1: changed “human resources” to “required staffing numbers, staff qualifications, and staff training.”
3. Indicator 2: added the idea of “measurable goals and timelines,” along with examples.
4. Former SFQ Indicator 5 (i.e., comparison between projected staffing requirements and the current “talent pool”): now Indicator 3.
5. Formerly SFQ Indicator 1: now Indicator 4 and simplified. Reason: to ensure we are not telling service providers how to estimate staffing requirements.
6. Former SFQ Indicator 2 (i.e., considering external, organizational and workforce influences when planning human resources): now Indicator 5 with revised examples.

Standard 38 – Human Resources

1. Preamble: revised list in Examples of Human Resources Policy and Procedure Areas table.
2. Indicator 3 (i.e., criminal records checks):
 - a. expanded to include checks “that span municipal, provincial, federal jurisdictions”; and
 - b. Intervention Record Checks, with the qualifier “if applicable.”
3. Former Indicator 8 (i.e. payroll): moved to Standard 47 (formerly Standard 46).

Standard 39 – Human Resources

1. Preamble: added text regarding annual reviews for long term staff vs. probationary or newer staff.
2. Former Indicators 1 and 2 (i.e., concerning roles and responsibilities): combined into Indicator 1. Reason: the indicators contained similar ideas. Subsequent indicators renumbered.
3. Indicator 3b: changed “formal review” to “formal or informal review.”

Standard 40 – Human Resources

1. Preamble:
 - a. added examples for “variety of methods”; and
 - b. changed “Community Rehabilitation Careers Project” to “Community Disability Services Job Profiles.” The corresponding footnote has changed to match the new reference.

No changes to indicators.

Standard 41 – Human Resources

1. Preamble: moved the reference to “exit interviews” to the very end of the list rather than as an example of “communication system.”
2. Indicator 2: added “employees indicate that.” Reason: to show who believes that communication mechanisms exist.

Standard 42 – Structure of Organizations

1. Preamble:
 - a. sentence that starts, “Incorporation under relevant provincial legislation” (paragraph 2): deleted the phrase “distributing the assets upon dissolution of the organization”;
 - b. added sentence: “Under the *Societies Act*, periodic reviews of the by-laws are required and, if any changes are made, then they must be resubmitted for approval”;
 - c. added description for Scenarios 1 and 2.
2. Several indicators have been reworded just to add clarity or conformity, but without changing the context.

Scenario 1

1. Changed title from “Governance structure includes a Board of Directors or management committee” to “Governance Structure operates under the auspices of the *Societies Act*.”
2. Removed several references to “management committee members.” Reason: organizations in this classification will have “board members” only.
3. New Indicator 1 reads: “There is a process for the recruitment of new members of the Board of Directors.” Subsequent indicators renumbered.
4. Indicator 3: added the idea that conflicts of interest policy “gives examples of conflicts and distinguishes between board conflicts and staff conflicts.”
5. Indicator 5: added “governance” to the noun “roles.”
6. Indicator 6: changed the wording to “The Treasurer of the organization is involved in the approval and ongoing review of the budget.” Reason: the Treasurer is not always included in site surveys; therefore, it’s not possible to know if the Treasurer can “describe” the process.
7. Former SFQ Indicator 2 (i.e., board minutes substantiate review of budget and audited statements): moved to become Indicator 7. Reason: the change noted above removed any mention to what evidence is present regarding the budget.

Scenario 2

1. Changed title from “Governance structure does not include a Board of Directors” to “Governance Structure operates under the auspices of the *Companies Act* or as an unincorporated business.”
2. Changed “administration/partners,” “management,” and “decision makers” to “owner(s)/operator” throughout.
3. Considerable reorganization of the indicators. Reason: to add new indicators and to create a more logical sequence.
4. New Indicator 1 reads: “If the organization has a Board of Directors, there is a process for the recruitment of new board members.”
5. Indicator 2 (i.e., orientation of new members): added qualifier: “If there is a Board of Directors” to start of sentence.
6. Indicator 3 (i.e., individuals involved in the decision-making process): added the phrase “as it relates to the governance of the organization.”
7. Indicator 6: added the idea that the conflicts of interest policy must include examples.

8. Indicator 7 (formerly Indicator 5): changed from “The bookkeeper/accountant responsible for finances can describe the budgeting process” to “The owner(s)/operator has a policy and process that guides the financial management of the organization.”

Standard 43 – Structure of Organizations

1. New standard.
2. New title: “The service provider facilitates continuous quality improvement and outcome evaluation.”
3. Outline of what this standard is about, as described in the preamble:
 - a. Having a strategy for establishing and maintaining a data collection system that is capable of supporting outcome monitoring, evaluation, and quality improvement efforts.
 - b. Developing and/or reviewing programs, services, and/or work plans to identify outcomes or goals, to measure their success indicators or the evidence used to evaluate outcomes or goals, etc.
 - c. Describing the organization’s outcome goals, stipulating the training needed, and defining the various components involved.
 - d. Training staff to ensure they know how to monitor and measure outcomes and use the organization’s data collection system.
4. There are 6 new indicators:
 - a. Indicator 1: addresses policy and procedure regarding continuous quality improvement and outcome evaluation;
 - b. Indicator 2: addresses having and maintaining a data collection system;
 - c. Indicator 3: addresses staff training;
 - d. Indicator 4: addresses implementing a quality improvement plan;
 - e. Indicator 5: addresses having an annual review of programs, services, and/or work plans; and
 - f. Indicator 6: addresses monitoring the individuals’ goals and supporting them to reach their goals.

Standard 44 – Structure of Organizations

1. Formerly Standard 43.
2. Changed title from “The service provider has a written statement of its purpose and values” to “The service provider has practices that promote its purpose and values.”
3. Indicator 2 (i.e., staff can explain how their work reflects the organization’s values): deleted first two sentences. Reason: the assumption of ownership and the attitude of “buying into” the purpose and values are subjective and hard to measure.

Standard 45 – Structure of Organizations

1. Formerly Standard 44.
2. Preamble: Paragraph 1: added examples in various places.
3. Indicator 1: changed “individuals” to “stakeholders” and added examples.
4. Indicator 3:
 - a. added “internal” to “external factors”; and
 - b. added “and its future direction” to the end of the indicator

Standard 46 – Structure of Organizations

1. Formerly Standard 45.
2. Preamble: Paragraph 3, first sentence: changed “goals as a whole” to “goals as they relate to the scope of service.”
3. Indicator 1 (i.e., process to obtain relevant information about individuals): added “interests.”
4. Indicator 3 (i.e., “drive” the planning process): changed “preferences” to “interests.”
5. Indicator 6 (i.e., significant aspects of individuals’ lives): added “cultural sensitivity” to list of examples.
6. Indicator 7 (i.e., supports and resources to assist individuals to achieve their goals): added an example.

Standard 47 – Structure of Organizations

1. Formerly Standard 46.
2. Preamble: added considerable information about accountability, financial statements, audits, recommendations, insurance, and funds belonging to individuals receiving service.

No changes to indicators.