

INDIVIDUALIZED FUNDING IN CANADA

Presented October 17, 2015

Claiming Full Citizenship 2015
International Conference

Presented by:
Member of the National
Individualized Funding Discussion
Group

Canadian Provinces and Territories



Individualized funding Advocacy

- ▣ IF began as result of pressure brought by advocates, for example:
 - British Columbia: 1970's – families of residents of Woodlands Institution advocate for IF as model for funding closure
 - Alberta: 1980's – families of individuals with significant challenges who could not obtain support through service providers
 - Ontario: June 1980 - Judith Snow secures order in council for first individualized funding arrangement

Policy and Legislative Reform

- ▣ Comprehensive policy frameworks in some jurisdictions (Alberta)
- ▣ Funding mechanisms and evolving policy in other jurisdictions (Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island)
- ▣ Slow implementation in others (Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, BC*)

A Little More Detail

- Ontario
- Manitoba
- Saskatchewan
- Alberta

Ontario

- ▣ First IF program 1982 for respite services
- ▣ First IF legislation introduced in 2008
- ▣ At present IF represents about 8% of funding for supports and services to people who have an intellectual disability
- ▣ Capped at \$35,000 (25 plus 10)
- ▣ Difficult to access full range of support for creating a home in community
- ▣ Policy framework still under development
- ▣ Growing recognition of the value of independent facilitation

Manitoba

- ▣ In the Company of Friends (ICOF) launched as a pilot project in 1993
- ▣ ICOF – individualized, one-source funding
- ▣ ICOF embraces Support Networks
- ▣ Manitoba Vulnerable Person's Act 1996
- ▣ Innovative LIFE Options Inc. (LIFE) created in 2000 provides resources, guidance and support

Saskatchewan

- ▣ Joint community – government policy development since 2012
- ▣ Demonstration project June 2014 - December 2015
- ▣ Final decision hoped for in spring 2016
- ▣ Want IF to be option on menu of services
- ▣ Funding will be based on individual plan and needs within standard funding guidelines

Alberta

- ▣ IF for families of children (under 18 yrs of age) in place for 40+ years; over 90% access supports through IF
- ▣ IF for adults in place for 30+ years; 15 % access IF (down from 30% in early years); growing annually
- ▣ Inclusion Alberta established province's first and only resource centre to assist adults and their families in all aspects of IF
- ▣ All IF flows to individuals/families directly
- ▣ No upper limits to funding

National Individualized Funding Discussion Group

- ▣ Formed to promote national dialogue and to coordinate advocacy action on IF
- ▣ 9 of 10 provinces represented on discussion group
- ▣ Range of perspectives included (family members, researchers, academics, service providers, policy experts, etc.)

Individualized Funding - A Framework for Effective Implementation

- ▣ Recognizes IF as significant tool for advancing goals of UN Convention
- ▣ Developed as resource for government, families and service providers
- ▣ Aimed at working towards a consistent understanding of what IF is, the role it plays in providing supports and strategies for advancing implementation

Four Key Principles

- ▣ Self determination
- ▣ Individual control of needed supports and services
- ▣ Supports that are person-directed, comprehensive, flexible, responsive and reflective of what the person envisions for their life
- ▣ Role of family and friends recognized and given legitimate status

Six Essential Elements

- ▣ Eligibility
- ▣ Funding
- ▣ Planning
- ▣ Supports for Implementation
- ▣ Quality Evaluation
- ▣ Accountability

Eligibility

- ▣ Criteria is fair and transparent and is based on disability related support needs
- ▣ Universally available to all eligible individuals
- ▣ Not based on perception of persons ability to administer the funds

Funding

- ▣ Based on person directed plan developed by the individual
- ▣ Involved direct payment to the individual (or designated supporter)
- ▣ Is subject to transparent ceilings and guidelines

Planning

- ▣ Is directed by the individual
- ▣ Planning functions are separate from eligibility, service deliver and funding functions
- ▣ Be available as needed over time

Supports for Implementation

- ▣ A support structure is necessary
- ▣ It may be informal (Support Circle, family/friends) or formal (Microboard, resource centre)
- ▣ Supports are distinct from funding, eligibility and assessment process
- ▣ Provision of legal framework for supported decision making

Quality and Evaluation

- ▣ Success is self measured
- ▣ Ongoing evaluation
- ▣ Clear quality standards of services are in place
- ▣ Safeguards to protect rights
- ▣ Appeal mechanisms exist
- ▣ Issues that arise (policy and/or service delivery) are monitored and attended to

Accountability

- ▣ Individual (with support) responsible for use of funding
- ▣ Accountability simple and flexible
- ▣ Lines of accountability are clear
- ▣ User friendly financial accounting in place
- ▣ Supports for adhering to accounting expectations are available

DISCUSSION