



Claiming Full Citizenship

Self Determination • Personalization • Individualized Funding
2015 International Conference

October 15 - 17, 2015 | Vancouver, BC, Canada

The Vancouver Benchmarks

Proposed benchmarks up to 5th November

Please note: We're making steady progress towards a strong set of draft Benchmarks, but without more comments and 'Likes' on the Vancouver Benchmarks Facebook page it's not possible to say which suggestions have won strong support. So for now the evolving list, below, just sets out the suggestions that have been offered and debated on the Facebook page. When we close those discussions in early December, we'll hammer the list into a shape that's good enough to open further discussions, and further development of the Benchmarks, with organizations across many countries that share a genuine commitment to full citizenship for every person with disabilities.

| | |
|--|--|
| 1 There is political commitment to citizenship, rights, and inclusion | |
| 1.1 | There is an office of government which has responsibility and the power to make sure that the policy-making processes of every department of government takes account of the needs and rights of citizens with disability, and ensures that the policies of different departments work together in ways that are beneficial to people with disability. |
| 1.2 | Each year, the government issues an annual audit report which clearly articulates what has been done, in the context of their publicly stated commitments, to advance the citizenship, rights and inclusion of people with disabilities they are mandated to serve. The report includes goals and objectives for the following year(s). |
| 1.3 | The government provides resources for a 'shadow' report on their compliance with the benchmarks, similar to the shadow report for a country's report on compliance with the UNCRPD. The report is developed by people independent of government, for example third sector organisations or peak user bodies. |
| 2 - and there is adequate public funding | |
| 3 There is strong input from those who use services and their organisations in policy development, system design and monitoring | |
| 3.1 | Organisations representing people with disability are funded to develop policy and build the capacity of people with disability to be equal decision makers and developers of policy with government. |
| 3.2 | Government departments responsible for the delivery of publicly funded disability supports and services include people with disabilities and their |

| | |
|---|--|
| | allies on their governance structures to provide input on policy development, system design and monitoring. |
| 3.3 | Government departments responsible for developing public policy actively employ people with disability in paid policy development roles and in their governance structures to provide input on policy development, system design and monitoring (even on a project basis). |
| 4 Political commitment to prioritize individual choice and control in human services. | |
| 4.1 | All shared living or weekday activity arrangements for people with disabilities are required to demonstrate that they have governance systems that ensure the arrangements reflect the wishes of each individual with disabilities who uses, or is intended to use, the service. Where necessary, these arrangements employ person-centred planning methods and independent advocacy to establish the individual's wishes. Governance arrangements ensure that the arrangements are regularly reviewed to ensure that they continue to reflect the individual's wishes. |
| 4.2 | Any institutional services are subject to closure programmes, with explicit target dates, and with sufficient funding to provide alternative support arrangement in the community that are based on the preferences of each person. |
| 5 There is a well-designed system for easy and equitable access to entitlement-based, disability compensation (social model) funding for each person, with recognition of the contributions and needs of family members and others who provide unpaid support. | |
| | |
| 6 There is a well-designed system for funding and delivery of support services | |
| 6.1 | The government, as source for individualized funding, recognizes that individuals and their closest others can be trusted to utilize individualized funding in ways and means that are going to improve individuals' lives, providing relevant experiences that lead to meaningful citizenship in community. This allows for flexibility in usage of funding and easy processes for accounting for funds and actions. The indicators for agreed outcomes, and the way in which reports will be provided on progress, are designed to be meaningful and practical to the funding recipient. |
| 6.2 | Individualized funding for individuals is implemented without monetary caps, since caps tend to actually cost more in the long run. |
| 6.3 | The government collaborates with community leaders (including advocates, researchers, family leaders and leaders with disabilities) to design the frameworks for individualized funding and independent facilitation. |
| 7 There is political commitment to inclusive policies across all public services | |
| 7.1 | There is an overarching disability strategy or framework across all public services with specific reporting requirements on disability access and inclusion. |

| | |
|---|--|
| 7.2 | There are clear internal pathways through which people can lodge complaints relating to poor access and/or inclusion facilities and practices with public organisations and expect timely, corrective action. |
| 7.3 | Investment across the whole range of civic services, including health, education, and transport, is directed to strengthening services used by citizens as a whole so that those services have the capacity and readiness to include and serve people with disabilities. This replaces funding being used to create or perpetuate separate systems for people with disabilities. |
| 8 Systems are responsive to the variety of cultures of communities within the jurisdiction | |
| | |
| 9 There is a range of trustworthy information, advice, and decision support services from both specialist and mainstream organisations, including supported decision-making. | |
| | |
| 9.1 | The government invests in community-based resources, including organisations controlled by citizens with disabilities, that can assist people to plan and manage the use of their IF allocation, and strengthen their networks in community. |
| 9.2 | Governments seed and support community development in local areas to insure that on-the-ground systems actually reflect the local issues and the local lived experience, and include a range of stakeholders in the development of alternatives, such as family networks, peer support initiatives, independent facilitation, etc. |
| 9.3 | Government recognise ‘supported decision making’ as a legally valid option that stands alongside substitute decision making options such as Guardianship despite SDM arrangements sometimes being ‘less formal’ and ‘unsigned’. |
| 9.4 | Governments seed and support community development in local areas to insure that on-the-ground systems actually reflect the local issues and the local lived experience, and include a range of stakeholders in the development of alternatives, such as family networks, peer support initiatives, independent facilitation, etc. |
| 9.5 | Governments fund the provision of trained and regulated planning support agents (“brokers”; “facilitators”) who are chosen by and accountable to people with disabilities, and are independent from government and service delivery. |
| 10 There is strong input from those who use services in the development, operation, and oversight of local public services | |
| 10.1 | People with disabilities (physical or intellectual) are meaningfully consulted at an early stage in the design and development of new public services and/or physical and social infrastructure. Similar consultation should also occur when existing services and infrastructure are being reviewed, re-designed or re-developed. |
| | |

| | |
|--|---|
| 11 The market for support and services operates to provide choice and control for citizens with disabilities. | |
| | |
| 12 Independent research and evaluation informs system and service design, and the practice of workers. | |
| | |
| 13 Training is relevant, high quality, and designed for both mainstream and specialist audiences. | |
| | |
| 14 Mainstream commercial organisations are in the market of supports, services, housing, and equipment. | |
| | |
| 15 Support services and personal assistance are focused on delivering to each individual's requirement. | |
| | |
| 16 Public services are inclusive, for example in health, education, housing, employment, transport, environment, etc. | |
| 16.1 | All new housing has to be built to an accessible standard, and governments must work out a balance between regulation and incentive to encourage the retrofitting of the existing housing stock to an accessible standard. |
| 16.2 | Government funding to community organizations to promote inclusion is channeled through organisations that are non-profit and/or led by people with disabilities, and local enough to identify which community services and organisations will use the funding most effectively to support inclusion. |
| | |
| 17 Mainstream commercial products and services (including housing) take account of citizens with disability in their design, marketing, and delivery. | |
| | |
| 18 High quality support services and/or personal assistance are delivered to the requirements of each individual. | |
| 18.1 | Support and personal assistance services utilize personal outcome data in their design and ongoing operation. |
| | |