

# AUDIT AT A GLANCE

COMMUNITY LIVING BC'S FRAMEWORK FOR MONITORING HOME SHARING PROVIDERS

## Why we did this audit

- Home sharing is the main form of residential support for adults with developmental and intellectual disabilities that is funded by Community Living BC (CLBC).
- People receiving home sharing services may be vulnerable, isolated and unable to advocate for themselves.
- CLBC must therefore ensure that they are cared for in a safe environment and that they receive the services they need to lead fulfilled lives.
- In 2018/19, roughly 4,200 people lived in a home sharing provider's home and received support based on their needs and goals.
- Almost 90% received home sharing support through a service provider that was monitored indirectly by CLBC via an agency; 10% received support through a service provider directly contracted and monitored by CLBC.

## Objectives

*To determine if CLBC had implemented a monitoring framework to ensure that home sharing providers:*

1. *aligned service delivery to further quality-of-life outcomes for individuals in care (Schedule A of its contracts)*
2. *complied with contracted standards and service requirements (Schedules B and C of its contracts)*

**Audit period: 2018 to 2019**

## Conclusions

We concluded that CLBC had not implemented a monitoring framework to ensure that home sharing providers:

1. aligned their service delivery to further quality-of-life outcomes for people in care
2. complied with all contracted standards and service requirements

We made 5 recommendations to help CLBC ensure that:

- home sharing providers understand what they must do to further quality-of-life outcomes
- monitoring enables staff to verify that providers meet contract requirements
- agencies oversee their home sharing providers
- it has the data it needs to oversee monitoring
- staff complete monitoring activities as expected

**CLBC has accepted all 5 recommendations.**

## What we found

**Outcomes were not clearly defined in contracts, but standards and service requirements were**

- Unclear how home sharing providers should align their services to further outcomes for people in their care
- Expectations to meet standards and service requirements were clear

Recommendation 1



OFFICE OF THE  
**Auditor General**  
of British Columbia

bcauditor.com

## What we found (continued)

### Monitoring policies and procedures did not examine all contract requirements

- CLBC developed two processes to monitor home sharing providers based on contract type:
  - Process for **direct-contract providers** examined standards but not outcomes or service requirements
  - Process for **agencies** did not examine whether they were monitoring their home sharing providers

Recommendation 2, Recommendation 3

### Extent of monitoring and critical incident response unclear from data

- Tools for tracking monitoring activities were incomplete or inconsistent with other monitoring reports
- System for monitoring critical incident response did not track timeliness of staff follow-up

Recommendation 4

### Inconsistent on-site monitoring and follow-up (in sample of providers)

- CLBC conducted on-site visits for 63% of providers sampled; of these, only 35% were conducted on time
- CLBC sent follow-up letters to 74% of providers who received visits; of these, only 48% were sent on time

Recommendation 5

#### *After reading the report, you may want to ask the following questions of government:*

- 1. How can CLBC improve its monitoring of home sharing providers?*
- 2. What other data could CLBC collect to improve its monitoring of home sharing providers?*
- 3. How will CLBC involve people receiving services, and service providers, in any changes it makes to its monitoring framework?*