

## DRAFT ONLY

### PREFACE

The Social Services Policy Committee of the Greater Vancouver Regional District (GVRD) is one of nine Policy Committees which came into existence through the Planning Department of the GVRD in response to the "Report on Livability", November, 1972, submitted by the GVRD Planning Committee. The purpose of the committees is to involve citizens, citizens groups, administrators, politicians, and technicians together in determining community needs and in the development of policies and programs to meet those needs. The committees were organized "so as to focus the attention of each committee on one or more urban systems, since it is essentially these systems which, through their operation, affect the everyday lives of the people of the Region and consequently affect livability." The committees have been charged with presenting policy statements to the GVRD Planning Committee and Board by October, 1973.

The underlying concern of this committee is the provision of the highest quality of care to meet community needs. In our initial discussions regarding social services and their delivery, it became clear that many frustrations exist in setting up community service facilities. In particular, community-based groups attempting to create new or innovative services find that the structures through which they must deal are inflexible. The present structures are unable to adjust their functions and processes to accomodate creative programs for providing services. There is no provision or opportunity for community groups to design programs and facilities to meet their own specific and unique needs. Community service facilities must conform to a set and structured model in order to become licensed, and that model may not be suitable for delivery of the type of service the facility is intended to provide. This limitation gravely affects the ability and initiative of people to be directly and responsibly involved in the development of services to their own communities.

This brief has been prepared by our committee to point out the obstacles which must be overcome by anyone attempting to provide a community service, and the destructive effects these obstacles create in the ability of people to meet their own community needs, and to make recommendations which might eliminate some of the existing problems. We have chosen the experiences of the Mental Patients Association and South Hill and Grandview Day Care Centres as examples to document our findings.

---

1. GVRD, February 26, 1973. Policy Committees - Membership and Terms of Reference.

## AGENDA

SOCIAL SERVICES POLICY COMMITTEE - JULY 11, 1973

- ✓ 1. Call to Order.
- ✓ 2. Approval of Agenda
3. Approval of Minutes
4. Correspondence
  - ✓ a. Response to telegram re: South Hill Day Care Centre
  - ✓ b. Letter from Health Minister Cocke in response to our letter regarding his attendance.
  - ✓ c. Letter from Human Resources Minister Levi in response to our letter regarding citizen participation in the administration of the Community Care Facilities Licensing Act.
  - ✓ d. Letter to Barrett regarding his comments on professionalism has not as yet been written.
- ✓ 5. Report from Finance Sub-Committee. S. Persky
- ✓ 6. New Business
  - a. Possible hiring of someone to write up the brief once all parts have been gotten together.
- ✓ 7. Brief Report
  - ✓ a. Presentation of proposed structure of the brief.
  - ✓ b. Distribution of prepared drafts for the brief:
    - ✓ 1). Preface
    - ✓ 2). Introduction
    - ✓ 3). Pre-draft of description of the problem.These to be read and discussed at the next meeting.
  - c. Discussion on the third aspect of the brief:
    - 1) The significance of our investigation and what we learned
    - 2) Recommendations
8. Further directions of the committee. Discussion.
9. Adjournment.

## PROPOSED STRUCTURE OF BRIEF

### I Memo of Transmission

Short letter to explain what the brief is and why it is being submitted.

### II Preface

To explain the existence of the Social Service Policy Committee and how we undertook preparation of this brief.

### III Introduction

Instructions to the reader and general discourse on the conclusions and recommendations contained in the brief.

### IV Body of the Brief

- ✓ A. Discursive description of the problem.  
Chronology - Appendix
- ✓ B. Attempts to discover and analyze the process which causes the problem, including how we went about it, what we asked, etc.  
The existing structure as we understand it.
- ✓ C. Conclusion
  - 1. Comments on the significance of the above.
  - 2. Recommendations.



# Greater Vancouver Regional District

2294 WEST TENTH AVENUE VANCOUVER 9, BRITISH COLUMBIA TELEPHONE 731-1155

Please refer to our file number:

## AGENDA

### SOCIAL SERVICES POLICY COMMITTEE

JUNE 26, 1973

1. Call to Order.
2. Approval of agenda
3. Minutes of the last meeting.
4. Attendance of H. Rankin
5. Correspondence:
  - Clipping re: Integration Hearings
  - No reply as yet from Levi.
6. Sub-Committee Reports:
  - Finance Committee
  - Membership Committee
7. Brief Committee Reports:
  - Sub-Committee 1 - Draft
  - Sub-Committee 2
  - Sub-Committee 3 - Where are you??
8. Beyond the brief: further directions of this committee.
9. Report from M. Payne on the Government & Society Policy Committee.
10. New Business?
11. Date of next meeting. Chairman of next meeting.



# Com. Care Facilities Licensing Board

## Dept of Health

Dr. Larsen - Chairman  
Ray Goodacre  
Ted Luscombe



Standards +  
Regulations  
Health Inspection

## Human Resources

Don Bingham  
Eric Berry  
Iris Preddy

Alternative Person  
Jack Allman



Financing  
- capital grants  
- equipment grants  
- daycare subsidies  
- special needs centers

## Education

John Walsh  
One seat not filled



Training  
Resource only  
advisors  
+  
liaison  
at present



Received from Dr Tyhurst  
May 30/73.  
TYHURST

SOCIAL SERVICES POLICY COMMITTEE

Report of Sub-committee I (Structure)

The following themes emerged during the presentation of the above sub-committee (29 May, 1973):

1. Centralization. From the information so far available, there is a strong impression that we are witnessing a process of centralization centered on Victoria. There is talk of the "consolidation" and "integration" of services and this rationale appears to cover the present centralization going on. While there is talk of consolidation and integration, there is also talk of a policy of <sup>essential</sup> "decentralization." However, this process of decentralization, if it is occurring at all, appears to be concerned only with the distribution of services in local areas, ~~but at the same time an increasing centralization of control.~~ In fact, it may be better to speak of a distribution of services as a process of "regionalization," and to speak of the administrative processes as being centralized or decentralized. Thus, while there may be some regionalization of services, there is at the same time a clear drift in the direction of the centralization of authority, administration, funding, licensing, employment, policy-making, etc.

2. Bureaucratization. The setting out of the structure of committees, sub-committees, centres, etc., together with the names of those persons who are on these committees and functioning at various levels, indicates a very significant degree of bureaucratization in various areas of decision-making. Those forming the boards and committees are taken from the various ministries and bureaus ~~are~~ concerned, and their names keep resurfacing as each new committee is described. Nepotism is usually thought of in a family sense, but here there appears to be a great deal

of bureaucratic nepotism.

The members of the committees seem to be drawn from the civil service ranks within the various departments.

In discussion of the roles of the various bureaucrats a number of points were made:

- (a) while it has been said that the bureaucratic functions are to be primarily "consultant" roles, nevertheless many of them appear to see themselves in a policing function.
- (b) reference is made to the notion that the bureaucrats involved are nice people, well-intentioned, whose unfavourable decisions are due not so much to their malice or bureaucratic conservatism, but rather to their simply being "uninformed" and "isolated" on the basis of "communication problems." ~~In~~ this view all that is required is that more people go over to communicate with them.
- (c) this Panglossian view was reinforced by another member who suggested that "we have to accept that policy-making is no longer in the hands of the civil servants - but in the hands of the executive assistants" and that at the present time, therefore, the civil servants "bureaucrats" do not know exactly where things are going or how to respond to specific requests. The implication of this point of view would be that if the civil servants were back in the business of policy-making, all would be well and clear answers of the appropriate type would be available.
- (d) all of this takes us back to the basic question of whether or not there are certain kinds of policy orientation underlying

some of the changes, reflected in what is happening now including the type of legislation, the centralization of power, and the great difficulties experienced by those trying to get services established on local initiative at the community level. In this view, the difficulties are primarily because the civil servants - well-meaning and well-intentioned - lack information either because of their isolation or because policy-making has been placed in the hands of executive assistants. It was suggested that both possibilities may be relevant.

3. Professionalism or Professionalization. Another impression that emerged was that professionalization had already occurred or was developing further. The numbers of professionals on various committees was pointed out, together with an emphasis and expressed concern for qualification, training including a reference to a proposed four-year course for supervisors in day centres. At the same time, it was also suggested that the concern for professional qualifications could reflect the reponse of the bureaucrats in the face of uncertainty in the evaluation of people. This may be reflected to some degree in the legislation and the amendment, but reference should also be made to the fact that the amendment contains reference to the individual's personal characteristics "Section 4 (a)(2)(a) - " ... and also possesses the qualities that, in the opinion of the Board, are necessary to meet the needs of persons requiring personal care, supervision, social and educational training, or physical or mental rehabilitative therapy ... ."

4. Much of the above relates to the tendency of the bureaucrat and of the bureaucratized professional to obey the maxim, "when in doubt, don't."



It is suggested, further, that this disposition is at present reinforced by the present atmosphere of uncertainty and reorganization currently said to prevail. (See below, para 6 .)

5. Citizen Participation. Despite rhetoric to the contrary (and the time, occasion, and wording of the statement by Levi should be looked up) there is no provision for citizen participation in the decision-making structure that has been examined so far. Various people pointed out that the composition of the committees, their terms of reference, the legislation, etc. provide no place or opportunity for citizen input prior to legislation or for citizen consultation in implementation. The whole setup as so far revealed instead of fostering and developing local initiative and citizen participation at all levels, would seem instead to be so constructed as to stifle or frustrate local initiative and to exclude or inhibit citizen participation.

Reference was made to proposed advisory committees which may or may not include citizens. A proposed advisory committee to the CCFLB was referred to, but nothing has been done on this. It was said that there is a move afoot also in North Vancouver to have the Day Care Information Centre provided with an advisory committee with users on it, but it is not clear whether this is set up yet or not.

The effect of such structures upon citizen participation have not only to do with the possibility of input in framing legislation or of consultation and implementation, but more seriously have to do with the fostering of local problem-solving, local initiative, and creative solutions to community problems. It is always possible, even within a highly centralized and bureaucratic structure to provide for some kind of citizen participation on the basis of "requests" or "invitations" to the public to send in their

comments, briefs, or reactions to questionnaires, proposals and so on.

6. Change, Reorganization, Reformulation. It was suggested that programs and policies in the social services area may be in a state of reorganization and re-statement. At the same time it was also suggested that the whole process seems to be in a state of change day by day.

Besides the effects upon decisions and responses of the bureaucrats, it was suggested also that in view of the fact that changes are going on that communication was those engaged in bringing about the changes or responsible for them would be important at this time.

7. Assessment of Need. The impression is that there is little information about the need for day care facilities, or for other types of community care facility. Nor is there clear evidence that procedures for the assessment of need are being considered or are under way.

8. Clarity of Information. While the present information-gathering efforts reported at this meeting produced a great deal of material that people had not known before, and brought it together, it was felt that there is still a great deal of information still to be obtained. There is still not yet a clear comprehension and understanding of the setup, of the ways in which decision-making proceeds through and in relationship to the various committees. There were actually some contradictions between the information that was provided by the communities or other informants, and the actual experience of those in the community.

(Examples might be given.)

At the same time, there was a strong impression that the information obtained would not have been so readily available if the person obtaining it had not done so under the ~~auspices~~ <sup>ae-gis</sup> of GVRD. There was a feeling that a private citizen would probably not be so well supplied with information.

8. Regional Differences. There was some impression that difficulties in communication and receiving cooperation, etc. might be greater in the Vancouver area than elsewhere in the province. Some effort is going to be made to check this out by having similar information obtained from other municipalities within the region.

9. Jurisdictions. There was a certain amount of confusion concerning which ministry had jurisdiction for particular committees, functions, and activities. The legislation governing these matters appears to come out under the Health Minister. At the same time, however, the minister principally involved in implementation and the development of policy in the area of day care centres particularly seems to be the Human Resources Minister. It was also suggested that there may be some conflict between the ministers <sup>and departments</sup> in regard to policy and that this also should be explored.

10. Policy. There was some question as to whether or not some of the difficulties experienced and some of the ambiguities detected might be related to the absence of any clear overall policy or policies. It was agreed that policies seem to be in some kind of a state of change. It was stated also that policy statements had been issued and that these were being made available.



Meeting of Social Service Policy Committee delegation with  
Dr. Bonham, Vancouver Health Dept.  
Thursday June 7, 1973 1-3:30 P.M.

Vancouver Health Dept.

Inspecting for a facility.

Vancouver Municipal regulations: food, crowding, etc.

Old regulations under Welfare Institutions Licensing Act.

Regulations

New regulations being written now.

CCFLB board will present new regulations to cabinet, ~~after~~  
being vetted and signed by Lt. Governor and have force  
of law.

~~AK~~

Standards

Standards may be invoked by anybody, validation of areas  
Standards have no validity in law. of judgment.

When there is discretionary power in a regulation standards  
may be adopted, ~~xxx~~ e.g. Metro Board passes standards on  
water quality.

What can be done when a facility is not adequate?

1. refuse to grant a license or a permit
2. take the case to the courts.-obtain court order to  
have facility closed down.

New Regulations: - CCFLB doing drafting, Metro Health is not  
presenting a brief, no public hearing that Dr. Bonham knows of.  
However the board has apparently received various submissions  
with regard to above from various interested organizations.  
If we wish to make recommendations they should be submitted to  
Dr. Larsen, chairman of CCFLB.

Advisory Ctte. now existant: Citizen's Advisory Ctte. to the  
Volunteers for Senions Programme -(has a paid coordinator, goes to  
boarding and nursing homes). 411 Dunsmuir. Consists of 2 operator  
of homes, some volunteers in programme, 3 staff people.

T. of Ref: make budget, money recommendations  
in charge of orientation programme.  
advisory to Dr. Bonham re direction of services.

What areas does CCFLAZt cover?

Daycare - family and group

Aged - rest homes

Boarding homes

Intermediate homes or Personal Care.

Homes for Handicapped.

Orphanages.

Do you see one of the problems under CCFLAct the multiplicity of regulations and standards? - should this be regional?

A Regional Health By-law would be appropriate - quite similar now, but regional law would be better.

(Standards, codes etc. not enforceable)

To be dealt with in setting up a facility:

zoning regulations - local and regional

fire regulations - local, and provincial.

building regulations - local, provincial, and federal (NBC)

Health regulations - provincial and municipal.

Provincial Acts and Regulations.

Municipal by-laws.



Greater Vancouver Regional District

2294 WEST TENTH AVENUE VANCOUVER 9, BRITISH COLUMBIA TELEPHONE 731-1155

Please refer to our file number:

June 7, 1973

Hon. Norman Levi,  
Minister of Human Resources,  
Legislative Buildings,  
Victoria, B.C.

Dear Mr. Levi,

The Social Services Policy Committee of the Greater Vancouver Regional District has authorized me to write to you concerning consumer (user) participation in the Community Care Facilities Licensing Board, its committees, and local advisory committees.

We would like to ask that ways be found to include consumer participation in decision-making at all levels, including day care information centres in the community. We would like to recommend that citizen input is needed during the framing of legislation and that continued citizen consultation is required in implementation.

We would much appreciate receiving some indication of your present and future policies on this matter. Thank you for your interest.

Yours sincerely,

Nancy Grant,  
Secretary to the  
Social Services Policy  
Committee

cc: Hon. Dennis Cocke  
Hon. Eileen Dailly





Greater Vancouver Regional District

2294 WEST TENTH AVENUE VANCOUVER 9, BRITISH COLUMBIA TELEPHONE 731-1155

Please refer to our file number:

May 31, 1973

Hon. Norman Levi,  
Minister of Human Resources,  
Legislative Buildings,  
Victoria, B.C.

Dear Mr. Levi,

Your letter of May 24th was read at the May 29th meeting of the GVRD's Social Services Policy Committee and I have been instructed by the members of that Committee to reply to your letter on their behalf. As you requested, I am also enclosing the Minutes of Committee meetings to date.

The members of the Social Services Policy Committee appreciate your interest in their deliberations and welcome your willingness to participate at some of the proceedings as time permits. Could you suggest a date when you might be available to meet with the Committee? We would hope that your colleagues Mr. Cocke and M s. Dailly might also be available to attend one or more of the Committee's meetings.

We look forward to hearing from you further in this regard at your earliest convenience.

Yours sincerely,

*Nancy Grant*

Nancy Grant,  
Secretary to Social Services  
Policy Committee

/ng

cc: Hon. Dennis Cocke  
Hon. Eileen Dailly



Greater Vancouver Regional District

2294 WEST TENTH AVENUE VANCOUVER 9, BRITISH COLUMBIA TELEPHONE 731-1155

Please refer to our file number:

May 30, 1973

Mr. C. Gorby,  
Executive Officer,  
Community Care Facilities Licensing  
Board Office,  
Department of Health Services,  
Parliament Buildings,  
Victoria, B.C.

Dear Mr. Gorby,

The Social Services Policy Committee of the Greater Vancouver Regional District has noted that Marilyn Dahl has recently moved from the position of Consultant on Day Care to the position of Provincial Director of Day Care Services. We understand this leaves a Consultant position vacant.

This Committee would appreciate receiving a copy of the present qualifications for this position at your earliest convenience.

The Committee believes that there is need for the consumer viewpoint to be capably represented at the Consultant level. We would like to see consideration at this time to filling this open position by a service consumer.

May we have your comments on this?

Yours sincerely,

*Nancy Grant*

Nancy Grant,  
Secretary to the  
Social Services Policy  
Committee

cc: Hon. Norman Levi  
Hon. Dennis Cocke  
Hon. Eileen Dailly