

Evaluating the outcomes for people who have moved from group home to home share



Inclusion BC Conference

May 2015

Vancouver, B.C



a place of mind

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

CENTRE FOR INCLUSION AND CITIZENSHIP

Project Team



- Dr. Rachelle Hole Associate Professor,
School of Social Work – UBC Okanagan
Co-director, Centre for Inclusion and Citizenship
- Dr. Tim Stainton Professor and Director of the School of
Social Work – UBC
Director, Centre for Inclusion and
Citizenship
- Assunta Rosal Masters Candidate, UBC Okanagan
School of Social Work
- Jordan Lige Self-Advocate



Background of the Project



- Initiated and funded by CLBC
- Purpose is to explore self advocates' experiences of transitioning from group homes to home share with a special focus on how living in home share influences self advocates' quality of life (QoL) as informed by Dr. Schalocks' QoL index.



Research Design



- Exploratory qualitative study
- Aim – to gather in-depth information about the transition from group home living to home sharing:
 - Understanding individual satisfaction with their current home sharing experience
 - Understanding how an individuals quality of life is impacted by the home sharing model
- Data collection – interviews
 - (face to face, Skype and telephone interviews)
- Data analysis – thematic analysis –
 - finding patterns and interrelationships in the data (interviews).

All names and places have been changed in quotes used in this presentation.

Participants



Participants:

Participants	Interior	Lower Mainland	Van. Is./ Sunshine Coast	Central and Northern BC	Total #
# of Self Advocates	4	12		1	17
# of HS Providers	1	6			7
# of Family Members	3	4	1		8
Total Interviews -					32

Number of Self-Advocates represented	
	25

Number of Self-Advocates we spoke to directly	
	17

Participants



Participants:

Age & Gender of Self Advocates Represented in Study			
Age		Male	Female
19 – 30 years	6	10	15
31 – 40 years	12		
41 – 50 years	5		
51 – 60 years	2		
61 – 70 years			
71 years & over			
Total # of Self Advocates Represented →			25

Quality of Life (QoL) Framework



International recognized – Schalock QoL model

Represents over 30 years of research about QoL

From a sensitizing notion of “A Good Life” to a social construct

- ✦ Provides a conceptual framework to assess personal outcomes
- ✦ Mechanism for operationalizing and measuring UNCRPD rights



Quality of Life (QoL) Framework



Four organizing principles:

1. QoL same factors and relationships for all people;
2. QoL experienced when individual needs are met and person has the opportunity to pursue life enrichments in major life activity settings
3. QoL has both subjective and objective components; and
4. QoL is a multidimensional construct, influenced by Individuals and environmental factors (Verdugo et al., 2012)



Quality of Life (QoL) Framework



3 Second-order factors and 8 Domains

1. Independence
 1. Personal Competence
 2. Self-determination
2. Social Participation
 1. Interpersonal relationships
 2. Social Inclusion
 3. Rights
3. Personal Well-being
 1. Emotional
 2. Physical
 3. Material



INDEPENDANCE: Personal Development



- 80% of respondents reported improved PD since moving from GH to HS
- SA are doing more for themselves
- PD varied widely from simple tasks of daily living to more complex activities such as organizing one's schedule.
- Participants also described areas where they might still need supports.
- Ability to travel independently was an example of improved PD



INDEPENDANCE: Self-Determination



1. Who decides?
2. Increased Autonomy
3. SA's doing more for themselves
4. SA liked HS better because...
 1. Needs no longer secondary to other residents
 2. Increased flexibility.
5. More control over environment
6. Increased Personal controls
7. Sensitivity to preferences



Transitioning from GH to HS



1. Decreased sense of personal controls when HS presented as the only option
2. Despite this - SA are now in HS they liked better than GH and where they wanted to continue to live.
3. All seventeen SA interviewed stated they preferred HS to GH
4. Participants reported HS supporting SA to achieve unique desires and personal goals.
5. Opportunities to express preferences and choices.



SOCIAL PARTICIPATION: Interpersonal Relationships



1. Relationships between HS and SA pivotal and significant

HS provider often a primary source of emotional, physical and social supports.

2. SA described HS providers in affectionate terms.

3. Many HS providers worked first as a support worker to the SA.

4. Long established friendships

5. HS providers proud of SA accomplishments



SOCIAL PARTICIPATION: Interpersonal Relationships



1. Intimate relationships
2. Family relationships
3. Social Networks
4. Home share providers and family members collaborating = improved QoL for SA



SOCIAL PARTICIPATION: Social Inclusion



- Community integration and participation
- 4 SA attended church weekly and participated in church activities.
- 15 SA described participation in Special Olympics, volunteering, arts & crafts, cooking classes and other activities offered through community centre.
- 10 SA preferred less active social schedule: spending time at home, going for coffee, hanging out.



SOCIAL PARTICIPATION: Rights



1. 3 SA no longer interface with the legal system.
2. 1 SA lived on the streets, then in GH and finally HS
3. Human rights were raised directly in three interviews
 - a. 1 SA no longer on probation
 - b. In adequate Notice that the Group Home was closing
 - c. In appropriate HS placement led SA to develop anxiety



PERSONAL WELL BEING: Emotional



1. Contentment – “Happy” Factor
2. Improved Self-concept
3. Lack of Stress
4. Affection



PERSONAL WELL BEING: Physical



1. Improved Overall Health – focus on fitness
2. Management of medications – linked to emotional well-being
3. Daily Living – self care and mobility
4. Physical Activities – recreation
5. Self-care and personal competencies linked to limitations of the individuals disability.



PERSONAL WELL BEING: Material



1. Financial Status
2. Employment
3. Housing - Home Share
 1. Pluralistic relational intervention: addresses individual limitations and societal barriers
 2. Responsive to SA unique needs, interests and dreams (“A Good Life), increases social inclusion, normalizes life experience and protects human rights.



Flexible and Responsive



1. Part of the Family
2. Separate suite
3. Part of the family/separate suite
4. Duplex
5. Roommates vs married couple
6. Jordan's Home

