OXFORD COUNTY
WOODINGFORD LODGE SERVICE REVIEW
PROJECT LAUNCH MEETING: MARCH 27, 2013
NOTES

ATTENDANCE

Councillor Margaret Lupton, Mayor, Township of Zorra
Councillor David Mayberry, Mayor, Township of South-West Oxford
Warden Don McKay, Mayor, Township of East Zorra-Tavistock.
Councillor Sandra Talbot, Councillor, City of Woodstock.
Councillor Marion Wearn, Mayor, Township of Blandford-Blenheim

Peter Crockett, Chief Administrative Officer
Lynn Buchner, Director of Corporate Services & Treasurer
Corrie Fransen, Corporate Manager and Administrator, Woodingford Lodge

Ian Smith, Regional Leader, MNP Consulting
Tim Dobbie, MNP Consulting.

PURPOSE OF MEETING

- To examine all aspects of service delivery, explore potential efficiencies and cost savings.
- To keep residents and partners informed in order to limit their angst.
- To develop a clear understanding of objectives - what is on the table, what is not.
- To encourage informal, open dialogue.
- To bring in some capacity to help us along the way if necessary. Must be operationally viable.

SETTING THE REVIEW CONTEXT

- It is imperative that the quality of care currently offered by the Lodge be maintained
    - The Lodge currently offers really good service
- We want to ensure the sustainability of operations
    - Not be a huge burden on the taxpayer
    - As part of the review, we need to find efficiencies
- The current problems with the buildings:
    - Are they serious?
    - Will they involve future costs?
    - Are there construction-related barriers to gaining efficiencies eg., layout of the facilities
- Given the escalating costs overall, what are the drivers of the costs and how can we change them?
- There are increasing needs in the community for the long term care services
    - There are 500 on the waiting list
        - Why? Quality care being offered; issue is cost
    - There is also a change in nature of services required
        - Now have residents with multiple care needs which increases staffing needs.
- It was understood that the new satellite facilities would cost more
    - The objective was to serve other communities
    - Number of beds was/is a concern (re., efficiencies)
- We want to demonstrate that the Lodge is being efficient and effective with current expenditures/costs
- There is a concern about how the review will affect staff

o   We/they have pride in being a good employer

CONFIRMING THE PROJECT PARAMETERS

Purpose

- To ensure accountability:
    o   Provide best service
    o   Be most efficient
    o   Be sustainable

> As part of this process, we want to assess the alternatives available to the Lodge

- Want to retain the total number of beds available in the county
- Want to build a plan to ensure a more stable/secure future for residents and staff
    o   Make a decision and move forward
- Want to make an informed decision that sets the future direction

Scope

- Not revisit the historical decisions
    o   What are the options to move forward?
    o   We have three buildings, what do we do now?!
    o   Look at everything; not dwell on past

Deliverables

- Plan for long term care in the County
    o   Understand the implications in terms of:
        ▪   Costs
        ▪   Services
        ▪   Regulatory/Provincial requirements
    o   Address future issues and demands
    o   Focus should be on the long term – may have short term pain for long term gain
    o   Implementation plan

Work Plan and Timeline

- Refer to Appendix A which was attached to the Agenda

Communications /Engagement

- Council
    o   Interview all councillors not on Ad Hoc committee
        ▪   Provide questions in advance
        ▪   Can conduct by telephone
    o   Provide progress reports and key milestone reports
- Residents
    o   Check in with resident advisory council
    o   Follow-up on specific questions?
- Staff
    o   Lodge: Administrator connecting on a regular basis
    o   County: It has been communicated that this review is of many service reviews that the County will be conducting over time
- Others to be contacted:
    o   Ministry/LHIN: County staff and consultant will be determining the best approach to connect with them

- o Hospitals: Consultant will be interviewing
- o Service providers to the Lodge: Administrator to connect with them

BUILDING THE ACTION PLAN

Regulatory Environment

- We are not alone. Other municipalities as well as private sector are looking at long-term care.
- Falls under *Long-Term Care Homes Act, 2007* (Refer to separate PowerPoint presentation prepared by the consultant).
- Ministry of Health posts inspections on website – Woodingford is running well within the legislation.
- We must remain cognizant of pay equity issues, Public Works operators are the comparator for long-term care staff.

Comparable Operations

- Long-term care home is not the same as a seniors' home. Much older resident population, complex needs – average stay of 3 years to 18 months – end of life.
- The community values our homes which is not the case in many other municipalities.
- Ministry is studying the impact of long-term care on municipalities in southern Ontario.
- Private sector often approaches municipalities that cannot meet regulatory standards, but that is not the case here in Oxford.
- If private sector homes can make a profit, why? Is it just related to staff costing?
    - o Private sector homes are extremely functional, ceilings lower, rooms smaller.
    - o Statistically, the optimum number is 32 resident rooms per dining room. Our ratio of rooms to dining rooms is 17 in satellites and 26/27 in Woodstock relative to the 32.
    - o Biggest factor is wages.
    - o Some successful private sector homes use centralized corporate office to deal with paperwork for the operation of multiple homes – 8 homes make corporate office viable. Potential opportunity to form alliance with other municipalities for shared services.

NEXT STEPS

1. Continue meetings with staff
2. Arrange and conduct interviews with councillors, Province and hospitals
3. Plan for the next meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee (later in May)