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Presentation Outline

• ICCER and the CNDRN
• Recreation services and QOL in continuing care examined using three studies:
  – Online site survey
  – Resident survey
  – Focus groups with recreation staff
• Study recommendations
• Next steps
Institute for Continuing Care Education and Research (ICCER)

A network of post-secondary institutions and continuing care providers collaborating to improve continuing care in Alberta by:

• encouraging research
• translating knowledge into better practice
• enhancing education
• informing policy
Needs Identification
## Ten Themes Identified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Sub- Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health related issues</td>
<td>Challenging behaviors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Care for non- dementia clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Client Mix</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education related issues</td>
<td>Adult Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effectiveness and outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HCA Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>System navigation and transition of care</td>
<td>Information and Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact on clients and families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology for adult learning and point of care</td>
<td>Point of care learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Literacy (ESL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role definition within the CC sector</td>
<td>Nursing professions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rehabilitation/Recreation professions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Ten Themes Identified

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Working with families</th>
<th>Family’s role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Families as CC clients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The overlooked value of family’s knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff retention and recruitment</td>
<td>Recruitment (numbers/appropriate interpersonal skills)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Retention (expectations, value of work, temporary staff)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caregiving</td>
<td>Attitudes and attributes of caregivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caregiving and couples in the CC sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Impact of habits and addictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercultural issues</td>
<td>Clients’ cultural backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff’s cultural backgrounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for Recreation and Rehabilitation staff</td>
<td>Need evidence to support funding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RT & QOL Study

• Study 1 - On-line survey of all continuing care facilities in Alberta
• Study 2 - Surveys with residents in both supportive living and long term care across Alberta
• Study 3 - Focus groups with recreation staff across Alberta
Study Three: Purpose

• The purpose of this study was to gain a better understanding of continuing care recreation staffs’ perceptions of residents’ recreation and quality of life.
Study Three: Limitations

- Organizational attitudes and funding model
Focus Groups

• Focus groups held in:
  – Fort McMurray
  – Grande Prairie
  – Edmonton and area (2)
  – Calgary and area (2)
  – Lethbridge (including Medicine Hat)

– A total of 39 recreation staff participated
Focus Group Results

- Six major themes identified:
  1. Funding
  2. Staffing
  3. Role clarity
  4. Professionalism
  5. Programming challenges
  6. Differences in perspectives on quality of life
Theme One: Funding

A. Budgets
B. Funding Model
Theme Two: Staffing

A. Lack of staff
B. Education and training
C. Volunteers
D. Locations
E. Safety
Theme Three: Role Clarity

A. Responsibilities
B. Confusion of the “therapies”
C. Therapeutic recreation vs activities
D. RAI MDS 2.0 and RAI Home Care
A. Recreation is “shunned and discredited”
B. Regional variability
Theme Five: Programming Challenges

A. Diverse and complex populations
B. Staff and administrator attitudes
C. Volunteers
D. Programming space
Theme Six: Differences in Perception of QOL

A. Lack of consensus as to what quality of life is.
How do the six themes relate?

- Funding formulas and the structure of the continuing care sector impede the appropriate funding and delivery of recreation services.
Recommendations

We made a series of 13 recommendations related to:

• Practice
• Government Policy
• Provider Organization Policy
• Education
• Research
What next?

• Continue to share our study findings
• Encourage more research into recreation services and continuing care
• Participate in the legislative review in Alberta looking at the Acts and regulations
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- www.iccer.ca
- twitter (@ICCER_AB)
- facebook
  (http://www.facebook.com/iccer.ca/)
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  - (http://tinyurl.com/p9eabah—Group) or
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