Standing Committee on Public Accounts – May 12, 2026
Assisted Living and Social Services
Supplementary Responses

Question 1 (PA-558): MLA Renaud

Does the ministry collect any demographic data on those users? Like, could you tell us how many are in the big cities? How many are in the mid-size cities? How many are rural? Do we have any kind of insight?

In 2024-25, a total of 45,146 clients accessed CEIS programs, of which 5,813 clients self-identified as having a disability (approximately 13 per cent).

Of these, 20 clients accessed Disability Related Employment Supports (DRES) such as:

- Workplace supports (including vehicle modifications or workplace modifications)
- Educational supports (including interpreter services or note takers)
- Job search supports (including assistive technology)

Demographic Breakdown

Location (Zone/Area)	Individuals Served	Percentage of Total
North Edmonton Zone	14,897	33%
North (Small Urban and Rural Areas)	5,418	12%
South (Calgary)	17,156	38%
South (Small Urban and Rural Areas)	7,223	16%
Unknown (generally due to incorrect or unlisted postal code)	452	1%

Age (years)	Individuals Served	Percentage of Total
<18	452	1%
18-24	8,578	19%
25-44	25,281	56%
45-54	6,772	15%
55+	4,063	9%

Gender	Individuals Served	Percentage of Total
Female	21,399	47.4%
Male	23,431	51.9%
Gender Diverse	90	0.2%
Unknown	226	0.5%

Classification: Protected A

Question 2 (PA-569): MLA Eremenko

How many more complaints were made to licensing and compliance for continuing care than in the previous three years? Was there an increase in the severity or seriousness of complaints.

The following complaints summary indicates total complaints, their severity, and non-compliances issued.

	FY 21-22	FY 22-23	FY 23-24	FY 24-25
Total Complaints	229	234	179	291
Risk Breakdown:				
High	5 (2.2%)	8 (3.4%)	4 (2.2%)	11 (3.8%)
Medium	35 (15.3%)	18 (7.7%)	25 (14.0%)	55 (18.9%)
Low	115 (50.2%)	126 (53.8%)	137 (76.5%)	194 (66.7%)
N/A	74 (32.3%)	82 (35.0%)	13 (7.3%)	31 (10.7%)
Number (percentage) of non-compliance to standards related to actioned complaints				
Non-Compliance	40 (17.5%)	35 (15.0%)	29 (16.2%)	138 (47.4%)

There is no notable difference in the severity of complaints from FY 24-25 to previous years. Complaints where a risk assessment is not included (N/A) account for complaints that were referred to others, withdrawn, or assessed as frivolous or vexatious.

During 2024-2025, the most common standards investigated related to complaints across all accommodation types included Standardized Assessments and Person-Centered Care Planning, Menu Requirements, Resident Safety and Security, and Cleaning Requirements.

Question 3 (PA-569): MLA Eremenko

How many more sanctions were laid in 24-25 as compared to the previous three years? Did the severity of sanctions laid increase?

There has been an increase in the number of non-compliance (i.e., sanctions issued following investigation of complaints) in FY 24-25 compared to the three previous years. This increase is a result of enhanced clarity in legislative requirements in the *Continuing Care Act* and the expanded scope and authority to act on investigations and complaints.

Complaint severity (high, medium, low) is assessed on impact to a resident or client's health, safety, and wellbeing.

Classification: Protected A

Risk assessments are intended to categorize concern on whether they represent an isolated procedural gap or a serious potential non-compliance to legislated standards. A potential low-risk incident may be a minor administrative lapse like irregular menu postings. A potential high-risk violation may involve an immediate threat to physical safety.

How does licensing and compliance co-ordinate with protection for person in care under a different ministry? Have any financial penalties been laid under licensing and compliance in this fiscal year?

The department's Licensing and Compliance Monitoring (LCM) branch reviews complaints to determine if it is within the scope of the *Continuing Care Act* and its associated regulations and standards.

Section 30(4) of the *Continuing Care Act* states if the director reasonably believes that the subject matter of a complaint could constitute abuse against a person under the *Protection for Persons in Care Act* (PPA), the director shall refer the complaint to the Minister responsible for that act. Primary and Preventative Health Services is responsible for PPA.

LCM Continuing Care Licensing Office coordinates with Protections for Persons in Care through both formal referral mechanisms and more informal program-to-program connections.

Administrative Penalties (financial penalties):

- On April 1, 2025, administrative penalties came into effect under the *Continuing Care Act* as a mechanism of progressive enforcement.
- No administrative penalties have been issued to date.

Question 4 (PA-569): MLA Eremenko

How many kids have been approved for FSCD are waiting for a signed contract, and how many adults who have been approved for PDD are waiting for a signed contract in the fiscal year in question?

Family Support for Children with Disabilities (FSCD)

The Family Support for Children with Disabilities program does not operate as a single, linear intake system in which families are placed on one list and served strictly in order. FSCD is a needs-based program, designed to respond to the varied and often changing circumstances of children with disabilities and their families. As a result, eligibility for FSCD does not necessarily mean that a family requires immediate or ongoing services, nor does it result in placement on a waitlist. The program is designed to ensure that resources are directed where they are most needed, that families facing urgent circumstances are supported without delay, and that long-term service delivery remains stable.

Classification: Protected A

Persons with Developmental Disabilities (PDD)
ALSS prioritizes critical and urgent access through a province-wide review process that supports consistent and fair funding decisions. In 2024-25, all PDD-eligible individuals with critical and urgent needs were approved for funding to access services based on their needs.

Question 5 (PA-569): MLA Schmidt
You know, I've noted that when we've asked questions, the department has really struggled to provide answers, but when the government backbenchers ask questions, answers are readily available. I'd like the department to provide all written communications, including e-mails, text messages, briefing notes, meeting notes and calendar invitations, as well as records of phone calls, and virtual meetings between the department, the minister's office, and government caucus members or caucus staff relating to preparation for the Public Accounts Committee held on May 12, 2025, including any discussions regarding anticipated lines of questioning, witness preparation, messaging or committee strategy.

Records excluded from *Access to Information Act* (ATIA) include communications between MLAs and communications to or from a Minister. Caucus communications are not subject to ATIA unless copies are held within departmental systems. In those cases, they would be assessed on a record-by-record basis.

Records where ATIA does apply include communications within the public service, such as communications involving Deputy Ministers and departmental staff. Where ATIA applies, information may still be withheld or redacted based on content. For example, advice to an official may be protected under section 29.

Question 6 (PA-569): MLA Armstrong-Homeniuk
Through you, because I actually love service dogs a lot, I'd like to ask some questions about service dogs. Could you tell me more about the service dog program and why the government of Alberta funds this program? Also, I'd like to know about Alberta's approach and how Albertans with disabilities are supported through the service dog program.

Two pieces of legislation govern the use of assistance dogs in Alberta. The *Service Dogs Act*, in force since 2009, provides public access rights and protection from discrimination for Albertans using dogs that have been qualified pursuant to the Act and its regulation. The *Blind Persons' Rights Act*, in force since 1980, provides the same protections for persons with visual impairments using guide dogs.

The Service Dog Program provides access to qualified service dogs so Albertans with disabilities have the opportunity to get a job, go to school, access services, and participate in their communities.

Classification: Protected A

Albertans have the option to acquire a pre-qualified service dog from an Assistance Dogs International (ADI) or International Guide Dog Federation (IGDF) organization at no cost, although waiting lists can be long. Albertans can also acquire a pre-qualified service dog from an organization on the Minister's Qualified List at a cost, or to train their own service dog and then complete the provincial assessment. This approach helps increase access while ensuring dogs meet provincial standards.

In 2024-25, Alberta had a total of 14 qualified service providers located in Edmonton, Calgary, Medicine Hat, Lethbridge, Red Deer and Grande Prairie: 11 on the Minister's Qualified List, and three are Assistance Dogs International (ADI) accredited schools with operations in Alberta.

In 2024–25, Service Dog Grant funding supported approved organizations to produce 38 qualified service dogs, provide 830 hours of owner training support, and conduct 113 service dog assessments.

Question 7 (PA-569): MLA Armstrong-Homeniuk

Since we've been exploring approaches and tools for providing improved experiences for employable Albertans with specific client accountability and program duration outcomes, I would also like to know how the ministry initiated a pilot project targeting long term income support clients in Calgary. I'd like to know how the Calgary pilot for long term income support recipients contributed to increased program efficiency.

In August 2024, ALSS launched a pilot project involving 1,178 long term Expected to Work (ETW) Income Support recipients in Calgary. Participants were reintroduced to the Income Support program and provided an updated Employment Readiness Assessment to identify barriers to employment.

Program staff and clients co-created a vigorous and reasonable action plan with the goal for the client to find a job. Examples of action plan activities may have included attending a job search workshop, updating their CVs and engaging with a contracted employment supports provider for more individualized support.

The project defined employment timelines as measurable outcomes for ETW clients and required staff to review action plan items with ETW clients using digital tools. In eight months of this pilot, approximately 30 per cent of the initial pilot group resulted in their files closing for various reasons including securing employment.

Learnings from the pilot informed the development of an updated approach connecting to and supporting long term Income Support – ETW clients in their participation in the Income Support program and to access employment services. This includes ensuring clients have an up-to-date Employment Readiness Assessment and are accountable to a goal-oriented action plan that keeps the client involved and invested in their future employment goals. Each individualized action plan has specific outcomes and objectives, including a connection to an employment service provider or internal

Classification: Protected A

employment services. Additionally, dashboards are utilised to track and monitor outcomes to assist in developing further strategies on how staff will work with the client to connect them to employment services.

Income Support program expectations include client participation in services that move them closer to employment. A client's choice to not participate may result in future benefits being held and the eventual closure of a file.

Question 8 (PA-569): MLA Armstrong-Homeniuk

Another one I'd like to ask would be – this is regarding independent advocacy with Alberta's disability system and the ministry's support for accountability mechanism related to disability services – what role did the office of the Advocate for Persons with Disabilities play within the disability services system for individuals with disabilities and what mechanism does the advocate use to provide advice? How is it used by the ministry?

The Office of the Advocate for Persons with Disabilities (OAPD) promotes awareness of disability related issues and helps thousands of Albertans with assistance in navigating disability-related issues across government systems.

The department provides ongoing support and funding to the Advocate's Office to enable advocacy and system-wide issue identification. The Advocate raises systemic issues and identifies opportunities to improve outcomes for Albertans with disabilities across government programs and services through ongoing interactions with individuals with disabilities, their networks and community organizations.

The Advocate provides advice to the government through regular meetings, written reports and recommendations, participating in consultations facilitated by various ministries and programs, and collaborative work with other public agencies, such as the Premier's Council on the Status of Persons with Disabilities.

Classification: Protected A