National Institute on Mental Retardation
Institut canadien pour la deficience mentale

Kinsmen NIMR Building, York University Campus
4700 Keele Street
Downsview, Ontario M3J 1P3
Canada Tel.: (416) 661-9611

THE PRAIRIE HOUSING COOPERATIVE:

A Case Study of a Cooperative, a Community and a Cultural Event (1982 - 1985)

Prepared by:

Bruce Kappel
Senior Program Officer
National Institute on Mental Retardation

July 1985

This project was carried out with the assistance of a grant from Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation under the terms of the External Research Program. The views expressed are those of the author and do not represent the official views of the Corporation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LISTING OF TABLES

PREFACE

A Caution to Readers

For many readers, the story of the Prairie Housing Cooperative may be, at first, a confusing one. The PHC is neither a typical cooperative nor a typical residential service for people with mental handicaps. As a cooperative, its housing is dispersed throughout the community in small clusters of houses in five neighbourhoods. As a place of residence for people with mental handicaps, it differs from typical residential programs in significant and profound ways which will become apparent as the story unfolds. If you, as a reader, have some preconceived notions about either cooperatives or residential services, the caution is simple -- suspend your preconceptions. This is a story about something different.

The Case Study

In 1983, the Prairie Housing Cooperative (PHC) of Winnipeg, Manitoba, applied for a Research Grant from the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) to conduct a case study of the cooperative's efforts to link cooperative housing with the movement to create opportunities for community living with dignity for people with handicaps.

The purposes of the study were identified as (i) to communicate the process of the PHC's development to interested others; (ii) to provide the descriptive basis for further study and evaluation of the quality of PHC's provision of housing and support; and (iii) to support PHC's members in learning from their experience.

This report is the final report of that case study. It is based on a series of questionnaires and interviews with the members of the Prairie Housing Cooperative and observations by the author in March 1984, September 1984, and February 1985. An interim report based on the March 1984 field visit was submitted in May 1984.

While this report covers developments from August 1982 to February 1985, it is just the beginning of a story about a group of people and the community that they are building, a community that is part of Winnipeg and devoted to supporting people with developmental special needs. This is a story that is constantly in the making as the Prairie Housing Cooperative identifies and builds on its strengths, and develops new strategies to address issues and problems.

The National Institute on Mental Retardation has an active interest in the Prairie Housing Cooperative. The PHC represents an exciting and principled approach to citizenship - the citizenship of people with developmental special needs and of their fellow citizens. It is an approach to community building that holds promise, deserves careful analysis, and critical under-

standing. This study is an attempt to assist the PHC and others to learn about the positive and negative aspects of such a venture.

As with any community, the Prairie Housing Cooperative, its members and dynamics, are complex. This report attempts to focus on various aspects of that complexity by describing the coop from three different perspectives. The first chapter discusses the context in which the PHC developed and continues to exist, and the mission in which the coop is engaged. The second chapter looks at the coop from the perspective of the people with developmental special needs. The nine people who lived in the coop in March 1984, and who are followed over the next year, are introduced. Then we take a look at the houses and households in which they live; the support provided to them and the relationships in which they are involved; their involvements in their neighbourhoods, the wider community, and decisions about their lives; and finally, their views about the kind of difference the coop has made in their lives and how they participate in the process of making decisions in the coop. Chapter III presents the structure and organization of the PHC, then turns its attention to the dynamics of continuity and renewal within the organization, and some of the challenges created by those dynamics.

The final chapter, Chapter IV, presents an overview of the Prairie Housing Cooperative, some of its major achievements and the challenges it must face.

The complexity of the story is increased by the fact that different people lived in the PHC at different times between March 1984 and February 1985. The major focus of the case study is on the nine people with special needs who were living in the PHC on a permanent basis in March 1984, but some of the data and discussion also include members who left prior to March 1984, members who joined the coop between March 1984 and February 1985, and members who left the coop during that time period. Very little information was collected on several individuals who entered and left the coop between field visits. In one way or another, almost eighty people became part of the story, just in terms of people who have lived in the coop.

The questionnaires and interview schedules used in the case study are available from the author.

Achievements and Challenges

The Prairie Housing Cooperative is an exciting development. To the best of our knowledge, it is the first attempt to achieve concurrently a number of objectives, including the following:

* to ensure that people with developmental special needs live in decent housing;
* that they have tenure in that housing that is under their control, not that of others;
* that they live with people of their own choosing, not that

of others;
* that they are surrounded by neighbours and friends who have an interest in their lives and are willing to support the development of their lives in the community;
* that they be able to remain a part of their families and/or form their own families;
* that their housing, households and arrangements with neighbours promote their membership and sense of belonging as members of neighbourhoods and the community, rather than highlighting their differences and excluding them;
* that the personal assistance provided to members with developmental special needs be flexible and responsive to the needs of the individual; be natural and informal, as well as formal, in nature; and reflect the interdependence of non-handicapped and handicapped people, rather than foster one-way dependency;
* that they experience a sense of continuity and security in terms of both home and relationships; and
* that they have decisive involvement in representing their own interests and making decisions about their lives.

Many communities and groups of people across Canada share these objectives and have tried to achieve many different combinations of them in different ways. Many of the features of the PHC are not unique, but to the best of our knowledge, the combination of those features is. Some of the aspects of the PHC which, in their combination, make it distinctive include the following:

* it is a cooperative
* no more than two people with handicaps live in the same household
* the houses are dispersed throughout the community
* neighbours are intentionally recruited to live in the coop and form relationships
* the people with handicaps are involved in fundamental decisions about their lives, including the intimate decision about with whom they share their houses
* housing and support are provided to both families and individuals; children and adults; people who require little support and those who require considerable support
* heavy reliance is placed on informal and natural supports that are mutual between members with and without handicaps and voluntary in nature
* there is a distinction between housing and support to the extent that the nature of the supports offered and arranged can change without requiring the person with a mental handicap to move out of his or her house; and it is possible to alter the nature of supports offered to a household when a person leaves the Cooperative
* people with handicaps have equal tenure.

The creation of this combination is no small achievement. It has also involved a number of problems, many of which are related to the management of a complex and rapidly growing organization;

the lack of funding for new and different housing and for various support arrangements; and the complexity of human relationships. Both the achievements and the challenges associated with PHC are discussed in this report.

Lessons for Other Communities

This is a case study, not an evaluation, but readers are quite likely to ask two "bottom-line" questions -- should it be done elsewhere, and can it be done elsewhere? You, the reader, will ultimately have to drawn your own conclusions, but the following observations are offered for your consideration:

* This report presents both the successes and the problems of the PHC, but the bottom-line for at least four of the PHC members with handicaps is that the PHC has, to date, rescued them from an almost certain future of institutionalization and dehumanization. It has provided a positive and constructive alternative for these individuals when no other positive alternative existed. In the words of one of the key leaders of the PHC, "It may not work well, but it works better."

* Especially for the most vulnerable members of the PHC, the cooperative has demonstrated the power of a decent environment -- housing, people and relationships. It has also demonstrated that a community of concern can alleviate and ameliorate both the suffering experienced in the past and some of the mistakes made in the present. Some of the attempts by the PHC to create relationships did not work out, but by and large the PHC community has been able to respond to those mistakes in such a way that its vulnerable members continue to grow and develop.

* The initiation and continued development of the PHC has required tremendous energy and commitment from many people. In the words of a Manitoba government official, "The group was zealous. This is the key to cooperative development." The development of the houses, households and support arrangements within the PHC was and is a complex undertaking, one that requires a great deal of learning from experience. Because peoples' lives are at stake, it also requires a great deal of commitment to both principles and people. The PHC is a dynamic and complex organization, it is also and fundamentally a set of human relationships complete with all the joys and sorrows associated with relationships.

* The achievements of the PHC have involved the decisive presence and commitment of groups and individuals outside of its formal organization. Both the Canadian Association for the Mentally Retarded-Winnipeg (CAMR) and the L'Avenir Community Living Cooperative have been critical actors in both the initiation of the PHC and "making it work." CAMR-Winnipeg provides invaluable back-up in terms of people, resources and advocacy. L'Avenir has been very involved in the support arrangements and personal advocacy for a number of PHC members. The PHC is clearly not a social service agency -- it does provide housing, encourage

and foster relationships, and respond to many of the needs of the indivdiuals. Intentionally, however, it does not employ people to provide support. These people are employed through other organizations and arrangements. To think about the development of cooperatives or other arrangements similar to the PHC requires careful attention to the presence of other groups and agencies which can complement and support their efforts. For many people, a decent place to live, having control over decisions and tenure, and living with and amidst decent people will respond to many of their needs and foster their strengths. For some, these things will be fundamental and important, but will not be enough. Extra support will be required.

* Where groups of people or communities are fundamentally concerned about the quality of life experienced by people with developmental special needs and must develop housing and services to support them rapidly (for instance, in response to large scale deinstitutionalization), the PHC approach is probably too complex and time consuming as a single path approach. This is not to say, however, that such efforts should not very carefully attend to many of the issues which the PHC is attempting to address.

* Where cooperatives are developing or are interested in including people with special needs, many of the features of the PHC could be easily adapted and/or introduced. As mentioned above, however, it is important to involve people and organizations who have good experience and knowledge with developing both formal and informal supports for people with special needs. A major contribution such people and organizations can make is to assist in demystifying the needs of people with special needs, and assist other citizens to realize that they are, first of all, people.

I. THE CONTEXT AND THE MISSION

A. THE MISSION - THE PRAIRIE HOUSING COOPERATIVE

The Prairie Housing Cooperative sees itself as more than housing organized on a cooperative basis, though it is certainly that. The PHC was designed for people with developmental special needs. Specifically, it was designed to address the needs of such citizens in three areas:

* housing that is decent, affordable, and integrated;
* supportive relationships with friends, neighbours and families;
* control and ownership of their housing arrangements.

In the words of one of the PHC's leaders,

> ... it is not just housing. There must be a commitment on the part of people to support vulnerable members and there must be supports available to sustain and regenerate that commitment.

It is clear from the PHC's literature and documents, the words of its members, and its actions that it is an approach that has been designed and developed to respond to the specific needs of individuals. Unlike the vast majority of human services offered to people with developmental special needs, the people do not have to "fit into" the PHC. The PHC sees itself as changing and adapting in response to the person. The "fit" between needs and arrangements is determined, by and large, by the person, not the program.

B. THE NEED - PEOPLE WITH HANDICAPS IN AND FROM WINNIPEG

At any given time in a community, there are people with developmental special needs who live in circumstances which create demands for new and quality services:

* those individuals who live in institutions and other large, congregate care facilities;
* those individuals who live in the community but are at risk of being institutionalized; and,
* those individuals who live in the community, but whose needs are not being met.

The Prairie Housing Cooperative is relevant to people in each circumstance. At the current time, there are large numbers of people in or from Winnipeg who find themselves in such situations. There are hundreds of citizens of Winnipeg institutionalized in the Manitoba School (Portage), St. Amant Centre (Winnipeg) and Pelican Lake. In 1984, approximately two hundred of these individuals were on the official waiting list for community placement. Many others in the community are on the waiting list for new residential placements because their current

placements are not appropriate.

The waiting lists for community placements, then, include several hundred individuals who have been deemed "ready for community placement" or in need of more appropriate placements. Conservatively, this represents a large demand for supported living arrangements. Furthermore, there is a large body of literature and experience in North America which indicates that all people with mental handicaps, including those with severe and multiple handicaps, are capable of living in the community with appropriate supports. If public policy in Manitoba were to reflect this fact, the demand for supported community living arrangements in Winnipeg would involve all of the individuals in institutions, plus the many people currently in the community, but inappropriately placed.

In 1984, it was suggested at a meeting of residential service providers in Winnipeg that less than one hundred and fifty individuals can be supported in the residential programs offered by agencies in Winnipeg.

The individuals with developmental special needs who currently live in the Prairie Housing Cooperative are all individuals who at one time or another have either lived in institutions or in community settings that were not responsive to their needs. They also represent a very small percentage of the people requiring quality living arrangements in Winnipeg.

C. THE NEED - PEOPLE WITH HANDICAPS IN SOCIETY

A fundamental fact about people with developmental special needs is that their basic needs are the same as those of their fellow citizens. Just like other citizens of Winnipeg, they need:

* a decent place to live
* a job
* money
* experience and involvement with other people, with the community and with life in general
* love and meaningful relationships
* power and rights
* respect
* meaning in life
* to be seen by others and by themselves as valuable people.

What people with handicaps all too often experience is quite different from the experiences of their fellow citizens. All too often, they experience:

* rejection as individuals and as people who are different
* segregation from families, other members of the community, and normal places and activities in the community
* congregation into large groups where the only thing that people share in common is that they are handicapped
* negative images and low expectations

* limited access to opportunities to learn, grow and develop
* limited autonomy and control over their own lives
* limited access to opportunities to contribute to the social and economic life of the community
* poverty
* discontinuity in relationships
* being seen as a client of a service.

While the Prairie Housing Cooperative is designed to respond to many of the basic human needs of people with developmental special needs, it most clearly responds to the need for a decent place to live, meaningful relationships, power and rights, involvement with the community and other people, and to be seen by others as valuable people. It is designed to support people who need, in the first instance, a decent place to live, and most particularly, those who currently live in inappropriate settings. By and large, these people require support in the natural settings in which they live. However, in Manitoba and across Canada this often means that people live in services, not home.

In contrast to what all people need in terms of the places and ways in which they live, people with developmental special needs typically receive services with the following characteristics:

* People with handicaps are grouped together in numbers that are larger than typical households, usually ranging from four to hundreds of individuals sharing a group home or institution.
* The housing is rented or owned by and belongs to an agency, not the people who live in the housing.
* The agency controls who lives in the housing and who lives with whom, and who shares a bedroom with whom.
* The housing is furnished by the agency and the furnishings belong to the agency.
* The supports provided to the residents are provided by staff who either live in the house or are paid to be in the house for a certain number of hours a day or week.
* The agency, not the residents, determines who provides support, when and in what manner.
* The agency determines the rules and routines of the household.
* Often the residents are judged as to whether or not they are ready for another type of living arrangement. If they are seen as "ready", they then move on to another house, another group of residents and staff, another set of relationships.

In institutions, this usually means that an individual with developmental special needs has very limited, if any, control over his or her life. In institutions, group homes, and apartment programs, this usually means that the individual must "fit" into the living situation - the rules and routines, the personalities and capabilities of staff and fellow residents. There is very

little control over where someone lives, with whom one shares a house or a bedroom, when or what one eats. In effect, the person lives in a service, not a home or a household over which the person has control and choice.

It is in this context of needs and limited options that the social housing programs of the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, and the specific efforts of the Prairie Housing Cooperative are relevant to the lives of people with developmental special needs.

D. A RESPONSE - CMHC'S SOCIAL HOUSING PROGRAMS

The Government of Canada, through the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, has made it clear that a major goal of its social housing programs is to provide modest, appropriate, and affordable housing to low and moderate income families and individuals (CMHC, 1983, p.2). "Families and individuals" includes families, senior citizens and persons with special housing needs, such as people with disabilities.

Section 56.1 of the National Housing Act (1978) contains the mandate for CMHC's non-profit and cooperative housing programs. "This Section authorizes the Corporation to make contributions to eligible borrowers to offset the repayment charges on loans for non-profit and cooperative housing projects... The programs are intended to serve low and moderate income households" (CMHC,1983,p.12).

> Non-profit and cooperative housing can take a variety of forms: single or multiple family housing, hostel accomodation, care facilities or group homes. It can be provided by constructing new buildings or acquiring existing buildings and rehabilitating them, as necessary... The Section 56.1 programs comprise three program types: public non-profit, which may be municipal or provincial; private non-profit; and cooperative. While all three program types are basically similar, there are certain key differences which will be described below.
>
> (a) Private and Public Non-Profit Housing
>
> Loans of up to 100 percent of the accepted capital costs of a housing project are made to municipal and private non-profit corporations, and provincial housing corporations by private lenders, generally with NHA insurance. Provinces are entitled to maximum loans of up to 90 percent of acceptable capital costs. The federal government then makes contributions towards the operating costs (including mortgage costs) of these projects up to the difference between monthly amortization costs at the market rate of interest and those at an interest rate of 2 percent.
>
> The federal contributions provide two forms of assistance to

the projects. The first bridges the gap between economic rent (that is, the rent required to break even on a project) and the lower end of market rent (that is, the rent established each year by CMHC and the province as representing the lower range of rents for equivalent accomodation in a given market area). The remaining assistance is used to aid tenants who cannot afford market rents by offering them rents geared to their incomes (generally equal to 25 percent of their adjusted family income). The programs are intended to encourage a mixture of rent-to-income and market rent tenants.

In addition to offsetting on-going operating costs, a portion of the Section 56.1 assistance, in CMHC-led projects may be deposited in a subsidy surplus account...

Private non-profit corporations arise in a number of ways. In some cases, they are formed by informal community-based groups; in others they are formed by sponsoring organizations such as the Kiwanis. In addition, several Native organizations have developed private non-profit housing groups as a component of CMHC's Urban Native housing initiative...

(b) Cooperative Housing

In housing cooperatives, the housing is owned collectively by the cooperative members. They do not own their individual units, but each owns a share of the project. Cooperatives are generally community-based, formed by groups of individuals who will both develop and reside in the housing projects.

Cooperatives obtain 100 percent loans from approved lenders and receive Section 56.1 differential interest rate contributions. However, the subsidy arrangement for cooperative housing is somewhat different than that described for non-profit housing. A predetermined amount of assistance, based on the difference between economic rent and the maximum occupancy charge (project rent) is established for a three-year period. During that period, any changes to the occupancy charges for individual cooperative units are based solely on changes in operating costs. In the fourth and subsequent years, occupancy charges related to mortgage payments increase by 5 percent per year compounded until such time as full mortgage payments are reached. This separation between the mortgage amortization costs and other operating expenses is intended to provide an incentive to cooperative members to keep operating cost increases low. Any surplus assistance resulting from savings in operating costs is retained by the cooperative.

The remaining Section 56.1 assistance is available for income-tested occupants. A subsidy surplus pool of up to $500 per unit may be established by the cooperative only

after 15 percent of the units are occupied by income-tested households. The account is used to supplement low-income households in future years when supplement requirements exceed the assistance provided (CMHC, 1983, pgs. 13-16).

In Manitoba, according to CMHC's 1983 evaluation of Section 56.1 housing, there were a total of 2,804 units that come under Section 56.1. Approximately 93% of the units are private non-profit, 2% native non-profit, and 5% cooperative. There are no provincial or municipal non-profit units supported through Section 56.1. Approximately 14% of the units are for families, 80% for senior citizens, and 6% special purpose.

There are, then, some variations in the ways that non-profit and cooperative housing projects are funded. The major differences, however, are in terms of governance and ownership. In non-profit housing, a non-profit corporation owns the housing and people pay rent. The governance of the housing is under the control of the corporation. In cooperative housing, the cooperative and, by extension, the members of the cooperative own the housing and control decisions about it. The members of the cooperative pay rent, but also own a share in the project. Some non-profit housing projects have tried to involve residents in the decision making process of the corporation by forming advisory committees; however, in a cooperative, residents are clearly in a position of governance, as opposed to advice giving.

In its 1983 evaluation of the Section 56.1 program, CMHC identified a number of objectives which the program was designed to meet or implied by the design of the programs and the ways in which they have been used.

The PRIMARY OBJECTIVES are:

1. Provide Modest Housing
2. Provide Appropriate Housing
3. Provide Affordable Housing
4. Provide Housing at Minimum Cost
5. Involve private lenders in the provision of capital

The ADDITIONAL/IMPLIED OBJECTIVES are:

6. Achieve Income Mixing/Integration within Projects
7. Contribute to the stock of rental accomodation
8. Increase the Participation of the Voluntary Sector in housing delivery.

Non-profit and cooperative housing programs have been designed to serve a wide variety of people with greatest emphasis on individuals and families with low and moderate incomes. Included within this part of our communities are specific groups such as Native peoples, senior citizens and people with disabilities. While people with disabilities are not a major target group, they certainly and often fall within the general population of low and moderate income individuals and families.

E. A RESPONSE - THE PRAIRIE HOUSING COOPERATIVE

1. Concept Development

The Prairie Housing Cooperative is one of the ways that citizens of Winnipeg have responded to the needs of their fellow citizens with developmental special needs. The PHC's brochure describes many of the fundamental aspects of their response. Those features include:

* affordable, congenial housing provided to members on a cooperative basis;

* welcome and support members who have developmental special needs;

* specifically designed to meet the needs of people with developmental special needs for

    - affordable housing
    - supportive personal relationships with friends and neighbors
    - control and ownership of their own housing arrangements;

* creating neighbouring groups of individuals or families. It is designed to create networks of responsible neighbouring relationships which include members with developmental special needs and emerging abilities. Ideally, the relationships include involvement in the social life of the family and the community, acceptance, friendship and mutual assistance. The relationships are chosen and voluntary, and are not intended to take the place of the formal supports which some members may need from time to time;

* dispersed throughout Winnipeg;

* groupings designed to include and support one or more members who have developmental special needs or one or two families with a child who has a handicapping condition;

* in most cases, specific locations, designs and support arrangements are planned around individual needs and requirements, although some design work must take place far in advance of people actually moving in;

* a wide range of options for personal assistance is possible for members with developmental special needs, from purely voluntary neighbouring relationships to arrangements in which non-handicapped assistants share housing with members who could use more extensive supports;

* based on traditional cooperative principles of mutual ownership, mutual effort and support. It belongs to all the people who use its services and control rests equally with all members;

* members with handicapping conditions have full voting rights and a powerful valued role in the design, governance and operation of the cooperative;

* individuals with handicapping conditions are assisted to own shares in their own housing;

* creates natural opportunities for interactions between handicapped and non-handicapped citizens, opportunities for working together, and the possibility that lasting personal relationships may develop;

* creates continuity of place and relationships, a sense of security, and a strong circle of friends and supportive neighbors, even though individual members may leave from time to time;

* members include individuals and families who live (or are planning to live) in housing owned or leased by the cooperative. Each adult may apply for individual membership status. Children with developmental special needs are eligible for membership, and are represented through personal guardians or advocates.

These essential features of the cooperative emerged over time as a result of a number of factors:

a) the history of commitment by the initial leadership to supporting individuals with special needs and advocating for their rights to live as full citizens of their communities;

b) the struggles of a number of people, most of whom were involved with the CAMR's Winnipeg and Manitoba branches, to assist two people, David Hay and Catherine Schaefer, to live as full a life as possible in the community;

c) the paucity of government programs that could support highly integrated and highly supported arrangements; and

d) the overall compatability of CMHC's cooperative housing program and funding arrangements with essential concerns of the initial leadership - integration; building on the natural supports of fellow citizens; people with handicaps controlling and owning their housing, the people with whom they live, the types and amounts of support they receive, and from whom that support is received.

The search for a solution to David Hay's dilemma - how to escape from a life of institutionalization and enjoy a life of dignity in the community - began in earnest when a group of people who knew Mr. Hay met after a CAMR meeting. They wanted to develop with David a solution that made sense for him. They certainly did not start out with the idea of developing a cooperative. A cooperative did emerge as a way of putting together a house, money and staff to respond to David's needs, and the needs of other people who were known to the group. Building a response and starting a cooperative was a time consuming affair. A long series of meetings of the group and an expanding number of people ensued, coupled with follow-up action by individuals to make the necessary contacts with CMHC and eventually to put the package together.

The idea of a cooperative was a positive response to the needs of one individual in the very beginning. It grew to involve considerably more people. The Prairie Housing Cooperative was also seen as a strategy for community change. The thinking of the early leadership was and continues to be that the human service system does not adequately respond to individuals and their right to live, participate, and develop as full citizens. The system tended to place more emphasis on the creation of services into which people with handicaps had to fit, and of situations that tended to isolate individuals in services rather than including them in communities. The PHC was seen as one way of doing two things:

- responding to the immediate and pressing needs of individuals for housing, community involvement and protection; and,

- demonstrating to others (the public and the government) that ordinary citizens will respond as good neighbours and friends to individuals who are vulnerable, and that such responses can be based on good relations within a community, supplemented, rather than supplanted, by more organized supports to individuals.

Concurrent to the development of the Prairie Housing Cooperative, many of the same individuals were involved in the creation of the L'Avenir Community Living Cooperative. The L'Avenir Cooperative is intricately linked to PHC. The stated purpose of the L'Avenir Coop is as follows:

> a registered non-profit cooperative established to provide the supports which will enable people with mental retardation and related disabilities to live with dignity and security in the community. Its specific purpose is to meet the needs of people with severe, multiple, or particularly challenging disabilities in regular community settings.

Membership in L'Avenir includes the people receiving service and their families (as joint members) and associates who provide voluntary supports to handicapped individuals. L'Avenir provides

Table 1: Developments and Changes within the Prairie Housing Coop from August 1982 to February 1985

Item	Numbers During Month					
	Aug 82	Feb 83	Aug 83	Feb 84	Aug 84	Feb 85
# of houses	1	8	15	18a	18	18
# of clusters	1	3	4	5	5	5
# of people in residence	4	25	51	57a	57	54
# of people with handicaps in residence	0	5	7	9a	9	9
New residents during period						
- Total	4	21	28	12a	4d	9d
- People with handicaps	0	5	3	2a	2d	1d
Residents who left during period						
- Total	0	0	3	6	6d	11d
- People with handicaps	0	0	1	0	2d	1d
People who returned after leaving	0	0	1b	1c	0	0
People who moved within the PHC	0	0	0	3	2	1

a) one house is currently occupied by a temporary resident. The house is included in the table, but the person is not included in the totals.

b) this support person left and returned in the same period.
c) this support person returned, then left in the same period.
d) does not include one person who moved in for a brief period.

In summary, 78 people, including 16 with special needs have lived in the PHC between August 1982 and February 1985. A total of 24 individuals, including 6 with special needs, have left the coop during that time period.

support to people in their homes, including in PHC homes, arranges and provides support to people in terms of employment and education, and assists families to develop, implement and safeguard individual service plans. A number of the individuals living in the Prairie Housing Cooperative receive supports from or because of arrangements by the L'Avenir Cooperative.

2. Housing Development

Over three years, a concern for the futures of David Hay and Catherine Schaefer led to the development of eighteen houses located in five neighbourhood clusters dispersed throughout Winnipeg. Over seventy five people have lived or are living in the cooperative, including 16 people with special needs. Several of these individuals have only lived in the cooperative for short periods of time, or on a visiting/trial basis. Table 1 charts the developments and changes over time.

The following discussion chronicles the evolution of the clusters and households over two periods of time -- first, from the beginning to March 1984, the time of the first site visit; and second, from March 1984 to February 1985, the time of the last site visit.

Cluster 1: Tyndall Park (Six houses)

a) TO MARCH 1984

The Knowles family (one adult, three children) were the first family to occupy a PHC house. They moved in during August 1982 and formed the nucleus for the Tyndall Park cluster.

Over the next two months, Allison Kelley, Betty Siemens, and Hazel Vandamme moved into the house next door. Betty and Hazel have special needs, and Allison was their live-in support person. When Betty subsequently got married and moved to another coop house, Mary Burke Gaffney, a woman with special needs, moved in with Hazel and Allison.

At the same time, a third house two blocks down the street opened to support David Hay. The first occupant of the house was a support person for David. David and a second support person moved in shortly thereafter. A ramp was built outside the house to accomodate David's wheelchair and several modifications were made to make to interior of the house more accessible. David lived in the house for about 4 months, but decided he did not really want to live with other people, so he moved to a residential program in downtown Winnipeg. David's departure marked the beginning of a series of changes in the house. One of the support people moved out at the same time. A family moved into the house and lived there for nine months. They subsequently moved to a house next door to the Knowles family, but one that is not part of the coop. The other support person moved out three months after the family moved in. A third support person for the cluster moved into the house in late 1983 but only stayed for a couple of months. The

house was occupied on a temporary basis by a person with special needs during March 1984.

In the beginning of 1983, the fourth house in the cluster was occupied by the Varey family (two adults, one child, then a second child was born late in 1983) and Rubin Meltzer, a young man with special needs. The house was two blocks from the other houses in the cluster. Rubin lived with and received support from the Vareys for just under nine months. In September of 1983, he and Betty got married and moved into the sixth house in the cluster. The Vareys continue to live in their home and provide support to their neighbours, the Meltzers.

The fifth house in the cluster was occupied in March 1983 by the Bilodeau family, initially including two adults and now a young baby. This house is next door to the house that David Hay occupied. The Bilodeau's currently provide support to a woman with special needs living next door on a temporary basis.

The sixth house in the cluster was first occupied by the Meltzers and one support person. A fourth person moved in as a boarder early in 1984. The Meltzers and their two housemates continue to live in the house.

b) MARCH 1984 - FEBRUARY 1985

The Tyndall Park cluster continued to be characterized by both stability and change. The core families (Knowles, Vareys, Bilodeaus) remained in the cluster. Numerous changes occured, however, in the households of the individuals with special needs.

The woman who was occupying the third house on a temporary basis (Miriam), remained in the house. For a period of time, Allison moved in with her, then eventually left the cooperative. Miriam was living alone in her house as of February.

During the summer, Mary Burke Gaffney got married and left the coop. Four different women lived with Hazel for short periods of time, and then during February, Dolores, a woman with special needs, moved in with Hazel. In February, Dolores and Hazel occupied the house.

The Meltzers household remained relatively stable between March and February. The only change was that the boarder moved out.

Cluster 2: Grant Park (Four Houses)

a) TO MARCH 1984

The four houses in the Grant Park cluster developed at the same time in January 1983 shortly after the first two houses in the Tyndall Park cluster were occupied.

The Lovegrove family (husband and wife) moved into one house,

the Plewes family (husband and wife) into a second. The Storey family (three sisters and one of their sons) were already living in and renting the third house purchased by the coop for this cluster. They decided they wanted to stay in the house and liked the idea of the coop. Nettie Hildebrand moved into the fourth house. Nettie has special needs. Terry Brown (a pseudonym) also has special needs and moved in with Nettie in May 1983. Nettie and Terry receive support and friendship from their coop neighbours.

b) MARCH 1984 TO FEBRUARY 1985

During September, Nettie Hildebrand moved out of the coop into an apartment of her own. Terry Brown occupied the coop house by her self until December when another woman (without special needs) moved in with her. In February, both women continued to occupy the house.

In December, the Lovegroves bought a house in St. James and left the coop. The Greifenhagens (husband and wife) moved into their house. The Plewes and Storey families remained in the coop.

Cluster 3: St. Vital (Three Houses)

a) TO MARCH 1984

The first house in the St. Vital cluster was occupied shortly before the Grant Park cluster began, but it was not until the late summer of 1983 that an individual with special needs and another family moved into the cluster. The Lauder family (two adults, two children) moved into their new home in December 1982. In August 1983, the second house was occupied by the Dubois family (two adults, three children), the youngest member of whom is Janelle. Janelle has developmental special needs. The third house was also occupied in August, by the Henrie family (two adults, four children). Janelle receives support from her family, the local day care centre and a number of individuals. Her coop neighbours are available for friendship and support, though there has not been much involvement by them in her life.

b) MARCH 1984 TO FEBRUARY 1985

There have been no changes in the St. Vital cluster.

Cluster 4: Adsum (Three Houses)

a) TO MARCH 1984

The Adsum cluster exists to support Arnold Yanofsky, a young man with special needs. In the summer of 1983, Arnold and his brother Albert moved into their house which is part of a condominium development. Initially one, then a second support person lived with them. Both had been involved earlier with David Hay. Later the first, then second support person moved out of the coop. Ray Simon moved into the house in the fall of 1983 to support

Arnold.

Shortly after Arnold and his brother moved in, two additional houses in the condominium, as part of the cooperative, were occupied by the Rice family (two adults, two children) and the Stermscheg family (two adults, one child).

b) MARCH 1984 TO FEBRUARY 1985

A number of changes occured in the Adsum cluster over the next year. In April, the support person in Arnold's house (Ray) left the coop. Arnold and his brother continued to live together until October, when a couple moved in with them. This move was in preparation for Albert's leaving. In December, Albert was married and moved to a new house in the neighbourhood with his new wife.

In August, the Rice family left the coop and the Barronis family (husband and wife) moved in during September. Mr. Barronis had been involved with the coop from the beginning, providing support to David Hay, and then Arnold.

Cluster 5: Southdale (Two Houses)

a) TO MARCH 1984

The Southdale cluster started in February 1984 and is the newest of the PHC clusters. John Koeppel is the focus of the cluster. He has special needs. Initially, Mike Zacharias and Robert Agland moved in with John to provide support. In March, Robert moved two doors down into the second house in the cluster. Marcel Vannevel shares the house with Robert. Craig sleeps over in John's house.

b) MARCH 1984 TO FEBRUARY 1985

A number of changes occured in the Southdate cluster from March to February, especially in John Koeppel's house. During the year, both of the young men living with John left, and for varying periods of time two other individuals lived with him, at times together, and at times individually. In February, Jacques was living with John, but active plans were being developed for a couple to move in with John. Shortly after the conclusion of the February site visit for this study, the family moved in with John.

In the Fall, Robert left the cooperative. In January, a young man with special needs moved in with Marcel in the second house. At the time of the February site visit, however, this young man was not considered part of the cooperative. PHC is currently seeking additional units of housing to support this young man in a setting closer to his family home.

3. Concluding Remarks

While all of these developments started with a concern for the futures of two people, they have obviously involved consider-

ably larger numbers of people, most of them ordinary citizens. Members of the PHC provide support to their fellow members who have special needs. Most of them are not paid to do so. They are not staff. They are neighbours.

The PHC is based on the needs of individuals with handicaps for housing, community and protection. It sees itself as being in the business of building communities and relationships. The ways by which people have come to live in the coop reflect this orientation to community. Its approach has been quite different from that of a service agency.

Typically, human services agencies are developed by citizens who want to respond to the needs of fellow citizens. Often these needs are seen in general terms and involve numbers of people. In many situations, the people are actually known to the people starting the agency. Typically, once the agency has been established, it advertises its services, sets up admission criteria, and forms a selection process, often involving a committee that screens and interviews clients. Staff are hired to provide services. Often, volunteers are enlisted to assist the agency in its work.

Like an agency, the PHC is dedicated to serving people in need. The PHC, however, started with a group of people concerned about one individual. That group also personally knew other individuals who needed housing, community and protection. The people with handicaps who live in the PHC are people who are known personally by members of the PHC, especially those who are involved in the work of CAMR-Winnipeg Branch, the L'Avenir Cooperative, and Citizen Advocacy. The process by which people are selected is described later in this report, but it is fundamentally based on the fact that members of the PHC are themselves involved in a wider community and networks of relationships through which individuals with special needs come to their attention.

Similarly, the process of finding, recruiting and selecting the non-handicapped members of the coop has depended on community and network contacts. A common strategy used in human service programs, specifically those that rely on foster families or host families with whom handicapped people can live, is to advertise in community media and places. The PHC has not done this, though it has effectively used another frequently used approach - using members' contacts in the wider community.

Many of the families and individuals within the PHC have been brought in through contacts with the churches to which members belong or are connected. Three families have members who work directly with or for CAMR-Winnipeg. Several individuals heard about the coop through friends who had contacts with it. In fact, one family heard about it from the person to whom they sold their car.

Contacts through networks have been quite effective. The

member of the board responsible for making contacts with many people reported that she interviews at least three families or individuals in order to find one that is both interested and suitable.

The non-handicapped members of the coop have joined essentially for two reasons - (i) they like the idea of providing neighbourly support, integration, having their children grow up with different kinds of people, and helping specific individuals whom they have come to know; and, (ii) many of them were looking for decent and affordable housing. For most, the idea of supporting and sharing their lives with handicapped people was the important thing, and the housing an added bonus. For some, both considerations were quite important. For a few, while they liked and supported the idea, actually seeing and finding the house "sold them." For the people who are paid to provide support to the people with whom they live, having a job was a central consideration.

The rest of this report presents more details on the people, their houses and households, relationships and support, involvements in the neighbourhood and community, and the organization and operation of the coop. As a final introduction to the Prairie Housing Cooperative as a response to the needs of individuals with handicaps, however, the following statements by PHC members in response to the question "What is the Prairie Housing Cooperative all about?" are offered:

* It's a place for people who need advice, not a training place.

* A terrific opportunity for our [handicapped] daughter to be in the community.

* A chance for the kids to experience and learn from handicapped people.

* People educating people. Individuals make it work. People are not paid to be friends.

* It expresses completeness - noone is excluded.

* A sense of brotherhood and sisterhood.

* A way of getting handicapped people out in the community rather than in group homes.

* A way for helping handicapped people be more self sufficient.

* Being your own landlord. Doing what you want with the place you live in.

* An alternative for peoples' futures.

* Physical security, because we live in clusters.

* It's not just housing. There must be a commitment on the part of people to support vulnerable members and there must be supports available to sustain and regenerate that commitment.

* The damage done [by segregating and isolating people] is not remedied simply by housing. We need to be cautious. We need to be supportive... It needs hard work, constant vigilance.

* It's a miracle. First because of how much John has changed, but also that John is here at all.

* There needs to be support and supportive relationships. Many people are not all that handicapped, but all are very vulnerable.

* A way to figure out how to house people, take care of them, and meet their needs without creating small institutions.

* A way to rescue people.

* An opportunity for people like Arnie to belong to a normal community. An opportunity for people to support others and for people to bring up their own families.

* A community that accepts.

* The whole idea of segregation and isolation is absurd. It is time that it changed. Support systems in normal communities work and are worthwhile doing.

* Feels like this is your home.

* Good citizenship.

* The only way that makes sense is for people to involve themselves in the life of a handicapped person on an unpaid basis, in a life sharing way. The coop is a way to do that.

* Decent housing at a reasonable cost, plus a responsibility to friendship and neighbours.

* Prairie Housing gives people another choice. After a certain age, people with handicaps are left with little or no opportunities or choices - the group home or institution. They can be very demoralizing. We're trying to show others and ourselves that the coop idea can work.

II. THE PEOPLE

The focus of the Prairie Housing Cooperative is people with developmental special needs. The purpose of this part of the report is to introduce the people with special needs who live in the coop and to discuss various aspects of their lives. Specifically, the focus will be on the following:

* the People with developmental special needs
* their Houses and Households
* Supports, Neighbours, Friends and Family
* The Neighbourhoods and the Community
* Living in the Coop.

The discussions which follow are based on meetings held during the three visits (March 1984, September 1984, and February 1985) with the people who lived in the Prairie Housing Cooperative at the time of those visits and the questionnaires which were administered in the first and last visits. As is evident from the discussion in Chapter I., a number of people moved in and out of the coop during the year. For this reason, the primary focus will be on the nine individuals with special needs who were interviewed on each occasion and other members of the PHC who were involved throughout the period. Discussions with the leadership of the PHC and new members indicate that the experiences of those not included in the core group would add depth to the Prairie Housing story, but not a change in the nature of that story.

A. INTRODUCTIONS

At the time of the first site visit, nine people with developmental special needs were living in the cooperative as members. One person was living in one house on a temporary basis. One person had moved out of the cooperative. Neither of these two individuals were interviewed during the first visit. Since the first visit, a number of people with special needs came into and left the coop. They were not interviewed. Finally, one young woman moved into the coop during the final visit. She was interviewed, but activities related to her moving did not permit the completion of the questionnaire.

Before introducing each of the nine, there are some general comments that can be made about the group.

The nine people come from a variety of backgrounds:

* Four have been in large, congregate care institutions for extended periods of time and a fifth has been consistently counselled, through her mother, to enter an institution. Two of them lived in institutions for 15 years. One young man has lived in 10 different places, moved 20 times, and has spent no more than two years in one place since the age of 11.

* Another four individuals grew up with their families. Three of them moved from their family homes to apartment programs sponsored by community agencies, then to the PHC. One moved directly from home to the cooperative.

* One member of the cooperative, a young girl, continues to live with her family. Professionals have consistently counselled her mother to institutionalize her.

It is impossible to describe in clincial terms the handicaps with which these individuals live. Clinical records were not reviewed. Professionals were not interviewed. In other words, "clinical labels" have not been identified. The individuals themselves, however, often do not conceive of themselves as handicapped. For them, "handicap" refers to physical disabilities. In the words of one woman, "I have two arms, two hands, two legs, two feet, and I can use them."

Most do describe themselves as having some difficulty conceptualizing and dealing with intellectual problems. Members of the cooperative who know them well state that all nine have been labelled "mentally retarded" or considered to have "developmental special needs."

Based on observations and discussions during the March 1984 site visit, the following can be said:

* Only three of the individuals would strike a normal citizen as having a significant developmental disability, though all are limited intellectually to some extent. Five have been institutionalized or seriously recommended to institutions by service agencies.

* Three people have a history of being described as having emotional disturbances.

* One person has severe mobility problems.

* Two people have some problems with speech. One does not speak at this time, while the other is developing a limited vocabulary.

* Six people have some trouble with tasks related to daily living. Three more have significant trouble.

* All but one have attended sheltered, segregated educational or vocational programs. For four people, those programs were in institutions. The youngest and most handicapped coop member has not attended sheltered, segregated programs. She attends an integrated day care centre in her neighbourhood.

The nine individuals moved into the Prairie Housing Cooperative for a variety of reasons:

* Six moved because they wanted more independence or to escape the restrictions imposed by their former place of residence. For some, the former place of residence was an institution, group home or apartment program.

* Two others moved because of the neighbourhoods in which they were living and the "hassles" in those neighbourhoods.

* Two moved to be closer to work (within Winnipeg) or to be able to find work (moved to Winnipeg).

The purpose of this section, however, is not to introduce a group. The purpose is to introduce nine individuals who are unique, who come from a variety of backgrounds, and who have a variety of needs in terms of support and housing. At the moment, the Prairie Housing Cooperative does not exist for a faceless group of people with developmental special needs. It exists for very specific people who are known to others. To understand the coop, it is necessary to know the people, how they describe themselves, what they like to do, what they do well, where they have lived, worked and learned, what choices they had before moving into the coop, and why they moved into it.

The introductions begin with information collected in March 1984, and then turn to changes which occured during the course of the case study.

BETTY AND RUBIN MELTZER

a) MARCH 1984

Mr. and Mrs. Meltzer are a newly married couple in their early thirties. They were married and moved into their house on Kairistine Lane in September 1983. Both lived in PHC houses prior to getting married.

Betty Meltzer describes herself as follows:

* a nice person
* not shy
* more open to other people now
* happy
* a good housewife
* capable of doing many more things now.

She has leaking heart valves and takes some medications for her nerves. She really enjoys cooking and taking care of the house. She needs a little help from neighbours to learn new recipes, shop, manage finances, learn to cross stitch, and get some day-to-day advice.

Prior to her marriage and move into her new house, she lived

in another PHC house for eleven months. Prior to that, she lived at home with her family for 30 years. She grew up in Argentina, but since moving to Canada, she has attended three sheltered workshops and a non-graded school. She was working full-time as a housewife in March 1984.

Betty moved to the Prairie Housing Cooperative because she wanted more independence and a place of her own as an adult. She has a number of things to say about her life at home:

> I used to sleep upstairs. It was cold. Other times, I slept with my mom. I about went nuts when my father died. I got blamed for everything. I'm not a little child. I felt rejected and unwanted.
>
> I never had my own freedom at home. People thought I was too dumb to do things. People thought I was not capable.

Before moving to the coop, Betty was told her options were either a group home or perhaps an institution. She says her mother had the "papers for the institution" and was threatening to use them. Instead, Betty moved into the coop. She lived with some other women in one of the houses, continued her relationship with Rubin, and decided to marry him.

She has a number of things to say about her life now:

> I feel really good that I did it [moved into PHC and out of her mom's house]. I am capable of doing it [living independently].
>
> The Coop changed my whole life. I'm happier, more cheerful, can do things I could never do before. There are friends close by who can help me out. I have a chance to be my own boss. A chance to be married. I'm happy I have my life.

Rubin Meltzer, Betty's husband, describes himself as

* smart - maybe not smart enough, but enough to get by
* happy
* pretty easy to get along with
* don't like to be put down
* I blow up when things don't go right.

He says he is slow at reading, though he enjoys reading. He has epilepsy. He enjoys his life with Betty and is thinking about getting a job. He gets some help from neighbours in terms of some of the daily decisions in the household, money management, and finding a job. He is trying to learn how to take things as they come rather than "blowing up" when things don't go right.

Rubin lived at home with his family for thirty years. After that he lived in two apartments, each with a handicapped roommate.

The apartments were part of a Winnipeg agency's program. He lived in the apartments for about two years, but says he was kicked out. Rubin has a number of comments about the apartment program,

> They babied me. They hassled me about Betty staying over. They held my money back.

There appeared to be no other options for Rubin in terms of a place to live. He was unhappy in the apartment program and the controls it exercised over his life. He could not afford a place of his own. His parents would not have allowed him to live in a group home, plus the fact "I'll run away if anybody puts me in a group home." Basically, he wanted more independence and a chance to marry Betty. He moved into one of the coop houses and lived with a family for seven months, then he and Betty married and moved into their current house.

Rubin attended a regular kindergarten class as a child. He attended two regular schools, but in special classes, then two non-graded segregated schools. He attended a sheltered workshop and a life skills program. In 1984, he was casually employed and spent most of his time at home with his wife and helping out. He maintains close contact with his family.

In terms of his life in the Prairie Housing Cooperative, Rubin says,

> I'm happy now. I'm free to come and go. I'm satisfied. I have a good marriage, good friends and neighbours.

b) FEBRUARY 1985 UP-DATE

After much encouragement from his coop neighbours, Rubin got a job at a fabric store in Winnipeg in the Fall of 1984. The job is a "work experience placement" arranged by an agency in Winnipeg, so it pays very little. It is giving Rubin some experience, more of a reputation as a worker, and constructive time away from home. Betty continues to be active -- learning to bake at neighbours' houses, babysitting, helping out at the CAMR office, and going to a women's group at church.

Over the winter, Betty's family tried to convince her to separate from Rubin, but this got sorted out. One of the coop neighbours helped Betty and Rubin through this rough time. By February, Betty was carefully rebuilding her relationship with her parents.

Rubin and Betty still like their house very much. In fact, Betty wishes they could own it. Rubin understands that they do own it, just through the coop.

HAZEL VANDAMME

a) MARCH 1984

Hazel Vandamme is in her late twenties. She lives a couple of blocks over from the Meltzer's. Hazel is very precise and concise when talking about herself and her life. When asked how she would like to be described to others, she said, "Tell them I'm a nice person."

Ms Vandamme likes to listen to music, mainly country and western and disco music, to go shopping, watch TV, go to church, and visit her friends at L'Arche (the house and community in which she last lived). She says she is a good cook. When asked if she has trouble doing anything, she said, "not much." In 1984, she got weekly advice from a fellow coop member in terms of money management and life in general. Hazel's fingers are large so she has some trouble manipulating small objects.

Hazel is on the board of the Prairie Housing Cooperative. She says she is her own person. She likes to be listened to. She likes working.

Hazel Vandamme grew up with her parents and four brothers until she was ten years old. She then lived at the Manitoba School, an institution, for about eleven years. Next she moved to the L'Arche community in Winnipeg, then to a L'Arche apartment with one staff person and three other handicapped people. Three years later she moved to the Prairie Housing Cooperative. She moved because she wanted to be on her own more. She wanted a change. She also wanted to be closer to her place of work.

Hazel Vandamme is a very capable young woman. Over the last two decades she has moved from sharing her living space with forty other handicapped people on a ward of the Manitoba School to her current situation where she shares a house with two other women, one of whom has a handicap.

While at the Manitoba School, Hazel attended a school program in the institution. She has subsequently attended two sheltered workshops. Then, for two years she worked part-time as a housekeeper in a nursing home. Today, she has a full-time job as a chambermaid in a local motel.

In her precise way, Hazel commented on her life now as a member of the Prairie Housing Cooperative - "I'm more on my own now."

b) FEBRUARY 1985 UP-DATE

In August Hazel was laid off at the motel. In October she started working part-time (one or two days a week) doing housework. She says that not working so much is "OK, it gives me more time to do things." She also says that when she is alone at home, she gets pretty bored. It's better when friends drop in. She is

still very active with the L'Arche community, goes bowling once a week, and goes downtown on the bus frequently.

Hazel also experienced a great deal of change in her household over the year, but seems to be coping quite nicely. She keeps in contact with Betty, Mary, and Allison. Three other women lived with her for short periods of time during the year. She feels all right about all the moves, after all "no one left because we couldn't get along."

MARY BURKE GAFFNEY

a) MARCH 1984

Mary Burke Gaffney shares a house on Burrows Avenue with Hazel Vandame. She is a woman in her early forties who describes herself as "a lady. I act like a lady." She also says she is,

* intelligent
* friendly with everybody
* a nice person.

She says she was called mentally ill once by three people at a bus stop. She has travelled extensively around Manitoba, Ontario and the western United States. She enjoys travelling. She also enjoys making friends, going to shows and concerts in downtown Winnipeg, reading about different nations and religions, and watching TV. She enjoys seeing a man friend to whom she is thinking about getting married.

She gets some help from her housemates and neighbours with cooking, shopping, budgetting, getting out and about, signing her cheques, and talking over problems.

Ms Gaffney spent her first twenty five years living at home with her family. She then moved into an apartment program operated by a Winnipeg-based agency. She lived in one apartment for three years, another for two years. In both cases she shared the apartment with another woman with developmental special needs.

In terms of the apartment program, she says, "I was tired of apartment living. The costs go up every year. I didn't get along with my roommate."

She moved into the Prairie Housing Cooperative in November 1983. She did not see any other choices. "I can't live on my own. I can't afford it." She has a number of things to say about her current situation,

> I have the same amount of money now, but there's a big difference. I can spend it for what I want. I have more control over my money.
>
> The Coop is a nice idea. People who are handicapped can move into houses like this. The houses are fantastic.

Mary has attended two regular schools, a private school, and a segregated school. In one regular school and in the private school, she attended regular classrooms. She spent nine years in a special class in a regular school. She has worked in a sheltered workshop for over twenty years.

b) FEBRUARY 1985 UP-DATE

Over the summer, Mary got married and moved into her husband's one bedroom apartment in an older building downtown. Her husband was not interested in the coop, but Mary says, "I was happy in the coop. I would have liked to have moved into another coop house."

Mary still works in the sheltered workshop, but she is interested in leaving. She is not sure what she might do for work, maybe sewing. "They only help six people find jobs each year, and they haven't talked to me about it yet." When Mary got married she was cut off welfare.

ARNOLD YANOFSKY

a) MARCH 1984

Arnold Yanofsky is a 21 year old young man who lives with his brother and a support person in a townhouse on Adsum Drive, about a mile and a half from the Meltzer's, Hazel and Mary. He moved into the PHC during July 1983. He is handsome, has black hair, and sports a moustache. He says only a few words, so his brother described him in the following way:

* a generous guy
* very affectionate and friendly
* a bit of a joker
* very curious
* expresses his emotions
* a special person who has a lot to teach
* likes to waltz with girls, a good dancer
* not shy
* likes to be wanted
* infectious laugh, a beautiful smile, charming
* a likeable person
* loves to watch babies.

Arnold likes to eat, watch TV, listen to music, study women, dance, play a variety of sports (swimming, bowling, basketball, field hockey), go for car rides, jog, go for walks, and visit friends and family.

Arnold gets a lot of help from his brother, family, neighbours and support staff. He gets assistance with his school work, communicating, personal appearance, getting dressed, getting to school, learning to cook and clean house, learning appropriate

behaviours, and getting along with others.

In 1983, Arnold was described in other ways. He was rated on the Adaptive Behaviour Scale and was ranked highly negatively in terms of the following behaviours - violent/destructive, rebellious, withdrawal, unacceptable social behaviour, self-abusive, sexually aberrant, antisocial, stereotyped behaviour, inappropriate interpersonal manners, eccentric habits, psychological disturbance, and use of medications. His brother states that the Manitoba School said Arnold would "never make it" in the community. He has seizures. He has been variously diagnosed or labelled "severely mentally retarded,""mildly mentally retarded," "trainable mentally retarded," and "acute psychosis (unspecified)". He has a hearing loss, probably severe in one ear and some loss in the other.

Arnold grew up with his family for fifteen years. He spent a few months in the Health Sciences Centre and several years at the Manitoba School. At the Manitoba School he spent some time in a school program and some time in a vocational program. In 1984, he attended a segregated school in Winnipeg and received additional instruction at home.

Arnold has learned a great deal, according to his brother, since leaving the Manitoba School and moving into the Prairie Housing Cooperative. The list is long, and includes,

* to do dishes, vacuum and make the bed
* to brush his teeth and go to the bathroom
* to relax and interact with others without hitting them or himself
* to not pat girls, but offer them a handshake
* to stay with his parents during visits
* to communicate
* to fit in at a dance
* to use the fridge properly rather than raiding it all the time
* to dress himself
* to participate in recreation with other kids
* not to masturbate in public
* not to hit or bite
* to go to a restaurant
* to sit down and do a task
* to take a bath once or twice a day rather than many times a day.

According to his brother, Arnold moved into the Prairie Housing Cooperative because he was

> stagnating, not living a normal life at the Manitoba School. He was doped up, locked up, had no freedom or privileges. He lacked a sense of belonging.... The Coop means an opportunity for Arnie to live a normal life in his own home. With freedom. With his own friends. He can go to the fridge and take his own bath by himself, not a communal bath. He is not

pressured by routines. He can sleep in. His posture has changed, walking and sitting. He uses his muscles. He is more active. He walks beside people, not behind them. There has been a thousand fold increase in his interaction with the family. He has a chance to go to dances. He is integrating with women.

b) FEBRUARY 1985 UP-DATE

There were quite a few changes in Arnold's life over the year. The support person living with Arnold and his brother moved out of the coop in April. He and his brother lived together until the late Fall when a couple moved into the house just shortly before Albert got married and moved to a house just down the street. Albert is still very much involved in his brother's life.

Arnold also graduated from the segregated school. He now spends some time at a day program, and some time with a companion out and about in the community. He is learning much more about his community and is more actively involved in it.

Over the year, Arnold has begun to talk more and initiate conversations. His medications have been significantly reduced. People who are close to Arnold are beginning to think about how to get him a job.

NETTIE HILDEBRAND

a) MARCH 1984

Nettie Hildebrand moved into her PHC house during January 1983. The house is on Ebby Avenue in Grant Park about six miles to the south of Arnold Yanofsy. Ms Hildebrand is in her late thirties. She has a quick and engaging smile. When asked how she would like to be described, she said the following:

* some people have labelled me, but I prefer they don't
* describe me in terms of what I'm capable of doing
* "a good mouth." I speak up for handicapped people who can't speak for themselves
* love entertaining
* love company
* love to cook and bake
* friendly and like to maintain friendships
* socialize well.

She also says she cannot use her right hand "the way I should." Nettie gets some help from her coop neighbours to balance her chequebook, to get to the local supermarket, to find work, and to give a bit of advice.

Ms Hildebrand grew up in Steinbach, south of Winnipeg. She spent 32 years with her family, then moved into a local apartment program for four years. She lived on her own in the apartment. In

that neighbourhood, "a group of teenagers used to hassle me and break into the house. I wanted to get away from them and go somewhere where I could get a job." She says that in the apartment program, "the staff told me basically every day what to do."

In Steinbach, she attended an employment preparation centre. In Winnipeg she attended a similar centre for job experience and job training. She is now receiving job training at a lodge for senior citizens. She is a member of the board of the PHC.

Of her life now, Nettie says,

> The coop people make me feel more comfortable here...Here you do your work when you please. The people are friendly...I know more people from back home, but I keep in contact with them. There's no way I'm going to let go of old friends.

She wants to get out on her own as soon as possible when she has a job. "I want to stay in the coop, just on my own. I have too much going for me now to give up the coop."

b) FEBRUARY 1985 UP-DATE

Nettie and her housemate had some difficulties getting along with one another. Over the summer, her housemate pushed her down. "What are you going to do? I had to move on." So, Nettie moved into a bachelor suite in a three-storey apartment building downtown. A fellow coop member helped her find the new place.

Nettie says she gets along much better with her former housemate now. They see each other quite often. She stays in touch with the coop.

She says the quality of her housing is "about the same on average. The ideal would be to be in the coop, live downtown, be alone, and have housing that costs less." Her move meant that she got three out of the four. She says the added advantage of her new place is having a caretaker in the building ("it's very convenient to have someone to report trouble to. We didn't have that in the coop.")

The job training program she was involved in stopped over the winter. She is looking for work, but nothing appears available. She is still a very active volunteer in CAMR and with People First (a self advocacy group). She went to Tacoma, Washington in July to attend an international People First Conference, to St. John, New Brunswick in October to attend the annual conference of the national CAMR, and to Toronto in February to chair a meeting of CAMR's Consumer Advisory Committee and attend the Board meeting.

"TERRY BROWN"

a) MARCH 1984

"Terry Brown" is a young woman in her late twenties who is still afraid of her past and does not want her real name used in this report. She lives with Nettie Hildebrand. She is reluctant to talk about her past, but is willing to describe herself in the following way,

* happy and cheerful
* sometimes feel and act miserable
* a hard worker.

She says she is "not that good at thinking and learning." She enjoys learning numbers, going swimming and bowling, and sometimes watching TV and going to the movies. She gets help from her fellow coop members in terms of job finding, getting a ride to the store, banking, and working things out around the house.

Terry has lived in a variety of places. She lived with her family, then lived "a long time" in the Manitoba School. She then moved to a group home in Winnipeg and lived with seven handicapped people and a staff person for two or three years. She returned to the Manitoba School for several weeks. Then she moved in with a family in a foster-family arrangement for eight months. She has lived in the Prairie Housing Cooperative for nine months.

When the foster-family arrangement did not work out, Terry was clear that she did not want to return to either the group home or the Manitoba School.

> I wasn't happy in the group home. I ran away because people were threatening to send me to Portage [the Manitoba School]. I was really miserable there. There were lots of rules about going out and being in. If you didn't follow them, the police come and bring you home.
>
> I used to get a lot of medications at Portage and the group home. I was really doped up in Portage. Just don't ask me about Portage or the group home. I don't want to talk about them. I don't want to remember.

Terry attended special classes during her school years, plus programs at the Manitoba School. She now works as part of a team of people with handicaps at a paper shredding operation in the government buildings.

b) FEBRUARY 1985 UP-DATE

Terry has mixed feelings about what happened with Nettie. On the one hand, she vowed never to push Nettie again, and felt bad about pushing her in the first place. On the other hand, Terry liked being on her own for a while and is getting along with Nettie better than ever.

Terry wanted to continue living alone, but the PHC said they needed another person to cover the costs.

Terry quit the paper shredding job -- "I got bored." The employment agency did not find her a new job.

JOHN KOEPPEL

a) MARCH 1984

John Koeppel lives on Weatherstone Drive about 4 miles east of Nettie and Terry's place. He is in his mid-twenties and lives with a support person. There is also a boarder in the house. John describes himself as follows:

* nice looking, handsome
* smart
* nice
* big
* brown hair, brown or hazel eyes
* wears nice clothes
* clean
* excellent memory.

He likes to play cards, go for walks, go to the library, look around stores, read magazines, draw and paint, and do school work. He does a number of things well, including math and spelling, playing cards, drawing, chores, and remembering. John's memory is truly remarkable. He says he has trouble knowing how to use machines, moving furniture and doing heavy work.

He is trying to learn a number of new things in his new home, including,

* cooking, cleaning, doing the dishes and the laundry
* controlling his behaviour (not hitting, stealing or threatening others)
* not hugging strangers
* not hitting the house
* not screaming
* respecting others' privacy and property
* to talk things out when upset.

He very much wants to learn to control himself so he can go out of the house alone, and stay in the house alone when other people are away.

Over the last 25 years, John Koeppel has moved 20 times, lived in 10 different places, spent about fifteen years in institutions and group living arrangements for more than eight people. Since the age of 11 he has not lived in any one place for more than one or two years. He has lived at home, in group homes, in foster homes, in boarding homes, in an institution in another province, in hospitals and in mental health centres. He has spent

his days in segregated schools, sheltered workshops and institutional day programs. In March 1984, he spent his days at home or out in the community with a companion.

For the three and a half years prior to moving into the Prairie Housing Cooperative, John lived at home and periodically went into hospitals. He slept in an unfinished basement. He says he could not get along with his mother. He occasionally threatened his mother. He wanted "to be more independent and grow up." He moved into his house in the Prairie Housing Cooperative on February 1, 1984 after a stay in a psychiatric setting and three months at home with support staff.

In terms of his current situation, John says,

> I'm getting more independent now. I can handle money and pay bills. I get along with other people better. I get help so I won't get into trouble. There are people to talk to if something is bothering me. I'm learning how to do things. This is a nicer place to live. I have my own room. I'm not in the basement anymore...If I keep up to good work, I want to get a job.

b) FEBRUARY 1985 UP-DATE

It was an eventful year for John Koeppel. Starting in the summer, John began working under a Career Access grant to CAMR-Winnipeg. He also developed quite a drinking problem, but when this began to interfere with his work, his friends in the coop and the Association were able to help him deal with the problem. He regularly attends AA meetings.

More recently John has been working with Wilf doing plumbing, carpentry, moving furniture, and deliverying flyers. They get out every day, and usually John puts in a full six hours. During the February visit, Wilf was offered a new job, and he was worried about John's future. One idea he hopes will work out is for John to work in a re-upholstery business that Wilf's wife is starting.

It also became obvious to the PHC that some of the people living with or near John were not having the best type of influence on him. Some of those individuals are no longer involved in John's life, and the PHC was successful in recruiting a couple to either live with John or in the other house in his cluster. Since the time of the February site visit and this writing, that couple has moved in with John and things are stabilizing nicely.

John continues to be troubled by his behaviour, and is trying very hard to overcome his drinking problem and to stop hitting people. "I hit people to get out my feelings. I talk and do exercise to get them out now. My problem is that I've had a rough life. It's hard not to worry about my life." Wilf has noticed a big change in John's behaviour since he started working.

John has been on a special macro-diet and this has helped

considerably. He is more aware of changes in his body and how that might affect his behaviour. He spends time on his own now.

JANELLE DUBOIS

a) MARCH 1984

Janelle Dubois is four years old and lives with her family on Rillwillow Place about three miles south and west of John Koeppel's house. She has lived there since August, 1983.

Janelle likes to do a lot of things, including,

* go outside
* see people
* feel like she is doing something
* enjoys quiet times
* take a bath
* being with other kids, especially her sisters and the other kids at the day care centre
* music
* car rides
* eating, though she has very particular tastes and preferences.

Janelle began to have seizures when she was four months old. Before that her mother, Joanne, says she "looked like a regular pudgy baby." She was in hospital because of meningitis, pneumonia and a broken leg. Mental retardation was also suspected. It is not clear whether Janelle can see or not. Joanne knows that she can hear and understand, but has trouble convincing the doctors of this. Janelle does not walk, crawl, or talk. She gets a lot of help from her family, including Joanne's mother when she visits. She requires assistance to meet her physical needs and all activities of daily living.

Janelle belongs to a loving and dynamic family. Her mother and two older sisters provide much attention, support and gentle challenge to grow and learn. Janelle attends a regular day care centre in the neighbourhood unless she is sick. At the time of the first site visit, Janelle had been home for a few weeks because of a respiratory infection. Normally, she spends half the day at the day care centre. The rest of the day she is at home sleeping, playing with kids, doing exercises or being in her posture board.

Before moving into the Prairie Housing Cooperative, Janelle lived with her family in a low income housing complex in Winnipeg. Concerning that neighbourhood, Joanne says, "The neighbourhood was not bad, but the kids were learning things that weren't so good. There were a lot of devious characters in the neighbourhood." Joanne thought the situation was deteriorating, and there was no clear way to get more support for her and Janelle. Government social workers were encouraging her to place Janelle in an institution. A foster family was one possible option, but that kind of

arrangement had not worked before. The PHC offered decent housing in a good neighbourhood, and support.

b) FEBRUARY 1985 UP-DATE

Over the year, Janelle has made new friends in her neighbourhood, mainly through her sisters. Her mother, with some help from the L'Avenir Coop, is trying to get Janelle into a regular school program for next year.

NEW MEMBERS

In March 1984, Miriam was living in one of the houses in Tyndall Park on an emergency basis. This became permanent over the year. In February 1985, Dolores moved into Tyndall Park to live with Hazel. Because of the circumstances in March and February, neither woman was interviewed using the questionnaire.

Miriam says she is in her mid-thirties. She has black hair with a touch of grey. She has trouble walking and is much too proud to use a walker, but she does get by with a grocery cart she tries to keep handy when she walks around the neighbourhood. She has trouble getting around the neighbourhood, especially in winter when the sidewalks are not cleared. She talks and expresses herself well, though her speech is hard to understand.

Before coming to the PHC, Miriam lived in a hotel in Winnipeg with sponsorship from the regional housing department. She was kicked out of the hotel, supposedly because she yelled and screamed at herself, though she says it was because she had a party one evening. Miriam's social worker gave her the PHC telephone number, and emergency arrangements were made for her.

Miriam lives on her own in her PHC house, though over the year attempts have been made to have someone live with her. These arrangements did not work out. Miriam likes her privacy, and does not get on easily with others. She looks after just about everything in her house, and is used to living alone, but she does get lonely. She still screams from time to time. She has a friend who spends a fair bit of time with her at her house.

Miriam used to work in a sheltered workshop doing contract work, but she is currently unemployed except for occasional work at the CAMR-Winnipeg office. She had a job over the summer, but would really like a permanent job. She does her shopping in the neighbourhood, and goes downtown to shop and do her banking.

Miriam grew up in Winnipeg and went to school in her neighbourhood. She has spent time in at least one institution, but that part of her history is not clear.

While she has lived in the PHC, Miriam has bought a waterbed, couch, dresser, drapes, and a mirror. She has money in a trust

account controlled by the Public Trustee under an order of supervision.

Miriam decided to stay in the PHC because she "had no place else to go." She would prefer to live in a suite or an apartment either downtown or in the North end of town. "I want to live my life the way I want to."

Miriam has developed a number of relationships in the coop, and calls two of her neighbours about twice a day. She definitely does not want to live with other people with handicaps.

Dolores is in her late twenties and was familiar with the PHC before she moved in. She did a lot of visiting with Hazel over the last few years. She lived with her sister for a time before moving into her new house.

Dolores and her sister really just discovered one another in the last three years. They were split up very early in life. Dolores lived in foster homes, the institution in Portage for seven years, and a group home for several years prior to and after Portage. She ran away from the group home twice. It was while she was in the group home that her sister finally found her.

Dolores's sister has taught her a lot in a short period of time about relationships, cooking, and taking care of her self. Dolores herself is very capable.

Since leaving the institution and the group home, Dolores has gradually stopped taking the 32 pills a day she took there. The four different prescriptions were related to behaviour, seizures and bed-wetting (the last two of which had not been an issue for the past five years). Her sister's insistent requests to have the medications reviewed were ignored by the social worker, so she took action herself.

Dolores's first day in the coop was eventful. First there was the move, getting settled in, and spending some time talking about herself for this case study. In the evening Hazel went out for dinner and spent the night at friends. Dolores was not clear about the arrangement and got worried around midnight. She called Brenda, her coop neighbour, who came over and spent the night with her.

These, then, are the people for whom the Prairie Housing Cooperative exists. What follows is a description of the environments and relationships in which they now live.

B. THE HOUSES AND HOUSEHOLDS

Members of the Prairie Housing Cooperative with developmental special needs have lived in seven houses. The purpose of this section is to review the following topics related to those houses and the households in them:

* The houses and attitudes about them
* The households - who lives with whom, attitudes, and integration
* What goes on in the households - possessions, activities, learning and supports, and decision making.

In March 1984 and February 1985, PHC members with developmental special needs were asked a number of questions about the places in which they live and have lived. Questions were asked about their attitudes re: the last in which they lived before moving to the PHC; their PHC house in March and again in February; and for the two individuals who moved out of the PHC during the year, their new places.

Where information was collected in a structured interview, the responses of nine people were recorded in March and of ten people in February. In March 1984, an interview was not conducted with one resident who at the time was considered to be in the house only on an emergency basis. She was still in the coop in February, and an interview was conducted. In February 1985, one young woman had just moved into her house, and an interview was not conducted. Two members who were interviewed in March 1984 had left the coop by February, but interviews were conducted concerning both the PHC and their new places of residence.

Information related to household composition (numbers of people present, etc.) involved observations and reviewing PHC written material. All individuals with developmental special needs who lived in the houses during March 1984 and February 1985 were included.

1. THE HOUSES

a. Characteristics and Numbers

The seven PHC houses in which people with developmental special needs live have the following characteristics:

* the houses are relatively new. All were built during the late 1970s.
* they all have three bedrooms.
* four houses have two stories, plus a basement. Two have one story plus a basement
* all are attached to other houses. Except for one row house, all are semi-detached.
* only one house has a finished basement
* one house is wheelchair accessible, however, the person living in it does not use a wheelchair.

The numbers and relationships of people living in the houses varied considerably in both 1984 and 1985. Table 2 summarizes those variations.

TABLE 2: HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION, 1984 AND 1985 -- PHC MEMBERS WITH DEVELOPMENTAL SPECIAL NEEDS

House-hold	March 1984 Members with Special Needs	Others	February 1985 Members with Special Needs	Others
1	Husband and wife	2	Husband and wife	1
2	One adult *	0	One adult **	0
3	Two unrelated adults	1	Two unrelated***	0
4	Two unrelated adults	0	One adult	1
5	child	family	child	family
6	One young adult	2	one young adult	2
7	one adult	2	one adult	1****

* emergency situation
** permanent situation
*** one person just moved in
**** after February, a couple moved in

In 1985, except for the house with the married couple, each individual with developmental special needs has his/her own bedroom. In three of the seven households, there are more bedrooms than people. In one of those houses, one person occupies two of the smaller bedrooms in the house.

b. Attitudes about the Houses

PHC members with developmental special needs were asked a number of questions regarding the degree to which they like their houses, their location and condition. They were also asked the same questions about their last place of residence. For the two women who moved out of the PHC, questions were asked about their new homes.

Table 3 summarizes their answers. The information in Table 3, as well as a comparison of the individual answers about PHC and other residences, indicates the following key points:

* In 1984 and 1985, PHC members with special needs liked their houses, the location of those houses, the condition

Table 3 : Ratings of Houses, Location, Repairs and Condition - PHC 1985 and 1984, and Previous Place of Residence

ITEM	PHC-1985 ++	+	-	--	PHC-1984 ++	+	-	--	Last Place ++	+	-	--
House	8	1	1		9				3	2		4
Location	7	3			7	2			4	1	1	3
Inside Condition of House	8	2			8	1			3		3	3
Outside Condition	7	3			5	4			3		3	3
Major Repairs	some*- 5 none - 5				some*- 3 none - 6				a lot - 3 some - 3 none - 3			

* It is difficult to judge what "Some" major repairs means in these instances. There was no apparent evidence of major structural problems with any of the houses, though in one instance there was a significant draft coming from around the chimney area.

of the inside and outside, and their state of repair.

* This contrasts with their ratings of their last places of residence. Most ranked their PHC houses higher. Some ranked them the same. In terms of location, repair and condition, one person ranked the PHC house slightly lower than the last house.

* In 1985, six of the seven members who are still living in the PHC indicated that they like their PHC houses even better than when they first moved in.

* For the two who moved out of PHC, they like their new houses about the same as their former PHC houses.

c. Summary

The houses, as houses, were rated highly by the people with developmental special needs who live in them. The majority of the people rate their PHC houses higher than their previous residence. The vast majority think that their PHC houses are better or as least as good as their former houses.

The number of bedrooms, relative to the number of people living in the houses, affords privacy and personal space. No person with developmental special needs shares a bedroom with another person, except for the married couple. In the strict sense of the word, there is "underutilization" of bedrooms in that in three houses there are three bedrooms for one or two full-time occupants. This is also the case for several of the other PHC houses occupied by members without handicaps.

For people who are vulnerable and trying to establish themselves in the community, these houses represent a significant and positive message to the people themselves and their community.

2. THE HOUSEHOLDS

a. Integration and Congregation

The composition of the households is significant in terms of integration and congregation, as well as in terms of interpersonal relations in one of the most important places a person spends time - home. The information related to these issues comes from questionnaires about the households, interviews with the individuals with developmental special needs, and observations.

As mentioned above, there is considerable variation in the composition of the households in which the people with developmental special needs live. There are a number of indicators of integration and congregation:

* the numbers of people with handicaps in the house;

* the groupings of individuals in terms of the degree of their handicaps;
* the appropriateness of the people in the household in terms of the age of the occupants; and,
* the absolute and relative numbers of non-handicapped sharing the house

(i) The numbers of people with handicaps in a house: In no case have more than two people with handicaps lived in the same house. In 1984, three individuals shared their houses with no other handicapped person. In 1985, there were five individuals living with no other handicapped person.

In terms of the eleven people who were living in PHC in March 1984 and/or February 1985, five experienced a decrease in the number of handicapped people with whom they live compared to their last place of residence. For four people, this represents no change. For two people, however, they are now living with more handicapped people than previously. In one case, this is because the individual married another person with developmental special needs, whereas before she lived with her family.

In the wider community, it is very rare for more than one person with a handicap to naturally appear in a family or household. In this context, five of the individuals in 1985 live in a clearly non-congregated house. Relative to the usual congregation of people with handicaps in institutions, group homes and apartment programs, however, all are living in situations that are far less congregated than the norm, and all are living in situations which are more like what would occur naturally.

(ii) The groupings of people with handicaps in terms of the levels of their handicaps. One of the rationales for integration is to provide role models for people with handicaps, that is to have other people present from whom can be learned appropriate behaviours and skills. If people who have a lot to learn are grouped with people who also have a lot to learn, the chances are low that they will be able to learn appropriate skills and behaviour from one another. In fact, people who need to learn appropriate behaviours often learn inappropriate behaviours if the other people with whom they live are behaving inappropriately. In none of the PHC houses are people grouped in such a way that they cannot learn from each other. Consistently, people who have significant handicaps do not live with other handicapped people, much less with other handicapped people who also have significant handicaps.

Other problems arise when people with physical disabilities share a house. For example, more than one person in a wheelchair makes it difficult to move around in the house. The one person in the PHC who has mobility problems does not share her house with other handicapped people.

(iii) Age Appropriateness. All the households are composed in ways that are appropriate and typical in terms of the age of the

members with developmental special needs. All of the adult members are sharing their houses with people who are adults; either their spouse or a partner in the house; and of similar age. The one young child is living with her family. This is in direct contrast to the situations in which some of the people found themselves previously - living as adults with their parents. For the married couple, it was impossible for them to live together in their previous settings.

(iv) Absolute and relative numbers of non-handicapped people sharing the house: There are two traditional views concerning the impact of integration - first, people with handicaps appear less different when they are seen in the presence of non-handicapped people, and second, non-handicapped people can provide models for growth, development, and learning. With both views, the presence of non-handicapped people in a household is important, as is their presence in greater numbers than people with handicaps.

In 1985, two individuals live in two households where the number of non-handicapped people in the households is greater than the number of people with special needs. This was the case for three individuals in three housholds in 1984. In 1985, two people lived in two households where the numbers are equal. In 1984, this was the case for two people in one household. In 1985 and 1984, five people lived in three households where there are more handicapped people than non-handicapped people. In two of these households, there were no non-handicapped people present. It is important to note that between March 1984 and February 1985, four of the households and individuals experienced a decline in the number of non-handicapped people with whom they lived, and one individual experienced an increase.

This contrasts sharply and positively with the situations experienced by people prior to moving into the Prairie Housing Cooperative. In those previous situations, eight people lived in houses where the number of handicapped people was greater than the number of non-handicapped people. Three people lived in situations where the number were the same or non-handicapped people out-numbered handicapped people.

In terms of integration and congregation, then, the Prairie Housing Cooperative represents an improvement for most of the individuals with developmental special needs. In absolute terms, there was a slight degree of congregation in 1984 for six individuals, two of whom were married to one another, but only for four, including the couple in 1985. This congregation, however, is only at the level of two people with handicaps living together. People with handicaps and non-handicapped people are grouped so that appropriate skills and behaviours can be learned. The households are composed in ways that are appropriate to the age of the individuals. By and large, people live in more integrated settings than they did previously.

Three issues emerge related to integration and congregation:

* The fact that the PHC has bought only three bedroom houses in which people with developmental special needs are to live has in some cases meant that more than one person with a handicap lives in a house. This is especially the case for individuals who require less support. The individuals who require most support are those who are less congregated and more integrated. It is also true that those who are less handicapped are better able to overcome the potential negative imagery of slightly congregated and less integrated settings.

* At least one individual is 1984 experienced more congregation and less integration than she desired. She and the PHC wanted her to live on her own with supports being provided by neighbours. Here the "program" required the person to fit in, insofar as PHC had no units suitable for this individual. She left the coop (for slightly unrelated reasons) and is enjoying living on her own.

* In one household in 1984, two individuals with developmental special needs live with two other people who are considered to be non-handicapped. There is some doubt, however, whether the community at large would consider this to be the case. While there is no evidence to confirm or deny this doubt, it is of concern. Integration and congregation relate to community and self attitudes about handicapped people. The handicapped people in this household do not view their housemates as handicapped, but if the community does, there may be some negative consequences in terms of image. Integration and congregation also relate to the availability of role models. There is some doubt as to whether these two individuals provide quality models. In 1985, one of the individuals moved out of the PHC.

b. Attitudes and Continuity

Household composition also involves relationships - liking the people with whom one lives, and experiencing continuity in those relationships.

There is no doubt that the people with developmental special needs in the Prairie Housing Cooperative like the people with whom they live.

In 1984, the following attitudes were expressed. Seven of of the nine members liked those other people "a lot." Two liked them "some." Only four of them liked the people they used to live with "a lot." Five of them disliked the people they lived with either "some" or "a lot." When asked how they get on with people they live with, seven people indicated they get on better now compared with the last place they lived. Two said they get on the same.

TABLE 4: Continuity and Discontinuity in the Lives of People with Developmental Special Needs in the Prairie Housing Coop

Person	TO MARCH 1984			MARCH 1984 TO FEBRUARY 1985	
	Months in PHC	# of PHC Houses In	Changes/Continuity	Additional Months	Changes/Continuity
1	16	2	* after 10 months, moved to another house because of marriage * in new house, 6 month relation with husband and support person * in new house, another person (a boarder)introduced after 4 months * former housemates still in neighbourhood	11	* boarder left after 10 months in house * no changes for 7 months, stable relationship with other two people for 17 months
2	12	2	* after 6 months, moved to another house because of marriage * in new house, 6 month relation with wife and support person * in new house, boarder introduced after 4 months * former housemates still in neighbourhood	11	* as above
3	18	1	* consistent relationship with support person for 18 months * 1 housemate moved out after 10 months * new housemate consistent for 6 months	11	* Support person leaves after 21 month relationship, then returns later for 2 months, and leaves * Housemate leaves after 9 month relationship * Four new housemates come for short periods of time then leave * Lives 3 months alone * New housemate moves in February '85
4	5	1	* five month consistent relationship with two housemates	4	* Support person leaves after 6 month relationship, and new housemate moves in * one month later second new housemate arrives * one month later individual leaves PHC (married)
5	7	1	* seven month consistent relationship with brother in house * 2 different support people for two months each * current support person consistent for four months	11	* Support person leaves after 5 month relationship * Lives with brother alone for 6 months * Support couple moves in * Brother leaves PHC (married) after 15 months * Consistent relationship with couple for 4 months
6	15	1	* no housemate for 3 months * consistent relationship with housemate for 12 months	5	* Leaves PHC after 20 months in PHC (17 months with housemate)
7	12	1	* consistent relationship with housemate for 12 months	11	* Housemate leaves after 17 month relationship * Lives alone for 4 months * New support person consistent for 2 months
8	1.5	1	* consistent relationship with support person for 1.5 months * a second person left after 1 month, but lives next door	11	* Over 11 month period lives with 4 different people (longest period with one = 5 months) * Current support person consistent for 2 months (to be replaced by couple)
9	7	1	* consistent relationship with 4 members of family	11	* continuing consistent relationship with family

In 1985, the ten people interviewed (two of whom had moved out of the PHC) indicated a slightly less favourable picture. Six said they like the people they lived with "a lot." Two said they liked them "some" while one expressed dislike and one did not answer. Of the eight who lived in PHC in February, four stated they liked their housemates "better" than they did in March, three said they liked them the "same", and one did not answer.

In terms of continuity, there have been considerable changes in household relationships while people have lived in the cooperative. Table 4 summarizes the continuities and discontinuities in terms of before March 1984, and between March and February 1985.

To March 1984

Up to March 1984 and of the nine people who were permanent residents, three people experienced no changes in their household relationships while they lived in the Prairie Housing Cooperative. Two people had moved to another PHC house, because they got married. Five people had experienced other people moving into their houses. Three people had experienced people moving out of their houses, though in two cases the individuals moved either next door or in the same neighbourhood.

By February 1985, this situation had changed dramatically. Except for the woman who moved in during February, only one person had not experienced some changes in their household relationships. Two PHC members left the coop, but none of the other members with handicaps moved to other PHC houses. Of the nine who were members throughout the period between March and February, all experienced at least one person leaving the household, three of whom lived with at least four different people during the eleven month period.

Not including the newest member, only one PHC member with handicaps has lived with one consistent person throughout her time in the coop. Two others, the married couple, have maintained their relationship for 18 months. In March of 1984, in contrast, it was possible to say that six people were still maintaining relationships that developed with one other person in their households from when they moved into the cooperative, and a seventh person was maintaining a relationship for the entire period of time in which she has shared her house with someone. The remaining two individuals were still maintaining relationships with each other after getting married and moving into another PHC house.

Table 5 summarizes the changes in household relationships experienced by PHC members while they have lived in the coop. Two people have experienced no breaks in household relationships, one of whom just moved into the coop in February. Two others have only experienced one break over more than a 20 week period. Six individuals have experiened between three and five breaks, and one has experienced seven. Five of the eleven have lived with five or more people while in the coop.

TABLE 5: Changes in Household Relationships Within PHC (Entry to 2/85)

Person	# of people with whom lives(d)	Total # of people with whom has lived	"Broken" Relations	# of Months in PHC
1	2	5	3	27
2	2	7	5	23
3	1	8	7**	29
4*	2	4	4	9
5	2	6	4	18
6*	1	1	1	20
7	1	2	1	23
8	1	5	4**	13
9	4	4	0	18
10	0	3	3	12
11	1	1	1	<1

* has left the PHC
** one person left, then returned

While the issue being addressed here is continuity in household relationships, it must be noted that some of these breaks have involved individuals moving out of households, but not out of relationships. All of the eleven PHC members with handicaps, whether currently residing in the coop or not, still maintain relationships in the clusters which began when they moved in. Four members maintain relationships with former PHC members who still live in their neighbourhoods, but not as part of the coop. The intentional creation of clusters and relationships by the PHC was intended to buffer the impact of some of the expected changes in households which would occur. It should also be noted that for five of the individuals, some of the breaks in continuity have been to their advantage -- the broken relationship was not a good one.

3. WHAT GOES ON IN HOUSEHOLDS

This part of the case study focuses on a number of aspects of the life in households: possessions and furnishings; chores and activities; rules and decisions; and learning and supports.

a. Possessions and Furnishings

People who live in institutions and group homes frequently do not have their own possessions. This is often true in terms of personal items such as clothes, family pictures, books, and so on, but most often true in terms of furniture, major appliances, dishes, telephones and the like. In group living situations, people with handicaps often do not own such major items. They do not have control over their use, they are not able to take them with them when they move, and the can not enjoy the status and image benefits that owning such items confers on an individual.

In 1984, members of the Prairie Housing Cooperative were asked a series of questions about some of the major items typically found in households - are they present in the household, who owns them, and where are they located. These questions were asked in terms of televisions, radios, matching sets of dishes, cars, washers and dryers, dishwashers, and telephones. These questions were not repeated in 1985.

Table 6 summarizes the information in terms of the number of such items present, who owns them, and the per capita availability for personal use. In terms of per capita availability, the assumption is that shared use of an item means having to share control over it. The fewer people that must compete for the use of something, the more control each individual has over it.

No inventory was taken of the furniture in households, but information was collected through observations and general discussion throughout the interviews. All but one of the houses were well furnished in terms of typical pieces of furniture (sofas, tables, chairs, dining room furniture, beds, dressers, and the like) being both present and in good shape. By and large,

Table 6 : Presence and Ownership of Household Items (1984)

Person/# in Household	TV #	TV per	TV owner	Radio #	Radio per	Radio owner	Phone #	Phone per	Phone owner	Dishes (matched set) #	Dishes (matched set) owner
1 + 2 (4)	1	.25	1+2	1	.25	1+2	2	.5	1+2	2	1+2
3+4 (3)	1	.33	4	2	.66	3	2	.66	3	0	
5 (3)	1	.33	*	2	.66	*/**	1	.33	5	1	**
6 (2)	0			3	1.5	**	2	1	6	0	
7+8 (2)	2	1	8**	?			2	1	7,8	2	7
9 (5)	1	.2	F	1	.2	F	1	.2	F	1	F

(number) = total number of people in household
per = number of items present per person in household
Owner = number refers to person who owns iten
* another person in the household owns the item
** the cooperative owns the item
F, the family owns the item

people brought bedroom furniture with them or picked it out when they moved in. Since 1984, the one house which was not well furnished has greatly improved in appearance, and a second house has improved even more in terms of furnishings.

In the case of the two families, furniture was either brought with them into the cooperative or received as wedding or family gifts. For the remaining households, living and dining room furniture was purchased by or for the individuals when they moved in. In one case, the furniture was donated from an estate.

By and large, then, the houses are well furnished. People have most major items about which questions were asked. The major exceptions are cars and dishwashers, both of which are comparative luxury items for people with low incomes.

Ownership is somewhat different, however. Seven of the nine individuals have telephones listed in their own names. One adult and the four-year old do not. Insofar as having a telephone listing is one of the most public items in the list (along with a car), it is one of the most important. In terms of the adults and their possession of TVs, radios and dishes, few of the individuals own these items. Though this was not explored in the interviews, at this time individuals do not appear to want these items. They have access to them in relatively non-competitive situations. Given that most of the individuals are receiving very low incomes, this appears to be a matter they choose to resolve over time.

b. Chores

A household is a small community. One of the most important ways that people participate in the life of that community is by "doing chores." By and large, the PHC members with developmental special needs participate actively in this way. Some receive more help and assistance in doing chores, but they do participate. Janelle, the pre-schooler, does not actively participate in these activities in her household.

People were asked to identify what they do around their houses and what they did in their last house. The list of activities are not reproduced here - they are not very exciting. In most situations (5 people), the individuals do about the same amount of work around the house as they did before they moved into the PHC. Two people do considerably more - one because she moved away from an over-protective situation at home into married life, the other because he moved from an institution to his own home. One young man does slightly less than he did before - he is now married and tends to let his wife do more of the cooking.

People were also asked who participates in a number of chores around the house - mowing the lawn, taking out the garbage, doing the dishes, cooking, doing the beds, cleaning the house, doing the laundry, planning the meals and fixing things around the house. In terms of most of the chores, all members of the household participate and take turns doing the work. In terms of mowing the lawn,

in all but one case, other coop households or other people (such as the condominium) mow the lawn. The same is true for fixing things around the house - in all but two households, other members of the coop are relied upon to either fix things or arrange for repair services.

In February 1985, there were no appreciable changes in the dynamics of responsibilities for chores. Over the course of the year, however, there were changes which reflected the changing composition of households, primarily in terms of there being fewer people in some households to do the chores.

c. Decisions and Rules

Many of the members with developmental special needs reported that in their last place of residence, the rules and degrees of freedom were oppressive. Comments related to not being allowed out of the house, having to return to the house at specific times, lack of control over money, and, in the case of institutions, having almost no freedom of choice about where and with whom one lives, what one does, who one sees, or where one goes.

PHC members were asked about a number of topics that directly or indirectly relate to the ability to make decisions:

- are there rules in the house
- who decides who lives with you
- who picked out the furniture
- who decided which room you sleep in
- who decides how you spend your money
- how do you decide who does what around the house
- has there been any improvement in your ability to make decisions about your life?

Except where noted, the responses discussed below are from the 1984 interviews, since there was no real change in the dynamics of households over the year.

* Rules

Members were asked, "Are there rules in this house about what you can and can't do?" The question is ambiguous at best insofar as there are rules or common understandings in all households about permitted behaviours and actions. This is true even when people live alone. We all set limits for ourselves and the others with whom we live.

Nevertheless, in 1984, four individuals with developmental special needs from three housholds in the PHC indicated that there were rules. Five from the other three households said there were no rules. The rules reported by the four were quite different:

- For two people in two households, the rules are clearly linked to behaviour. One young man has rules about when he can leave the house and with whom, behaviour in front of

company or in public, and about not taking a bath after midnight. Another young man is not supposed to scream or hit in the house, and there are rules about going into other bedrooms without permission, borrowing from others, listening in on telephone conversations, and when and with whom he can leave the house.

- For two people in another household, the house rule is "no men upstairs." This is an historical rule related to privacy. It started when a former resident was visited by a friend. The other members of the household simply did not want their privacy invaded. There are still three women living in the house, men still come to visit, and they have agreed the rule still has some relevance. There is one additional rule in the house about one of the members of the household taking a bath regularly.

In 1985, only two of these individuals reported having rules in their households, both of which related to behaviour. The specifics of those rules also changed, reflecting different areas of concern in the behaviour of the individuals.

* Decisions - Who Lives with Whom

Members were asked "who decides who lives with you in this house?" Four people indicated that they have a say in the decision. Two people indicated that their families make the decision. In one case, this involved the young man's brother, who shares the house with him, and his parents. In the other, the head of the household, the mother, makes the decisions about who lives with the family. One person indicated that the coop decides. Two people were not sure how the decision is made, though one said she knew the person who was moving in and approved of the idea.

For the people who indicated that they have a say in who lives in the household, all stated that they have a chance to meet the person who would either move into the house with them or into whose house they would move. Each thought that the coop would listen if they objected, though in most cases there were feelings that they should be as open as possible to potential members.

* Decisions - In Which Room People Sleep

Because the houses have been occupied by different people at different times, the ways in which decisions about rooms get made vary. Four people indicated they picked their bedrooms. Two people indicated there was no choice (only one bedroom was unoccupied). Two people indicated that other people made the decision for them. In the final situation, one person already occupied the largest bedroom in the house, so the person moving in chose to use the two smaller bedrooms.

* Decisions - Money

When asked "who decides how you spend your money?" two people

indicated that they decide themselves and have full control over their money. For the other seven people, other people play a role in money decisions. Three of the seven indicated that they decide how their money is spent, but they have joint, co-signing accounts with other members of the coop. Two people indicated that one of the other members of the coop decides how their money is spent. For two individuals, one of whom is a child, other members of the family control their money. In 1985, there were three individuals living in the PHC with whom the Public Trustee was involved.

* Decisions - Furniture

The selection of furniture by the people with developmental special needs is a complicated business. Four people actively selected some or all of the furniture for the house. Three people have not participated significantly in furniture selection because they received the furniture either as wedding gifts (2 people) or as donations. For one individual, the coop provided the furniture. For the ninth individual, her mother, as head of the household, selects the furniture.

In contrast though to a situation where a person moves into a residence operated by an agency, eight people either selected their own furniture or received them as gifts under normal circumstances.

* Decisions - Chores

Individuals were asked "how do you and the other people who live with you decide who does what around the house?" Eight people indicated that decisions are made through self made decisions ("I do what needs to be done,""I do what I like to do,""We all just do what we want and it seems to get done") and/or discussions among the members of the household ("We have a little meeting,""some times we talk about it,"" we'll talk it over with the neighbours [other coop members] if it's not working out"). The ninth person is a young girl who often "voices her opinions" about who does what, especially when the "who" is doing it to her.

* Decisions - About Your Life

Individuals were asked to compare their situation in the PHC with where they lived before in terms of, among other areas, "your ability to make decisions about your life." While this covers many areas in a general way, it bears a relationship to the topic being discussed here. Six people said that their ability to make decisions has improved, and three people said it was the same.

* Overview - Rules and Decisions

The members of the Prairie Housing Cooperative with developmental special needs do not have the full range of decision making power about household matters usually associated with independent adults living in society. There are certain decisions that are

limited simply because they share their houses with other people and people move into the houses at different times. There are other decisions that are limited because of the fact that the coop, rather than individuals living in the houses, maintains a considerable degree of influence over decisions about who lives with whom. And then there are limits on decision making and rules established because different individuals need support in different areas.

The life experience offered by the Prairie Housing Coop in the area of decision making and rules must be seen in light of the alternatives. On the one hand, independent adults or families who want to share their houses with other people have considerable degrees of control. They can advertise for and interview people who may be interested in sharing the house, because it is their house, they can determine who moves in, what room that person sleeps in, and so forth. Independent adults and families typically select their own furniture, discuss who will sleep where, control their own money, discuss who will do what around the house, and develop their own rules or agreements about what happens in the house. Members of the family who are children typically have much less to say in these important areas.

People who live in services (group homes, institutions, and the like) typically have very little control over the people with whom they share the house. A selection committee of the agency usually decides that. They have little control over which room they sleep in. Usually it is the one available or the one that staff assign. They have little control over the rules of the house. These are usually written policies of the agency decided over time by staff and Boards. They have little control over the furniture in the house. Furniture is usually already there and belongs to the house. They have varying degrees of control over their money. PHC members report that they had little or no control over their money in the apartment programs, group homes, and institutions in which they have lived.

The Prairie Housing Cooperative situation appears to be somewhere in between these two alternatives, but closer to an independent situation. Major decisions about who lives in houses and with whom are significantly under the control and influence of the individuals with developmental special needs. More choice is open to individuals who first occupy houses insofar as they can select their own bedrooms and interview potential housemates. They are more like people who decide to open their homes to other people. The people who move into such houses, however, have somewhat less control, primarily because the degree of choice is limited by circumstances.

Decisions about furniture are similarly constrained. As discussed in a previous section, a number of individuals brought furniture with them. In most cases, however, it is simply a matter of houses "filling up" with furniture resulting in there being fewer and fewer options open for selecting needed pieces of furniture. If and when people move out of households, more

Table 7: Learning in Households

Person	Learning in PHC 1984 (1985)	Learned Before
1	* to get along with people * to read and write	* to shop, cook, clean
2	* 14 new recipes * to get along and help others * to ask for advice * to shop, cook * cross stitching * look after my heart problem * (to make bread) * (for a period of time - to read and write)	* to take the bus
3	* how to reason and think things through * the responsibilities of marriage * budgetting * to take things as they are, to be a happy and better person * (to do my job)	* budgetting * pricing things in stores * do laundry * to cook
4	* budgetting * to take a bath regularly * that there is a lot of love in the Prairie Housing Coop * (no longer in coop)	* to cook * handle money * clean house * go shopping
5	* get along with housemate * balance the chequebook * (left coop, but still gets help from member with $)	* I learned most everything at home before moving to the last place

Table 7 (continued)

Person	Learning in PHC 1984 (1985)	Learned Before
6	* nothing special * to handle money * (maybe pottery)	* nothing
7	* do a better job with cooking, cleaning, dishes and laundry * to control my behaviour (hitting, threatening or screaming) * (not to drink) * (get a job and work for a living)	* mother taught cooking,cleaning, dishes and laundry
8	* grooming, house cleaning, dressing, cooking, etc. * academics, communications * appropriate behaviours * a number of sports * (lift head in public) * (watch for cars while walking) * (Share with others) * (cooking) * (keeping fit)	* "virtually nothing"
9	* physical activation and therapy * to socialize with other kids at day care * (use a spoon) * (pull self along floor) * (respond to different things)	* "less than now"

opportunities for selection opens up. People who move out take their furniture with them.

Decisions about who does what around the house and house rules, whether about behaviour, money or having men upstairs, tend to occur in typical ways. They are related to the individuals who live in the houses - who does what things well and willingly.

One major aspect of decision making that did not come out in the interviews with individuals is the role of the Prairie Housing Cooperative in deciding at what time it is suggested that someone live with someone else, have their own house in an existing cluster, or have a new house in a new cluster. This will be discussed later in this report. In this context however, the major point, in terms of individual decision making at the household level, is that the individual strengths and needs of existing and new PHC members are taken into account when making such decisions.

d. Learning

Prairie Housing Coop members with developmental special needs receive the support and assistance of others in two ways :

(i) help, advice and assistance in daily activities, and
(ii) more teaching oriented assistance so that people can learn new skills.

Table 7 summarizes what the people say they have learned or are learning in the PHC and in their last place of residence. The next section of this part of the report focusses on the support provided that assists this learning, but also on relationships with neighbours, friends and family. This is a somewhat arbitrary division of discussion, but responds to an underlying difference - much of the learning that takes place is focussed on the household, but the people who assist involve a much wider network of relationships, and thereby involve in that learning the people in the broader community.

C. SUPPORT, NEIGHBOURS, FRIENDS AND FAMILY

Physically, ordinary people spend a great deal of their time at home. Socially, the quality of life at home is very important. We all sustain and develop important relationships with our families, friends, and neighbours. Relations at home and with important people ideally provide us with personal support, a sense of belonging to a group of people who care about one another. This section focuses on the nature of these relationships in terms of the Prairie Housing Cooperative, specifically in terms of its members with developmental special needs.

As with many people, there are not always clear lines distinguishing household relationships from those with other people who are close physically and socially. This is particularly the case in the Prairie Housing Cooperative. Just as individuals are involved in "extended families" in quite different ways, many members of Prairie Housing Cooperative are involved in "extended households." People who are friends, neighbours, and supporters often relate to one another in ways that defy neat separations of households, next door neighbours, support providers.

This section focusses on the following topics:

* Supports - what kinds of assistance are provided;
* Clusters and Neighbours - social relations with neighbours, both within the coop clusters and beyond;
* Family Ties - on-going involvements with families; and
* Friends - the maintenance and creation of friendships.

1. SUPPORTS

The mission of the Prairie Housing Cooperative clearly involves providing support to its members with special needs. As mentioned above, there is a considerable amount of learning taking place in their households, individuals are assisted to make decisions, and help is provided to varying degrees in terms of everyday routines associated with maintaining a house and a household - chores, shopping, budgetting, and so on. The clusters of PHC houses were created specifically to surround the people who need support with good neighbours who can provide it. In some cases, support people live in the households of people with special needs.

The supports provided to PHC members with special needs are organized and provided in different ways and involve a variety of people. Fundamentally, the approach is one of developing a community of support that involves fellow citizens (usually fellow coop members) in being good neighbours, friends, companions and, some times, teachers. It also fundamentally involves families supporting one another.

This basic "good neighbours" and family-centred approach is

supplemented to varying degrees in several ways:

* the L'Avenir Coop, often in support of the family, arranges support and plans for support,
* people are paid by various means to live with and/or support people with special needs, and
* the involvement of agencies in providing services (counselling, job training, school and day care programs, etc.).

For individuals in each cluster, supports are organized in the following ways:

a) Tyndall Park

* TO MARCH 1984

For Betty and Rubin Meltzer, other members of their household and cluster help and assist them in a number of areas. They also help one another. Neil lives with Betty and Rubin. He is a friend, adviser, and helps out in the house with everyday activities. Brenda, Simone and Michael live in three other houses in the cluster. They provide friendship, advice, and help Betty learn new recipes, prepare for and do the shopping, and learn to cross stitch. They also help out with money matters. Ray and Barb provide friendship and counselling.

Hazel gets help from Brenda once or twice a week with money matters and shopping, and seeks her advice. Allison lives with Hazel. She is a friend and listener, and also helps with the cooking and cleaning.

Mary gets help with money matters, shopping, personal hygiene, and personal problems. Brenda, her next door neighbour, helps her in these areas and is a friend. Allison helps out in the house.

There is a great deal of mutual support among all the members within the Tyndall Park cluster. A number of the non-handicapped cluster members, when asked about to whom they provide support, reported providing "friendship" to other non-handicapped members. The impression left during the interviews and discussions was that the cluster is a community of good neighbours who help one another out and spend time together.

The support provided to Betty, Rubin, Hazel and Mary is provided on a voluntary basis by members of other households.

* FEBRUARY 1985 UP-DATE

Betty and Rubin reported in February that they get, but also need, less support than before. Simone continues to help Betty learn to cook, and this is complemented by a group of church members who have a cooking group. Simone also helps Rubin with money matters, but only when he gets "stuck." Simone was helping

Rubin learn to write (as opposed to print), but this ended when Rubin got a job and Simone had less free time. Barb was helping Betty learn to read and write, but this stopped when Barb no longer had time, according to Betty. According to Neil, "I just do small things to help. They do most everything on their own and are successful at it. I'm just a security blanket."

Betty is confident enough about money that she no longer gets help from a social worker. Rubin found his job with the assistance of a social service agency in Winnipeg. Brenda helped Betty and Rubin work through their problems with Betty's parents.

Hazel still relies on Brenda for help with her bank account and making sure she has enough money for food, but she does the shopping on her own now. Allison no longer lives in the coop, though Hazel keeps in touch with her.

Mary no longer lives in the coop either. She relies on her husband and parents for advice now.

Generally, there have been a number of changes in the supports provided in the cluster. This has been in response to the growing abilities of the members with handicaps, changes in the lives of many members of the cluster (new jobs, new children) and the fact that some members left the coop.

b) Adsum

* TO MARCH 1984

Arnold lives with and gets a lot of support from Albert, his brother, and Ray, his housemate. Albert is first of all a brother to Arnold. He also provides support in terms of teaching Arnold new skills, getting him involved socially, managing his money, taking him places, and helping him develop his skills in the area of personal hygiene, grooming and communications. Ray is also involved in teaching, being a friend, helping around the house, preparing meals, developing skills, physical activity, and getting out in the community. Ray's support is paid for under the Approved Home Program of the government. Some funds have also come from Albert.

The Rice and Stermscheg families live in other PHC houses in the cluster and support Arnold as well. They provide friendship and, once a week, each supervises Arnold. They do this as neighbours.

Gil and Phillip do not live in the coop, but provide a considerable amount of support. Phillip provides support for three full days and one half day a week. He accompanies Arnold to school and acts as a teacher's aide there. He also helps with communication skills, learning to swim, getting dressed, learning to cook, getting involved in recreation and community activities, and developing work skills. Phillip's involvement is funded through the L'Avenir Coop. Gil is involved with Arnold once or twice a

week to provide friendship, help with grooming, and getting involved in the community. Gil's involvement has been on a volunteer basis.

Harry, Vivian and Debra Yanofsky are members of Arnold's family who are involved in providing support. Most of all they are family. Once or twice a week they visit with Arnold or have him over for a meal, go out in the community, or go to the doctor's.

Sharon is a friend of Arnold's. Once or twice a week she works with Arnold on his communications skills, helps him learn to cook, goes shopping, and supervises him.

Brenda lives in another PHC cluster. She is a friend who is on call for social support or supervision when needed.

Since July 1983, for varying periods of time, 4 other people have been Arnold's friends, helped him with different activities and to learn new skills. Their involvement was funded through the L'Avenir Coop.

* FEBRUARY 1985 UP-DATE

There were a number of changes in Arnold's support network during the year -- a number of support people and neighbours left the coop. Albert is still very much involved in his brother's life, even though he no longer lives with him. Bill was hired through a grant to help Arnold with reading, encouraging him, and going for walks, swimming and to the movies. Steve and Heather now live with Arnold and help him do and learn chores, and to act appropriately. According to Albert, "they were just the right people and just the right time." Now that Arnold is out in the community more than before, he has less contact with his coop neighbours, though he still will go over for an evening now and again.

c) Southdale

* TO MARCH 1984

John gets support from a wide network of people. Craig lives with John, helps him get involved in activities inside and outside of the house, and helps him learn new skills and to control his behaviour. Michael sleeps over in John's house, but spends most of his time at school. Robert used to live with John, but now lives two doors down in another PHC house. Robert spends evenings during the week and full days on the weekend teaching John basic skills (doing the laundry and dishes, cleaning the house), teaching academic subjects (math, grammar, etc.), helping John develop proper speech patterns, assisting John to develop good hygiene, dress and posture, and providing financial aid. The L'Avenir Coop provides funds for Craig, Michael, and Robert's involvement. Additional funding for Robert's support comes from private donations.

Marcel shares a PHC house with Robert. Marcel is one of John's friends. With help from friends of Craig, Robert, Michael and Marcel, John gets involves in activities like camping and hiking.

John's relationship with his mother was strained at the time of the site visit, so he does not have a lot of contact with her. She is involved, supported by members of the L'Avenir Coop, in arranging and monitoring supports. David and Faye are involved with the L'Avenir Coop and assist in putting the supports together, supervising them, and providing training. But they are more intimately involved with John as friends, allies and advocates.

One of John's friends also belongs to a church near his PHC home. She has been actively involved in John's life, particularly in getting him established in his new home. Through her, the congregation has provided help and encouraged John's involvement in activities.

One plan for the future calls for the involvement of a Winnipeg agency in helping John find a job.

* FEBRUARY 1985 UP-DATE

Between March and February there were significant changes in the supports provided to John. Through a Career Access grant to CAMR-Winnipeg, a job was created for John that got him out of the house during the day and meaningfully involved in the community. Alongside of Ron, who was hired to work with John, John did painting and maintenance work. The fact that he received a minimum wage meant that he no longer required the social allowance paid by Social Services.

John's housemate was asked to leave the coop because he was not providing a good role model for John. Jacques moved in to provide support in the house. Over the year Jacques moved out for periods of time, and Angie moved in. By the time of the February site visit, Jacques was the person living with John, though since that time and this writing a couple have moved in with John. In February, Jacques was helping John with his medications, cooking, shopping, money management, and those rough periods when John is upset.

For most of the year, Robert continued to live in the other cluster house and provided support to John. Robert has subsequently left the coop.

Dave and Faye have been supporting John to deal with his drinking problem, and overseeing his support arrangements.

During the year as well, Wilf began assisting John during the day. They work together on painting, maintenance, plumbing, carpentry, and so on. While they work throughout Winnipeg, they have also been working in John's house. The condition of the house

has been improved considerably due to their work.

John's support has required a creative combination of resources including the Career Access grant, PHC members, and the L'Avenir Coop. It is hoped that the significant and positive changes which have occured in John's life over the year will be built upon by having a couple live with or near John.

d) Grant Park

* TO MARCH 1984

Nettie and Terry get some assistance, though mainly friendship and some advice from their neighbours in the coop. The Lovegrove and Plewes families help out with money matters and rides to run errands and do the shopping. Barry helps out with the yard work. The Storey family are friends and provide the occasional lift to the supermarket. Terry also gets assistance from her social worker in terms of income tax and personal counselling. Rod, a PHC member in another cluster, is also her friend and advocate. Nettie occasionally relies on her neighbours to help resolve differences of opinion with Terry about household matters.

* FEBRUARY 1985 UP-DATE

During the year Nettie moved out of the coop. The disagreement between Nettie and Terry happened when the Plewes were away, but upon their return they helped sort things out. Rod helped Nettie find her new apartment.

Gina Plewes continues to help Nettie with advice and her chequebook. Gina also helps Terry with banking and her chequebook. Dave Plewes helps Terry with problems and getting repairmen to fix things in the house.

The Lovegroves moved out of the coop during the year. Rick and Tina moved into their house, but have not been much involved with Terry.

A new support person moved in with Terry around Christmas. She and Terry go out quite a bit during the week, some times together. Terry also spends a good bit of time with Nettie.

e) St. Vital

* TO MARCH 1984

Janelle gets most of her support from her family, including her grandparents, but especially from her mother and oldest sister. Janelle relies on others for most things. Her family helps her with bathing, diaper changes, cooking and eating, preparing and taking medications, exercising, using her posture board, going to bed, going to appointments, getting to the day care centre, getting out and about, playing at home and outside, going trick-

or-treating in the neighbourhood, turning on music or the TV, and learning to crawl.

A number of other people and groups are involved. The day care centre staff and kids play with Janelle, help her learn new skills, and are friends. Doctors and physical therapists provide advice and help develop programs. The next door neighbour loans tools, helps fix the car, and lets it be known he is there to help a neighbour. Faye, as a member of the L'Avenir Coop, helps Joanne develop plans of support for Janelle and putting those plans into action. This kind of support often involves "keeping cool and working the system" when the system is not so ready to respond, and developing alternatives to the segregated options frequently offered by the system.

Other members of the cluster are available for friendship and support, but have not been called upon to any great extent.

Janelle's support fundamentally focusses on her family. They in turn get advice and assistance from others. Nevertheless, there is still a need in the family for a number of supports - someone with some life experience for Janelle's mother to talk about Janelle and life in general; and someone to come into the home, spend time with Janelle, and help her learn, grow and develop.

* FEBRUARY 1985 UP-DATE

During the year, PHC neighbours provided somewhat more support to Janelle and her family, but basically support is still family-centred. Janelle's sisters have been very involved in helping Janelle develop friendships with the neighbourhood kids. Faye has been helping Joanne get Janelle into the neighbourhood school. Janelle and her family need more neighbourhood support now that Joanne's parents are less able to be involved. This does not appear to have been forthcoming to the extent needed.

2. CLUSTERS AND NEIGHBOURHOODS

There is generally a great deal of involvement by members of the PHC clusters in the lives of the people with developmental special needs who live in those clusters. So far the discussion has focussed on the support provided by cluster members to other members. The issues to be discussed here relate to the more general topic of interactions with neighbours, who people know and how well, the degree of contact with neighbours, and how people feel about their neighbours.

Clearly, members of the Prairie Housing Cooperative with developmental special needs are physically integrated into regular neighbourhoods within the City of Winnipeg. The question here is whether they are socially integrated - whether or not they actually interact with people and whether they like the people in the neighbourhood, and therefore, feel a sense of belonging.

Table 8: Families Known Well Enough to Visit -- 1984 (1985)

Individual (Months in PHC in 3/84)	Families in PHC* '84	('85)	Families in Neighbourhood** '84	('85)	Total '84	('85)
1 (16 mos)	3	(4)	1	(0)	4	(4)
2 (12 mos)	5	(6)	3	(1)	8	(7)
3 (18 mos)	3	(4)	2	(0)	5	(4)
4 (5 mos)	3	(left)	1	-	4	-
5 (7 mos)	3	(5)	0	(5)	3	(10)
6 (15 mos)	2	(left)	0	-	2	-
7 (12 mos)	5	(3)	1	(0)	6	(3)
8 (1.5 mos)	1	(1)	0	(0)	1	(1)
9 (7 mos)	4	(4)	1	(6)	5	(10)

* includes coop families or households outside of neighbourhood
** does not include coop families

Table 9: Number of People in Neighbourhood with Whom Individual Spoke over Previous Three Days -- 1984 (1985)

In 1984, respondents = 9. In 1985 respondents = 8. 1985 responses are in parentheses ().

	0	1	2	3-5	6-8	Total for all
# People Named	1(2)	1(1)	3(1)	3(2)	1(1)	27 (21)
# Different People	1(2)	3(2)	2(1)	2(3)	1(0)	24 (16)

(Note: "People Named" refers to the totals for the three days, while "Different People" only counts each person once, even if that person was spoken to on more than one day.)

* Do you like your neighbours ?

During the interviews, PHC members with developmental special needs were asked, "Do you like the people who live in other coop houses near you?" In 1984, eight of the nine answered that they like them "a lot." One answered that she likes them "some." In 1985, nine of them answered that they like "a lot" and one said "some" (two of the ten questioned in 1985 were former residents, and were asked in terms of when they lived in PHC).

They were also asked, "Do you like the neighbours?" Again, in 1984, eight said they like them "a lot" and one said she likes them "some." In 1985, eight said "a lot" and two said "some."

In 1984, people were asked the same question about the neighbours around the last place they lived. Four said they liked them "a lot" and two said they liked them "some." One disliked them "some" and two disliked them "a lot." When asked explicitly whether they like their current neighbours "better, worse or the same as the people in your last neighbourhood," six indicated they like their current neighbours "better" and three said "the same."

In 1985, the coop members were asked if their feelings about their neighbours had changed from when they first moved in. Of the seven who answered the question, four said they like their neighbours "better" than before, and three said "the same." The two PHC members who moved out of the coop indicated that they see their new neighbours about the same as when they lived in the coop.

* How Often Do You See People in Your Neighbourhood? Who Do You Know Well Enough to Visit? Who Have You Spoken to In the Last Three Days ?

The individuals with developmental special needs were asked "Do you see people in your neighbourhood more often, less often, or about the same as before?" In 1984, "before" meant before PHC, and only one person indicated seeing neighbours "more" often. Four indicated they saw people "the same," and four indicated they saw them "less than before." Consistently, when people indicated that they saw people less often, they added the comment to the effect that "people are busy" - going to work, taking care of kids, busy with their own lives.

In 1985, "before" meant compared to 1984 in the coop, and four individuals indicated that they see their neighbours more now than they did in 1984. One said "the same" and two said "less." Of the two people who moved out, one said she sees her new neighbours about the same, and one said less compared to the coop.

Seeing people is one thing, it is quite another to speak with them and think that you know them well enough to visit in their own homes. Individuals were asked how many families in the coop, and then how many families in their neighbourhoods they know well enough to visit in their homes. As Table 8 indicates, people tend to know more people in the coop than other neighbours. In 1984,

the average number of coop and neighbouring families named by all respondents was 4.2, but the average of coop families (3.2) was much higher than for neighbourhood families (1). The same pattern held in 1985 (average total = 5.4; average coop = 3.9; average neighbourhood = 1.5). Interestingly, the average number of families named increased, due largely to an increase in the average of neighbourhood families known. But for individuals, there were more in 1985 who stated that they know no families who are not in the coop.

As with many questions and tables, numbers tell only part of the story. In Betty Meltzer's case, "knowing" one of the families well enough meant that she was present when Simone gave birth at home.

Unfortunately, information of this type was not asked for in terms of the last place that people lived. Based on discussions in the interviews, however, there was a strong impression that while people may see neighbours about the same or less than in previous neighbourhoods, by and large they know more people now. There appears to be no relationship between the amount of time someone has lived in the coop and the number of families or households they know well.

Finally, individuals were asked to name the people in their neighbourhoods to whom they had spoken over the last three days. Table 9 summarizes this information. In both 1984 and 1985, the question was asked during winter months, so while the answers may not indicate patterns throughout the year, they are comparable in terms of bad weather. The responses indicate a slight decline in contact between 1984 and 1985. As will be discussed in the section on neighbourhoods, however, these PHC members indicate that they are getting out more in 1985 than they did in 1984.

* Overview

It would appear from this information that people with developmental special needs not only live in neighbourhoods, but see their neighbours, speak to them, like them, and know a number of them well enough to visit in their homes. While most of them like the people in their neighbourhood better than their previous neighbours, most of them see their current neighbours less often or the same as before. Fellow members of the cooperative obviously play a large role in interactions with neighbours. Most of the neighbours spoken to over a three day period and most of the families and households known well enough to visit are in the coop. While there is no comparative information available in terms of knowing and speaking to neighbours in the past, there was a strong impression from the interviews that coop members with developmental special needs have meaningful ties with their fellow coop members and neighbours.

The interviews also indicate that relations with neighbours are not the only relationships outside of households that are significant - families and friends are also important.

Table 10: Family Contacts -- 1984

Person	Family Member(s)	Frequency
1	parents	every six months
	two brothers	every two years
	two brothers	every six months
2	wife	daily
	parents	once a week
	sisters	occasionally
	mother-in-law	not at all currently
3	husband	daily
	mother	not at all currently
	parents-in-law	once a week
4	parents	once a week
	sister and brother	once a month
5	parents	every two months
	sister	every two days
	3 siblings	every few years
6	mother	once a week
7	brother	daily
	parents/sister	once or twice a week
	aunt and uncle	every two weeks
	grandmother	every week
8	mother	every week
	father	not at all currently
	sister	not at all currently
9	mother/sisters	daily
	grandparents	often

3. FAMILY TIES

a) TO MARCH 1984

Hazel, Rubin, Betty, Mary, Nettie, Terry, Arnold, John and Janelle are members of families and keep in contact with them. Living in the Prairie Housing Cooperative has had varying effects on their family relations.

They were asked to indicate whether living in PHC has had an effect on "your relations with family." Five indicated that their family relations have "improved" as a result. Three indicated that there has been "no effect." One indicated that relations have become "worse," because her mother did not accept her marriage or move to more independence.

While eight of the nine indicated that their family relations have been stable or improved in terms of quality, it is interesting to note that five also indicate that they see their families less often than before (at the time they lived in the place of residence before the PHC). Two indicated that they see their family "the same" as before, and two see them "more" than before. When asked, "Do you want to see them more often? less often?" eight of the nine indicated they wanted the situation to stay "the same" (6) or to see their families "less often." One person indicated she would like to see her family "more often."

As Table 10 indicates, these individuals are in touch with a number of different family members with varying degrees of frequency.

The family situations are particularly close for four individuals. Betty and Rubin are husband and wife. Arnold lives with his brother. Janelle lives with her mother and sisters. For Arnold, John, and Janelle, family involvement also means very close involvement by their parents in decisions about their lives in the coop.

b) FEBRUARY 1985 UP-DATE

The nine members who were interviewed in 1984 were still seeing their families in 1985. Three indicated that they are seeing them more in 1985 than in 1984, but five indicated they see them less than before. Only one member who is seeing family less than before would like to see them more. While some changes have occured for the two women who moved out of the coop, these were unrelated to their move.

These individuals, then, are part of families and continue to be part of them. They are involved in relations with neighbours, especially coop neighbours, but also they are involved in friendships.

Table 11: Friendships - New and Old -- 1984 [1985]

Person	New Friends since PHC [1985 total]	Old Friends Still in Touch [1985 total]	Old Friends Not in Touch
1	2 [2]	6 (for 10 years) [6]	0
2	4 [4]	2 (for 3-10 years) [1]	2
3	0 [7]	5 (for 3-10 years) [2]	3
4	0 [1]	4 (for 4-10 years) [4]	0
5	0* [3]	10+ from Winnipeg* [20+] 10+ from back home	0
6	6 [7]	1 (from school days) [2]	0
7	8 + coop members [14]	not applicable	0
8	6 [10]	3 (for 2-7 years) [3]	4
9	6 [9]	1 (since birth) [1]	0

* many old friends are involved in coop

4. FRIENDSHIPS

Moving into a new house, a new set of relationships, a new neighbourhood, often means developing new friendships. It may also mean severing old ties. Unfortunately, for people with handicaps, moving all too frequently means severing relationships and having a limited number of people with whom new friendships can be developed. On the other hand and all too often, no friendships developed in previous places. Members of the Prairie Housing Cooperative with developmental special needs were asked who there friends are know, how long they have known them, who their friends were in the last place they lived, and whether they still keep in touch.

a) TO MARCH 1984

As Table 11 indicates, the pattern in the Prairie Housing Cooperative is one of developing new friendships, and maintaining old friendships where they existed.

There is a distinct difference in terms of making new friends in the PHC for those people who had few previous friendships and those who had many. The individuals who had four or more previous friendships which they still maintain have not made (felt the need) to make new friendships since coming to the PHC. In fact, only one of the four reports any new friends. For those who had few old friendships, the PHC has provided an opportunity of them to make a large number of new friends. For the nine together, only one person has lost more old friends than gained new friends.

b) FEBRUARY 1985 UPDATE

Over the year, almost every member experienced an increase in the total number of new friends made since they joined the coop. While not all of these new friends are involved in the coop, most are. In terms of old friends, some members lost touch with some old friends, while others regained some contact. By and large though, the situation remained the same.

While individual situations vary considerably, it is clear that PHC members with developmental special needs are part of the social fabric of their neighbourhoods, are members of families, have formed families, and have maintained and established friendship networks. The next section examines their uses of and involvements in the neighbourhood and wider community.

D. THE NEIGHBOURHOODS AND THE COMMUNITY

Thus far we have introduced the individuals with developmental special needs who are members of the Prairie Housing Cooperative, the nature of their houses and households, the supports they receive, their relations with other members of the coop and neighbours, and connections with families and friends.

The focus of this section is on three areas of their lives:

* Their Neighbourhoods as Places - Quality, Services, Use
* Working, Learning and Participating in the Community
* Decisions about and Control Over Activities outside of the Household.

1. THE NEIGHBOURHOODS AS PLACES TO LIVE

The PHC houses are dispersed throughout Winnipeg and involve PHC members in the life of five neighbourhoods. Two neighbourhoods (Tyndall Park and Adsum) are in the north end of the city, one (Grant Park) is just south of downtown, and two (St. Vital and Southdale) are in the southern end of the city.

The four neighbourhoods at the northern and southern ends of the city are newer, and fairly typically suburban. The houses have been built within the last ten years. There are new shopping centres of varying sizes in the areas. Grant Park is an older area, though the PHC houses are newer houses in that neighbourhood. There are shopping facilities nearby, but the major commercial pattern in the area is "strip development," that is, stores and businesses spread out along a major arterial road (Pembina Highway).

By and large, there is nothing to distinguish these neighbourhoods from other typical neighbourhoods in the city. There are some places and images associated with these neighbourhoods which may detract from the positive image of the PHC members who live in them, but they are not substantially different from other neighbourhoods. This is important because people with developmental special needs are typically viewed as different from other members of the community. Community members tend to stereotype people who are seen as different,and it is possible for those stereotypes to "colour" any interactions. When people who are vulnerable live near other people who are vulnerable or in neighbourhoods that have less than positive images in the public eye, the stereotypes are magnified or reinforced, and the people tend to have a harder time.

For these reasons, the ideal is <u>not</u> to have people with developmental special needs live in groups or in the vicinity of other people or images who are devalued or stereotyped. In the neighbourhoods in which the PHC houses are located, there are

some, though not many, potentially negative images or groups:

* the north end of the city is reported to have a less positive image than other new housing developments. This has unfortunate historical links to an image of the north end as " on the other side of the tracks" and an area for "poor people and Natives." This image could have some impact on the image of the people with developmental special needs who live in Tyndall Park and Adsum.

* the PHC has located a number of people with developmental special needs in three houses in Tyndall Park. While the actual number of people is not large and is not out of line with the natural occurence of people with developmental special needs in the population, the numbers of people with handicaps in this neighbourhood is approaching an upper limit.

* Within three blocks of the Grant Park PHC cluster there is a group home for people with developmental special needs and a low income housing development.

* Close to the St. Vital cluster is a nursing home. Another institution (St. Amant Centre) is in the area. A sign to that institution is posted at the intersection off of which entry to the St. Vital cluster is gained. There are also several children with handicaps in the neighbourhood, all of whom seem well accepted.

There is no indication, however, that the presence of these other places and images in the neighbourhoods of the PHC houses has had a negative impact on the integration of the PHC members with developmental special needs. There are clear indications that members of the Prairie Housing Cooperative feel good about their neighbourhoods.

Members were asked a number of questions about services in their neighbourhoods - their convenience, their quality, and how much individuals use them. Questions were asked about the following services and facilities:

* park
* recreational facility
* library
* playground
* school
* day centre for seniors
* day care for children
* bus stop
* medical facilities.

Table 12: Convenience and Quality of Neighbourhood Services and Facilities -- 1984 and 1985

Service	Convenience (# replying Very/# who replied) 1984	1985	Quality (# replying excellent or very good/# of replies) 1984	1985
Parks	4/6	3/6	2/6	4/5
Recreation Fac's	3/5	3/4	3/4	2/3
Playgrounds	3/4	2/3	2/3	3/4
Shopping Fac's	9/9	6/7	8/9	5/7
Schools	4/4	4/4	1/2	2/2
Bus service	7/9	6/7	6/9	4/7
Day Care for children	2/2	1/1	1/1	1/1
Library		1/3		1/2
Medical Facilities		1/2		1/1

(In 1984, Library and Medical Facilities were all described as being downtown, not in neighbourhood)

Day Centre-Seniors - no one interested

Condition of Buildings	6/9	3/7
Quality of Air	5/9	3/7
Safety from Crime	8/9	4/7
Neighbourhood as a whole	7/9	4/7

NOTE: The number of individuals who responded to a question varies. In terms of "Convenience", responses not included are "have no interest in using facility, don't know, and facility not available."

Table 13: Use of Neighbourhood Services and Facilities -- 1984/85

SERVICE (# responding) 1984/1985	RATE OF USE Daily 84	85	once a week/2-4 times per month 84	85	2-3 times per month 84	85
Park (6/2)	0	1	1	1	2	0
Recreation (5/3)	0	0	1	3	1	0
Playground (7/2)	0	0	0	2	0	0
Shopping (9/6)	2	4	7	2	0	0
School (9/0)	0		0		0	
Day Care (1/1)	1	1	0	0	0	0
Bus (9/6)	4	5	4	1	0	0
Library(0/2)		0		1		1

NOTE: In 1984, libraries and medical facilities are not known to be in the neighbourhoods.
No one was interested in day centres for seniors.

Table 14: Getting out in neighbourhood - More or less in the PHC Compared to Last Place of Residence (1984) and to earlier in PHC (1985)

	Get out more now	Get out the same	Get out less than before
1984:	3	4	2
1985:	7 + 2 movers		

Table 15: Quality of Neighbourhood Services and Facilities (Ratings by Meetings of Cluster Members)

Service	Excellent/ Very Good	Good	Fair/ Poor	Don\t Know/ No Answer
Parks	1	2		2
Recreation Fac's	4			1
Libraries				5
Playgrounds	2	1	1	1
Shopping	5			
Schools	3		1	1
Day Centre - Seniors				5
Day Care for Children	3	1		1
Public Transportation	2	3		
Medical Fac's	3			2
Condition of Buildings	5			
Air Quality	4	1		
Safety from Crime	2	3		
Neighbourhood as a whole	2	2		1

In addition, quality questions were asked with respect to:

* the conditions of houses and buildings
* the quality of air
* safety from crime
* the neighbourhood as a whole.

In 1984, individuals were also asked, "Do you get out of the house and go to stores and other places in your neighbourhood more, less or about the same as before [last place of residence]?" In 1985, this question was asked to compare "getting out" over time within the PHC.

Tables 12, 13, and 14 summarize the ratings assigned in 1984 and 1985 by PHC members with developmental special needs regarding these questions. Table 15 summarizes the quality rating assigned to services and facilities during group meetings with other members of clusters in 1984.

The neighbourhoods tend to fit popular conceptions of suburban neighbourhoods. Views of them reflect the fact that these individuals are adults, and interested in adult activities.

The most commonly present services and facilities are parks (of a variety of descriptions), shopping facilities, schools and bus services. These are all rated highly in terms of convenience. Shopping and bus services are highly rated in terms of quality. They are also used frequently. There is much less satisfaction with the parks available (or known to be available). Ratings on the other items reflect the composition of households. For those interested in or aware of recreation facilities, playgrounds, schools, and day care centres, they are seen as convenient and of quality. These areas are not well served by libraries. While medical facilities may be present, most PHC members use downtown facilities. Non-handicapped members of the PHC tended to be more critical of the quality of the services and facilities in their neighbourhoods.

The PHC members with developmental special needs are obviously quite satisfied with the quality of their neighbourhoods in general and the safety they afford. The conditions of houses and facilities, and the quality of air, received lower ratings, but were never rated less than "good" on the scale except by one individual in 1985.

In 1984, PHC members with handicaps indicated that, compared with their previous situations, they get out in their neighbourhoods about the same as before. For the three people who indicated they get out more, this represented a significant change. In 1985, seven of the seven consistent PHC members indicated they get out more now than in 1984. The two women who left said they also get out more now.

2. WORKING, LEARNING AND PARTICIPATING IN THE COMMUNITY

The Prairie Housing Cooperative represents a place for people with developmental special needs to live and be supported. The home in which a person lives is also the "base of operations" for a number of other activities that are part of living in and as part of a community. We have reviewed some of those activities-friendship, family, using services and facilities in the neighbourhood, and relations with neighbours. But there are other important ones.

For the adults and young child with developmental special needs, two very important issues will affect their futures - getting an education and working. What they do now, usually during the day, is therefore quite important both for the future and in terms of what kind of full life each can lead now.

a) TO MARCH 1984

Individuals were asked specific questions about what they do during the day, and what they did while at their last place of residence. In 1984, they spent their days in the following ways:

* 4 women were involved in full-time work in regular, integrated and typical places of work. One person had a full-time job where she earned $4 an hour. Another worked as part of a small team of people with handicaps in a government building. Another was engaged in training-on-the-job at a local hotel. And the fourth woman worked full-time at home as a housewife.

* 2 individuals (one young man and one small child) were involved in school and day care programs. The young man attended a segregated school and received additional instruction at home. The young girl attended a half-day program at a local day care centre with children who are not handicapped.

* 1 woman worked in a sheltered workshop where she had worked for twenty years.

* 2 men basically spent their days at home. One was developing his skills and behaviour, getting to know his community during the day, and looking forward to getting a job in the not too distant future. The other had not been satisfied with the vocational programs with which he was involved, enjoyed spending his days with his new wife, and was actively thinking about looking for work.

This situation contrasted markedly with the experiences of these individuals in their last place of residence. Previously, people spent their days in the following ways:

* 2 women were working or in training in regular places of

work. Both were still working in 1984, though at different jobs.

* No one was attending a school or day care program.

* 5 men and women worked in a sheltered workshop or were involved in life skills programs. Two went on to get jobs or training in integrated settings. One continued in the workshop. Two now spend their time at home.

* Two young people were either at home spending time with family (the young girl) or minimally involved in an institutional program.

For the eight adults, the major source of income, for all but one, was a social allowance received from the provincial government. Their annual incomes (for six individuals and one couple) ranged from approximately $3,600 to $6,656. The three women who earned a work-related wage had not been working a full year, so these figures do not reflect their potential annual wage.

In 1984, then, five of the nine individuals were engaged in either work or education appropriate to their ages and in integrated settings. Two were engaged in educational or vocational training programs in segregated settings. Two individuals spent most of their time at home or in their neighbourhoods. All received very low annual incomes.

Hazel, Rubin, Betty, Mary, Arnold, Nettie, Terry, John and Janelle also had hopes and aspirations for the future in 1984. They had a number of people, most of whom were involved in the Prairie Housing Cooperative, involved in building those futures with them.

Two of the people who were working, one at home and one outside of the home, were happy with what they were doing and wanted to continue. Another two wanted regular jobs. One was in training on the job, the other worked with a small number of other people with handicaps. Another three young men were interested either in getting regular work or continuing with their education. Janelle's mother wanted her to continue with her education.

b) FEBRUARY 1985 UP-DATE

As in other areas of their lives, the situations of these individuals changed over the year. Of the nine people living in the coop (two of whom were not discussed above), the following situations existed:

* Five were involved in work, either full or part-time. The two previously unemployed men were both working in February. Of the three women, one was working at home and occasionally in the CAMR-Winnipeg office; one was working occasionally in the CAMR office, though she did have a job over the summer; and one was working part-time doing house-

work for other families.

* Janelle was still attending day care.

* Arnold graduated from school, and was spending his days learning skills in the community and attending a day program.

* Two women were unemployed, one of whom was employed in 1984.

In terms of the two women who left the PHC, one continued to attend the sheltered workshop, and one was unemployed, though she was employed in 1984.

By February 1985, in terms of the eleven people, five adults were without work, though one was involved in signficiant and planned activities during the day. On the other hand, five adults were significantly more active and involved during the day than they had been in 1984, and one adult and one child still quite active. Three adults, one of whom had left the coop, were no longer employed and less active compared to 1984.

Work, school, households, and families do not define all of the ways in which these citizens are involved in their communities. In talking with them, it became obvious that they have other community interests and involvements. Several are actively involved in their churches. Betty, Rubin and Nettie keep in touch with friends and exchange visits with them. Mary likes to travel. Terry and Arnold participate in a range of recreational activities in the community. Hazel and Nettie are on the board of the coop.

3. DECISIONS AND CONTROL (COMMUNITY ACTIVITIES)

Earlier we reviewed the rules and decision making processes involved in households and the involvement of individuals in deciding what kinds of supports they receive and from whom. Later, the decision making processes of the cooperative will be discussed. The issue in this section is the degree of control members of the PHC with developmental special needs have over decisions related to questions outside of the house and the coop.

Individuals were asked a series of questions about three areas of activity - work, taking a holiday, and going out a night. They were asked how they reach decisions in each area and with whom they speak. There were considerable differences among the individuals and topics in terms of whether people had made decisions recently. The pattern of decision making was consistent however. The pattern in 1984, which remained unchanged in 1985 except in minor ways, was as follows:

* Hazel, Betty and Rubin Meltzer, Mary, Nettie, and Terry reported that they make their own decisions in these three areas. Most of them talk these issues over with other PHC members and members of their families. Many of their

decisions will require the assistance of others in order to implement them. Betty and Rubin, for instance, are thinking about moving out to British Columbia to live near Rubin's brother. They may take their holidays in Vancouver to explore this choice. They will talk the decision over with Rubin's brother, but also with their coop neighbours. A number of people depend on coop neighbours to give them rides to the supermarket, so when they decide to go out at night (and this often means to do the shopping), the availability of a ride is important.

* John and Arnold are more dependent on others to think about issues, explore possibilities, make decisions and implement them. Both of these young men have ideas about what they want to do and what they prefer to do, though to a different extent. Decision making frequently begins with their ideas, but compared to the other adults, is also more likely to involve ideas initiated by the coop members who support them, their families, the support people around them, and the L'Avenir Coop. Other people may initiate an idea (*for instance, going to someone's house for dinner*, or camping in a provincial park) and then discuss the idea with John or Arnold. Both young men depend on others to assist putting things together so that they can implement decisions about work and education, taking holidays, and going out for the night.

* Janelle depends on her mother for ideas and decisions in these and many other areas of her life.

Informal discussions with the individuals indicated that the patterns of decision making in other areas of life are similar. For instance, one woman was considering getting married in 1984. It was her decision, in conjunction with her fiance, but she discussed it with other coop members in her neighbourhood, as well as her minister. A similar process occurred when Betty and Rubin thought about marriage.

In 1984, six of the nine individuals reported that their ability to make decisions about their lives has improved since they moved into the Prairie Housing Cooperative. Three indicated their ability is the same as before. This "improved ability" has meant some remarkable changes in the lives of these individuals. Betty and Rubin got married. Arnold and his family have experienced a "thousandfold" increase in control over decision making in contrast to when Arnold lived in the institution. John is a partner in the decisions about what he can and cannot do for now, and seems to have a view of the future and some people around him who will help achieve it. Terry feels she can do more of what she wants because she decides where she goes and when.

The 1985 interviews indicated that this ability was still incresing. Seven of the nine answering the question indicated that their ability had improved even further over the year, and two indicated it was the same.

4. OVERVIEW

The neighbourhoods in which the PHC houses are located are typical suburban neighbourhoods. Basic services such as shopping, buses, schools and playgrounds are convenient and of good quality. Recreational facilities are less prevalent. Libraries are rarely present. Individuals are not aware of medical facilities because they use facilities and doctors in other parts of the city. For the one person for whom it is relevant, day care is very convenient and of high quality. Individuals tend to use shopping and bus services a great deal, and recreational facilities and places far less often.

Their work or educational involvements have tended to change while they have lived in the coop, but for six of the current members, their level of involvement has increased. All have a range of interests outside of work, school and home. They continue to be marginalized and vulnerable members of their communities, though apparently less so than before they joined the coop. Certainly in terms of the threats that many faced in terms of their futures (institutionalization or continued exclusion from services), the coop has enabled them to at least remain in the community and to continue with their attempts to participate in and contribute to the community.

Six of the individuals have a great deal of control over decisions related to their involvements in the community, and most actively involve their friends, neighbours and families in some or all of those decisions. Two individuals are more dependent, and one is totally dependent on others for decision making in these areas.

These individuals are clearly not isolated in their neighbourhoods or the larger community. They not only live in neighbourhoods, they use the resources that are there. They not only live in the community, they attempt to contribute to its economic life or are preparing to do so. They are integrated. They live in decent neighbourhoods. They are connected to the life of the community, though certainly not to the extent to which they aspire.

Table 16: Quality of Life Changes (1984 and 1985)

>>> What effect has living in the project [PHC] had on...
(1985 answers in parentheses)

Item	improved	no effect	worse
* the quality of your housing	8 (6)	1 (1)	
* your financial situation	7 (3)	1 (4)	1
* your health	6 (6)	2 (1)	1
* your marriage (if married)	2 (2)		
* your relations with family	5 (3)	3 (4)	1
* your life as a whole	8 (6)	1 (1)	

>>> Compared to where you lived before, are things better, worse or about the same in terms of:
(1985 answers in parentheses)

Item	better	the same	worse
* how you feel about yourself	7 (6)	2 (1)	
* how you get on with people you live with	7 (5)	2 (2)	
* your ability to make decisions about your life	6 (5)	3 (2)	

>>> How Satisfied or dissatisfied are you with the Coop as a place to live? How about the last place you lived?

Place	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Neutral	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissat.
PHC-1985	5	2			
PHC-1984	6	2			
Last Place	1	1		2	4
New Place-1985	2				

(Note: One respondent in 1984 indicated that her satisfaction was "undefinable in both cases)

In 1984, nine individuals were asked and responded to these questions. In 1985, seven remained in the coop and responded. The two who left indicated that they were "very satisfied" with both their new place and the PHC.

E. LIVING IN THE COOP (QUALITY OF LIFE AND DECISIONS)

By and large, living in the Prairie Housing Cooperative involves houses, households and families, connections with neighbours, involvements with the neighbourhood and the community. Discussions thus far have focussed on the realities in these areas and the differences those realities have made. The purpose of this section is to discuss two other issues:

* perceptions about the overall effect of the PHC on the quality of individuals' lives; and

* the involvement of people with developmental special needs in the decision making processes of the PHC.

1. QUALITY OF LIFE

Previous sections have dealt with such issues as integration and congregation, possessions, responsibilities and participation in household activities, learning and supports, decisions and rules, relations with family and friends, working and learning, and getting out into the community - both in terms of the situation now experienced by individuals and in comparison to their previous situations.

Individuals were also asked a series of questions related to other quality of life issues. Table 16 summarizes their answers. Clearly, the majority of individuals think the Prairie Housing Cooperative has improved, and continues to improve their lives in the following areas:

* quality of housing
* financial situation
* health
* relations with family
* life as a whole
* how you feel about yourself
* how you get on with people you live with
* your ability to make decisions about your life
* marriage (only relevant for two people).

In 1984, though not in 1985, three separate individuals indicated that things were worse on three separate items. One person's financial situation was worse because she had to pay for utilities in the PHC. One person (through her mother) reported that her health was worse because she had started attending day care and had caught the usual array of childhood diseases associated with being around other children. One person reported her relations with her family were worse, because her mother had strenuously objected to the marriage that living in the coop made possible.

Table 16 also presents the ratings of satisfaction with the PHC as a place to live in 1984 and 1985, and with the last place of residence. Members reported more satisfaction with the PHC

compared to their last places of residence; and generally high satisfaction with the PHC itself. One respondent did not rate her satisfaction in 1984, but in 1985 said that she was "somewhat dissatisfied." This change in expression reflected her disappointment that the PHC had not provided the amount and quality of support she expected. The fact that very little had changed between 1984 and 1985 was behind her more clearly negative expression in 1985.

The two women who left the coop said the were "very satisfied" with both the coop and their new apartments as places to live. As mentioned, both expressed a desire to be able to both live in the coop and enjoy the benefits of their new living situations (for one, living alone, and for the other, living with her husband).

For people who are vulnerable and often feel devalued, these indications of improved conditions are no small matter. Some changes are coincidental with moving to Winnipeg, but most represent significant life changes. For instance, behind one statement of improved "health" is the fact that Arnold has significantly reduced the medications he receives related to his behaviour and seizures, he jogs and plays sports regularly rather than not at all, he does not hit himself, and his hearing problem is being attended to. The statement that he gets along better with the people with whom he lives reflects the fact that he moved from living on a ward with dozens of other people to living with his brother and a person who provides support. The improved quality of his housing reflects a move from a complex of buildings housing hundreds of people to a three bedroom rowhouse in a new condominium complex. His improved family relations reflect the fact that he lives in the same city, visits his parents and aunt and uncle, lived with his brother for quite awhile, has his family over for a meal, and participates with them in making very important decisions about his life.

2. DECISION MAKING IN THE COOP

One of the distinctive qualities of the Prairie Housing Cooperative for Arnold and the others is the fact that they are members and deciders, not merely the recipients of decisions. In institutions, agency operated group homes and apartment programs, and non-profit housing organizations, the housing is owned by an organization and that organization makes the decisions. Some times the people who live in such situations advise decision makers, but they are not the decision makers. In addition, more often than not, the decisions about the supports and services a person receives or does not receive are made by the staff of those organizations or other service agencies.

Given that the Prairie Housing Cooperative is a cooperative, and one established fundamentally to include people with handicaps, it is important to discover exactly how those people participate in the decision making process.

Individuals were asked a series of questions about their attendance at coop meetings, taking part in discussions and votes, participation in committees, feeling like they are listened to, and feeling that their good suggestions would be acted upon. The following discussion is based on their 1984 responses. There was no significant change by 1985.

Most of the members with developmental special needs did not know how often the coop has meetings to which all residents are invited. Five stated they did not know. The rest indicated a range of answers from every 2-3 months (1 person), every 4-5 months (2), to every six months or less (1).

Four people indicated they attend all meetings of the coop, two indicated they attend half or more than half of the meetings, and three said they attend none of the meetings.

Six reported that they attended the last meeting of the coop (the first annual general meeting for all members). Five indicated they took part in the discussion during the meeting. Three indicated they voted at the meeting, but could not remember what the vote was about.

All the people who reported speaking at the meeting also reported that they think people in the coop pay attention to what they have to say at the meetings.

Members were not clear on whether or not the coop has committees. One person named the Board, while two others mentioned that there were meetings in the cluster. Others were not sure if there were committees or not.

Seven members indicated if they had a good idea about how to improve the coop, the coop definitely would take the idea seriously and act on it if possible. Two indicated that they did not know if they would be taken seriously or not.

By themselves, these answers indicate that those members of the PHC with developmental special needs, by and large, attend and participate in meetings of the coop and think the coop listens to them and takes their ideas seriously, but they are not keenly aware of the scheduling of meetings, the organization of the coop, or what decisions are made. Two PHC members with special needs, and family members of two others sit on the board of the coop, giving them very direct access to and involvement in decisions. The situation was virtually the same in 1985 -- presence and participation, but not keen levels of awareness or involvement.

Discussions during interviews, however, indicated that members with special needs are much more aware of and participate in the decision making processes of the coop that effect their lives more directly - the discussions and decisions that take place in clusters, and decisions about support to individuals in their homes.

The overwhelming impression left from the interviews is that individuals do not see the coop as an organization or a decision making structure. They do see it as a set of relationships and people. They all describe talking to their housemates and other members of the coop, and frequently to their families and representatives of the L'Avenir Coop about everyday decisions, getting help in various activities (banking, shopping, cooking, and so on), getting support to learn new skills, deciding who should live with them in their houses, and so on.

The degree of control that individuals have in these less formal decision making processes varies with the relationships. Arnold and Janelle, for instance, are very dependent on their families to speak for them. Arnold's brother and Janelle's mother are members of the Coop Board. John, on the other hand, speaks clearly for himself. In 1984, he was a new member of the Coop and did not express much interest in broader Coop management issues. Then and in 1985, however, he was keenly concerned with decisions about his house and his life. He receives a lot of support and guidance from his mother, his coop neighbours, friends from the local church, and representatives from L'Avenir Coop. While he clearly sees and exercises his right to state his opinions and his desires, he is still dependent on others for a number of decisions.

The other members talk about relationships with fellow coop members that frequently involve decision making. In the context of coop decisions at the cluster level, these relationships are informal. In talking about relationships, either in response to interview questions or in general discussion, none of these members indicated that they were "under the control" of the coop, at least in the same way that they talked about the restrictions of group homes, institutions and apartment programs. In terms of "who decides who lives with you in this house," there was some indication of their views. Four people indicated they have a say in the decision. Two were not sure how the decision gets made. One who was not sure was a new member who had not had the opportunity of participating in a decision regarding a new housemate. The other was not sure, but knew the woman suggested to move in with her and liked the idea. One person indicated the Coop makes the decision. She wanted to live on her own and felt some pressure to accept a new housemate who was in crisis. The families of the remaining two individuals make this decision.

In this section we have reviewed the impact of living in the PHC on the quality of life of its members with developmental special needs, and their involvement in decision making. Their responses to questions and comments in discussions indicate that there have been significant positive effects on the quality of their lives, and that they participate in the decision making processes of the coop, though mainly at the cluster level. The next section will review, among other topics, the overall decision making processes of the coop.

III. THE COOPERATIVE - ORGANIZATION, CONTINUITY AND RENEWAL

To this point in the report, we have reviewed the context in which the Prairie Housing Cooperative has emerged and operates, and some of the major dimensions of the lives of people with developmental special needs who live in the Prairie Housing Cooperative. Part I outlined the needs of people with handicaps, some of the realities facing those people in Winnipeg and across Canada, the social housing programs of the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation that can assist communities in responding to those needs and realities, and the Prairie Housing Cooperative as a specific response. Part II introduced the nine members of the Prairie Housing Cooperative who live with developmental special needs; their houses and households; the nature of the supports they receive; their interactions with family, friends, neighbours and the broader community; their involvements in the Prairie Housing Cooperative and decisions about their lives; and their attitudes about these and other parts of their lives.

This chapter examines the Cooperative in a broader way, including the following aspects of its organization and life:

* The structure and organization of the PHC - the Board, its Committees, the membership, the role of clusters, and relations with other organizations and individuals, especially in terms of arrangements for supports to individuals.

* Continuity and Leadership - the dynamics of the Coop's leadership, the ways in which it renews itself and ensures the continuous role of its values in operations, and considerations about its expansion and consolidation.

A. STRUCTURE AND ORGANIZATION

The Prairie Housing Cooperative is a relatively small organization in terms of membership and the numbers of houses involved. On the other hand, it has a relatively large board of directors (nine members) which interacts frequently and often informally. Administratively, the organization is somewhat complex because it has chosen to buy houses in clusters that are developed at different times and dispersed throughout Winnipeg. This has resulted in a number of mortgages, approval processes, and mortgage renewal considerations. The structure and organization of the PHC is also significantly effected by the fact that the Coop was created to respond to the needs of individuals with developmental special needs. The housing, who occupies that housing, funding and supports must be organized in response to those individuals.

Table 17: PHC Board Members - Past and Current

Members (* New, ** Past)	Residential Status (Cluster)	Relationship	CAMR Status
1. B. Knowles	Resident (1)		CAMR staff
2. D. Lauder *	Resident (2)		
3. G. Plewes	Resident (3)		CAMR staff
4. J. Dubois *	Resident (2)	Parent	
5. H. Vandamme	Resident (1)	Person w/handicap	
6. F. Svingen	Non-resident		CAMR staff/ L'Avenir
7. D. Wetherow	Non-resident		CAMR staff/ L'Avenir
8. A. Yanofsky *	Resident (4)	Brother	
9. N. Hildebrand	Resident (3)	Person w/handicap	
10. D. Hay **	Resident (1)	Person w/handicap	
11. R. Lauder **	Resident (2)	Citizen Advocacy staff	
12. D. Plewes **	Resident (3)		

There are four central elements to the organization of the Prairie Housing Cooperative:

* the Board and its Committees
* the membership
* the clusters
* organizations, families and individuals who support the Cooperative or individual members of it.

1. THE BOARD AND COMMITTEES

a. Board Composition and Membership.

The board is composed of nine individuals, three of whom are officers (president, vice-president and secretary/treasurer) elected by the board. Table 17 presents the current and past board members, their status within the PHC, whether or not they are individual with handicaps or members of their families, and their relationship to CAMR. The next annual general meeting was scheduled for May 1985.

The board members are elected for three year terms, except for those elected for the first full board. They were elected for staggered terms so that the board would begin to rotate its membership after the first year.

The composition of the board reflects the focus and origins of the Prairie Housing Cooperative. Four members are either individuals with developmental special needs or members of their families who speak on their behalf. Four members have direct involvement with CAMR-Winnipeg Branch, the L'Avenir Cooperative and/or the Citizen Advocacy program. The two non-resident members have played a very active leadership role in developing and operating the cooperative.

The early changes in the board resulted in more representation by people with handicaps or members of their families. The board is the most active, formal decision-making body in the cooperative. The fact that so many of the board members are people with handicaps or members of their families who speak on their behalf is a significant indicator of the PHC's commitment to control of the organization by the people for whom it was created.

By and large, the Board meets once a month at a regularly scheduled time. There are also frequent discussions among board members between meetings.

b. Board Responsibilities.

The Board of Directors of the Prairie Housing Cooperative is clearly the major governing body of the cooperative. While the board is elected by the membership and its decisions can be overruled by a membership meeting, it has wide ranging powers and

responsibilities. The board makes decisions in the following areas:

* The Location, Timing and Purchase of Housing. The board decides how many houses are to be purchased, where, when, and at what price.

* Membership Recruitment, Selection and Termination. The board is responsible for approving and terminating memberships. This has broader meaning than is normally the case in cooperative housing. The focus of the PHC is on people with developmental special needs. For this reason, decisions relate to deciding which people who require support will become involved in the Coop, finding and matching them with people who can provide them with support either within their homes or as coop neighbours, and deciding which of the support people should be actual members of the PHC. Individual board members are responsible for meeting prospective members and recommending them to the board. Members of clusters, individuals with handicaps and their families play an active role in this process, but the board is responsible for ratifying decisions.

Early in the life of the PHC, there was a membership category designated "Associate Member." This category was used for people who were not resident in the cooperative, but actively interested and involved in its mission. A representative from the Department of Cooperative Development of the provincial government recommended that this category be abolished in order to comply with one aspect of the Cooperatives Act. The PHC decided to do so and designated people "Friends of the Coop" in the future.

The board prefers that all residents in the PHC be members of the cooperative. This is not always the case, however. Some residents are awaiting approval for membership or are have a type of probationary status. This situation relates to an issue currently being discussed within the PHC - should individuals who are paid to provide support to individuals with developmental special needs be members of the housing coop. This relates to the core concern of the PHC -the people themselves. Residents who provide support are part of the cooperative primarily for that reason. Should the quality of their support or relationships with the individual prove less than adequate, the overriding concern should be the needs of the individual with special needs.

* Who Moves into the Houses. Formally, the question of who moves in is part of the membership decision. Informally, practice has been different in a number of instances. For instance, the individual who was temporarily living in one of the houses at the time of the first site visit moved in based on decisions made at the cluster level. Members of the cluster earnestly believed this woman needed immediate support and a decent place to live. Over the year of the case study, this type of situation has occured a number of times as individuals have moved into houses on a trial basis or a getting-to-know-you visit. In all cases, the board's ultimate decisions about who moves in are based on individual

board members getting to know the people, involving people with special needs and/or their family members in meeting them, and the recommendations based on these meetings and discussions.

* Finances. Most of the boards decisions about finances relate to the houses themselves - approving the offers to purchase and mortgage renewal applications, approving repairs over $50, borrowing money, approving the audited financial statement, determining how much money will be transferred to the Subsidy Surplus Fund and how much will be returned to CMHC, and banking resolutions. The Housing Committee can make a tentative offer to purchase on a house, but the board is responsible for approving the offer. A sample financial statement is included in Appendix A.

* Policy Decisions. The board is responsible for approving a number of policy documents - the charter, papers of incorporation, statement of purpose, statement of belief, and ordinary by-laws.

* Planning, Direction Setting, and Philosophy Development. Policy decisions reflected in major organizational documents are formal outcomes of the board addressing the overall direction, purpose and organization of the PHC. As a group, however, the board engages in broader discussions that do not necessarily lead to formal, specific decisions. These discussions generally relate to questions about how the PHC does its business and how members live with each other.

Generally, issues emerge in relation to individuals. The board acts, in the words of one of its members, like a "sub-membership". The board includes individuals from different clusters and perspectives. Discussions at the cluster level, among board members who work in the CAMR office, and between board members and other coop members inform the board's deliberations.

* Representations to Other Organizations. The board appoints and, as appropriate, directs representatives to organizations with which the PHC has formal relations, such as the Cooperative Housing Federation, consumer cooperatives and Credit Union.

* Electing Officers and Filling Interim Vacancies. The board is responsible for electing its officers and filling any board vacancies that arise between annual meetings. New officers had not been elected by the time of the March visit.

* Staff Hiring and Firing. There are no staff at present, but the board is responsible for staffing the PHC. Currently, CAMR-Winnipeg donates the time of its staff to support the PHC. This is an in-kind donation.

c. Committees

The responsibilities and organization of committees within the Prairie Housing Cooperative have changed over time. The

committees are as follows:

* Housing. The Housing Committee is responsible for making recommendations to the board regarding the purchase of houses. It can make a tentative offer to purchase which must be subsequently approved by the board.

* Membership. Initially, the membership committee had major responsibilities for developing the membership by-laws. Its on-going work involves developing recommendations on such issues as whether or not paid staff living in the coop should be members. The membership committee does not interview people for membership. This responsibility is assigned to individual board members who interview people and ensure that they meet at least three other board members. The membership committee also develops the news-letter.

* Financial. Initially, a finance committee was created and charged with the responsibility for arranging the many and complex financial matters related to the PHC. Once these initial arrange-ments were made, they were seen as "straight forward" in terms of operations and the requirements of CMHC. As a result, the finance committee was dissolved, and the board assumed its responsibilities.

* Nominations. The board acts as the nominating committee for the purpose of putting names before the annual meeting for election to the board.

* By-laws. A by-law committee exists, but is not now used.

* Executive. The officers of the board form the executive, but the executive does not meet as a committee outside of board meetings.

There have been continuing discussions among the leadership about forming an Advisory Committee which would be responsible for internal and external evaluations; developing new sites; long term planning and development; planning for new members with handicaps; and long-term financial management issues.

2. THE MEMBERSHIP

The membership of the Prairie Housing Cooperative acts as a decision making body at the annual general meeting and at any special membership meetings. The Annual Meeting is the context for the membership to make the following decisions:

- elect new members to the board
- appoint auditors
- amend by-laws
- reverse board decisions
- policy recommendations.

The President and Treasurer are required to make a formal

report to the annual meeting, but there is no formal ratification of those reports or the actions of the board by the membership. The annual meeting can pass policy resolutions, but unless they are embodied in the by-laws or relate to the reversal of a board decision, they are not binding on the board.

Special membership meetings can be called by the board. The board has decided that certain issues will always go before the membership either in annual or special meetings. These include any decisions about a major change in direction for the cooperative or changes to the ordinary by-laws.

The membership through the annual meeting, then, has specific responsibilities regarding major decisions of the organization. An equally important function of the annual meeting, however, is less formal and involves the membership discussing what people need in the coop and what needs to happen in clusters to respond to those needs. The last annual meeting focussed primarily on these discussions and building a common understanding of direction and purpose.

These discussions are reinforced by social functions for the membership, usually twice a year. The emphasis is on members meeting, greeting and getting to know one another, and to have fun together as a community.

3. THE CLUSTERS

The board of the Prairie Housing Cooperative is given the responsibility for making most of the formal decisions required by the cooperative. The board's decisions are based on a considerable amount of discussion within the board and between the board and the membership. The membership is empowered to make decisions affecting the general orientation and direction of the cooperative as embodied in by-laws and elected members of the board. As discussions in many of the previous sections of this report indicate, however, a great deal of the life of the cooperative and the interactions that affect decisions made within it take place within the clusters of houses.

The clusters are not formally represented on the board, though the current membership of the board includes individuals from 4 of the 5 clusters. Neither are the clusters recognized as formal decision making bodies. They do, however, have important roles in a number of areas:

* Maintenance. Members of clusters get together to make a number of decisions about maintenance and property improvement. One cluster, for instance, decided to build a common fence behind the houses. Each cluster has reached agreements about lawn mowing and snow removal, and sharing supplies and equipment. Between 1984 and 1985, considerable improvements were made to the inside and outside of a number of houses, partially due to the work of John Koeppel and his work partners.

* Social Events. In addition to the annual meeting and coop-wide social events, clusters decide when and how people within the cluster will get together. The Tyndall Park cluster is by far the most active in this regard, but the informal relations among other households in other clusters has resulted in cluster members getting together. The St. Vital cluster has been least active.

* Recruiting New Members. When individuals move out of households or the cluster, clusters have generally assumed responsibility for finding and getting to know people to replace them. While the board has fairly routinely approved the people recommended, there is some discussion about the recruitment process having to be a bit more structured, at least to ensure that the amount of subsidy funds available to assist individuals in meeting their housing costs is not adversely affected. In one cluster, recruitment usually involves individuals from CAMR and the L'Avenir Coop who are close to the handicapped member in that cluster.

* Determining What Kinds of Supports are Required. The degree to which the clusters get involved in these discussions and decisions, and their autonomy varies considerably. Tyndall Park, for instance, works out support arrangements within the cluster. There is far less autonomy in the Southdale cluster where more decisions are made by representatives from the L'Avenir Cooperative. There have been very few discussions in the St. Vital cluster about support arrangements.

4. OTHER ORGANIZATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS

The Prairie Housing Cooperative, as an organization, focusses on housing and neighbourly supports for individuals with developmental special needs. The organization of the cooperative, formally and informally, determines a great deal of what happens in this regard. There are, however, a number of organizations and individuals which are not part of the formal organization, but upon which it depends. These include the following:

* CAMR- Winnipeg Branch: The association provides an in-kind donation of staff time. This represents a substantial support to the coop in terms of time and support.

* Department of Cooperative Development: Until 1984 the Department provided auditing services for cooperatives. The PHC utilized these services, though is now in the position of having to make alternative arrangements. The Department has provided and continues to provide advice regarding the organization and operations of cooperatives.

* Families and Friends: For a number of individuals with developmental special needs, their supports and decisions about those supports involve members of their families and friends in the community.

* L'Avenir Community Living Cooperative: Often as an

extension of family involvements, the L'Avenir Cooperative is actively involved with a number of individuals - arranging supports, recruiting and orienting people who provide support, monitoring quality, and arranging and receiving funding. To the extent that the Prairie Housing Cooperative provides housing for people with special needs, the L'Avenir Coop is often responsible for arranging supports for those PHC members who are most vulnerable.

* Approved Home Program (Government of Manitoba): The supports provided to two individuals have been funded by the Approved Home Program. While the funding was arranged by L'Avenir, the funds go directly to the support person designated as the "caregiver."

* Personal donations. Some of the furniture for people in the coop was provided with funds from an estate donation. Some of the supports provided to individuals are funded by personal donations from friends of the coop.

B. CONTINUITY AND RENEWAL

1. THE CONTEXT

One of the major issues facing any organization over time is being consistent with its mission, values, and principles. As the organization, its leadership and activities change over time, a dynamic balance must be maintained between consistency to first principles and adaptation to new realities. These issues are critically important when the organization has committed itself to supporting vulnerable members of society, including those citizens with developmental special needs.

There are a number of dynamics operating within the Prairie Housing Cooperative that set the context for this discussion of continuity and renewal:

* The PHC has grown considerably over the three years of its existence. Over seventy people have lived in the coop. Eighteen houses have been purchased. Twelve people with handicaps have been supported by scores of individuals. Several other individuals have lived in the coop on a temporary basis. A number of people have left and several have moved to other houses within the coop. The challenge is to maintain and renew quality in the midst of growth and change.

* The Prairie Housing Cooperative provides housing for its members, ordinary citizens and citizens with special needs alike. The mission of the PHC, however, is explicit about its fundamental commitment to people with special needs. The mission and statements of belief and purpose are firmly entrenched in the formal documents of the Cooperative. That mission could be in jeopardy, however, if the needs and

desires of members who are not handicapped should emerge as a higher priority than those of the members with handicaps. This risk increases as the "novelty wears off" and members continue to develop their own lives. The challenge is to sustain the mission of the Prairie Housing Cooperative, and keep paramount the interests of handicapped people.

* There is clear evidence that the mission and values of the organization have guided the development of a number of quality situations for individuals. Individuals have been rescued from actual and potential institutionalization. People are being supported to stay with their families, and in one case, form a new family. The leadership of the PHC also recognizes that significant compromises have been made in terms of the values and principles that guide the organization. On the one hand, one principle is that the strengths and needs of the individual with a handicap fundamentally determine the nature of the housing and supports provided. Ideally, this would translate into a series of actions whereby an individual is located in a house selected to respond to that individual, then a community of support within the house and the neighbourhood would be developed. Ideally, this would involve individuals not living with other people with handicaps unless they chose to. On the other hand, the nature of the housing selected by the PHC, and the need to quickly put together a package of housing, support people, money and other resources for an individual has meant that individuals with handicaps have less control over the people with whom they live and the neighbours who surround them. The challenge is to be consistent to values and principles as arrangements are made.

* Many of the support relationships developed within the Prairie Housing Cooperative have and are assisting individuals to live and participate in the community. A great deal is being done based on relations with good neighbours that have been selected and recruited to share their lives with others in the cooperative. Because of the nature of certain funding arrangements and the lack of funds, however, the leadership of the PHC recognizes that there is a limited number of people who can provide support to people in their own households. For those who are paid to provide support, the pay is often low. There is the added question of the possibility that people who are paid to live with others would also be members of the cooperative. The challenge is to continually develop and renew the skills and commitment of people providing support.

* One of the things the Prairie Housing Cooperative is about is building communities around individuals. Individuals who are vulnerable also need to experience continuity in the relationships that exist in a community. The lives of members of the cooperative can be expected to change as do the lives of all citizens. People get married and set up

new households. Careers develop requiring a change in location. Relationships do not work out and individuals move on. New relationships develop and individuals move in. The challenge is to maintain continuity amidst change.

The challenge for the Prairie Housing Cooperative, then, is to sustain and build upon a strong base that involves a mission, support and continuity. For the people who are most important within the Prairie Housing Cooperative, those with special needs, housing is only one aspect of their lives. The nature of the community involved with that housing is even more important.

There are four aspects of the cooperative related to continuity and renewal:

- leadership
- mechanisms for continually affirming the values of the PHC
- the quality and continuity of support
- capability to consolidate and expand.

2. LEADERSHIP

The development and operation of the Prairie Housing Cooperative has resulted from the decisive leadership of a small number of people, coupled with the active involvement of PHC members, their families and friends. The level of energy committed by the leadership, especially those from the staff of CAMR-Winnipeg, was frequently described in terms like "extraordinary,""a fever pitch," and so on. Over time and currently, the leadership at the board level has people with diverse interests and skills to address a number of different issues involved in the PHC - financing, housing, arranging supports, the different perspectives of those who live in the coop.

Organizationally, there are a number of actions which will contribute to both continuity of leadership and its regeneration. The values and mission of the PHC are firmly established in policy. Board members, by and large, have a substantial history of involvement in improving the quality of life for people with handicaps, from both professional and personal involvements. Membership on the board is based on a one-third turnover each year. There are a number of written documents produced by the PHC, including this case study, that are and will be used to keep the values and mission of the PHC "front and centre" for future leaders.

The board experienced its first change in membership in 1984 and entered a new phase of leadership development. A great deal of energy is still required from the core leadership. There is concern among the PHC members and friends about the ability to sustain that energy. There is a less expressed concern about the ability of the coop to sustain the values and mission commitments of the leadership. There is some recognition that with the tremendous growth experienced over the last period, attention needs to

be paid to ensuring that new leaders are developed and committed.

This is becoming even more important as a number of families and individuals have left the coop, and new members are entering.

3. VALUES, CONTINUITY AND RENEWAL

The idea of the Prairie Housing Cooperative depends on far more than leadership - it fundamentally depends on the values and actions involved in the relationships among its members, especially the relationships involving members with special needs. In the words of one PHC member, "it needs hard work and constant vigilance. We need to constantly caution each other not to oppress people in new and different ways." Strong leadership by people with strong values is important, but so are mechanisms for ensuring that the everyday interactions among members actually support members with handicaps to build futures of quality for themselves.

There are a number of such mechanisms within the Prairie Housing Cooperative:

* The process of finding, recruiting and selecting new members relies on members of the PHC who are committed to its values and mission "working" their networks of friends, fellow church members, and contacts in the community. Initial contacts and interviews place a heavy emphasis on explaining the aims and principles of the coop and ensuring that prospective members agree to those aims. It is made clear to people that the coop is first and foremost a way of supporting people with handicaps, and only secondarily a way of providing decent, affordable housing. It is clear from discussions with the PHC leadership and members that this theme recurs throughout the selection process as prospective members meet other board members. It is also clear from interviews that the vast majority of coop members moved into the coop because of "the idea," not just the housing.

  The selection process also places heavy emphasis on prospective members meeting the people with handicaps to whom they will provide support.

* Sessions have been held in three clusters for the purpose of discussing values and what that means in terms of relationships. Two additional sessions were planned in the other clusters. Similarly, the annual meeting focussed heavily on individuals and appropriate ways to support them.

* The by-laws and statements of belief and purpose of the PHC are clear and present reminders to the membership. Formal statements regarding reasons for terminating membership make reference to working out relationship problems in the interest of handicapped people and to actions that are

detrimental to the welfare of the cooperative and of people with handicaps.

* A great deal of the interactions among PHC members is informal, and according to the leadership, provides excellent opportunities for discussing values and the ways they inform actions related to specific individuals.

* The involvement of families and the L'Avenir Coop in the lives of a number of individuals is a further and fundamental way that values are safeguarded.

* There is also a conscious effort to bring people who do not have a history of involvement with people with handicaps into the PHC. In one sense, this represents a conscious effort to have values challenged and revitalized. In another sense, it is a test of the PHC's ability to convince others to share these values.

There are, then, some formal and a number of informal mechanisms within the coop for ensuring that the values and mission are shared by the membership.

There is also recognition that these efforts are not entirely adequate. There is some danger that the compromises already made within the cooperative will not be seen as compromises but become informal standards. Interviews with members of the PHC clusters also indicate that there are considerable differences among individuals in terms of their understanding of what is at stake for vulnerable people. People are committed to varying, but always positive, degrees to individuals with handicaps, but there are some individuals who do not seem aware of what would happen for the most vulnerable members of the cooperative if the PHC arrangement does not work out, and work out well.

Discussions with the new members who moved in during 1985 also indicate that the orientation of new members has not been sufficient. They may understand the aims and directions of the PHC, but they did not feel sufficiently oriented or included to comfortably translate those aims and directions into everyday actions. As more and more responsibility rests with the clusters, and tends therefore to be less formal, there is a greater risk that routine matters of welcoming and orienting people to the coop and carefully involving them in the lives of the people with special needs will suffer.

The PHC is no longer "new" to the extent that its longer term members have developed routines and assumptions about "what everybody knows." In all endeavours, one of the most difficult things to remember when new people get involved is that they do not assume or know some of the "basics" known to others who have been around longer. PHC members have struggled with and figured out a great deal. Much of that now "feels easy" or "is just common sense." Neither will be the case for new members unless they are routinely introduced to what has been learned and is important.

4. THE QUALITY AND CONTINUITY OF SUPPORTS

Fundamentally, the quality of supports within the Prairie Housing Cooperative depends on a number of factors:

- the ability to recruit members who can provide appropriate supports over time;
- the ability of the clusters, L'Avenir, families and the individuals with handicaps to determine what supports are needed, and ensuring that they are provided and in ways that are consistent with the values and principles of the coop; and
- funding, as required, to pay for supports.

Some of the mechanisms for ensuring quality and continuity have already been discussed above - the selection process, the involvement of different people in determining what supports are needed, values sessions and discussions related to individuals, and so on. There is also recognition by the PHC leadership that there is still much to be done to ensure both quality and continuity. One board member commented,

> In terms of finding good people and making good arrangements, I would give us a "7" on a scale of 1 to 10. In terms of the degree of consensus and happiness with this, I would give us a "5" on a scale of 1 to 10.

Supports are provided in different ways within the Prairie Housing Cooperative:

a. the day-to-day support and friendship offered by individuals who live in households with people with developmental special needs.

For ten of the twelve individuals with special needs who have lived or are beginning to live in the coop for any period of time, someone has lived with them in order to provide support. For Janelle, this involves her sisters and mother. Three of the twelve and one additional person have lived for periods of time with no one in their households as support people, and one of these has done so for most of her time in the coop. The newest member of the coop was not living with a support person when she moved in. In two cases, other members of the coop have come to live with two individuals during crises, but not on a permanent basis.

The members of the households who provide support are, by and large, young (in their 20s) and in two situations, younger than the people with handicaps with whom they live. They have little if any background in human services, which is not an important issue for the type of support provided, if it is backed up by advice from experienced and knowledgeable people. They do not have human service careers in the usual sense of the word. The quality

of the supports they provide depends on their being decent people; on the nature of the advice and direction they get from the individuals with handicaps themselves, the cluster, the family and L'Avenir; and on the degree to which their support is monitored by others.

The PHC and many of its households are "young" in the sense that there compositions often change and new relationships are being formed. The experience to date has been one of frequent change in the support persons. In 1984, this pattern of change might have been attributed to a "settling in" period, but it continued into 1985. In February 1985, only four individuals in three households were living with the same support people that were with them before December 1983. Only Betty, Rubin and Janelle experienced no change in support people over the twelve months of the case study.

While there has been significant discontinuity in terms of support people, there is little indication that the effect has been negative. In some cases, the discontinuity resulted because the quality of support provided was lower than acceptable and the support person left. In terms of two members, a number of changes were intentionally made because the support provided was not of sufficient quality. The new arrangements hold better promise. For a third member, it has been impossible to develop a support arrangement that works well. For a fourth member, there are concerns by her family that the lack of a support person in the home may have less than desireable consequences. The support person for a fifth member does not feel well oriented to the coop and wants more guidance about what her role is.

IT IS IMPORTANT TO NOTE THAT IN THE PRAIRIE HOUSING COOPERATIVE, FAILURES TO PROVIDE ADEQUATE SUPPORT ARE SEEN AS THAT, RATHER THAN AS FAILURES OF THE PERSON WITH A HANDICAP. THIS STANDS IN MARKED CONTRAST TO THE VIEWS TAKEN BY MANY SERVICE AGENCIES.

Some of this support is funded through and/or arranged by the L'Avenir Cooperative. The strength of L'Avenir's role is its advocacy and the commitment of its members (families and those who act in staff roles) to the individual. The weakness is with the lack of secure and adequate funding for L'Avenir's core and support functions, and the fact that the provincial government has not recognized its role, and therefore requires funding to go to third party "caregivers." Recent decisions by the provincial government to enter into contracts with L'Avenir may ameliorate this type of problem.

b. Support provided by other members of the cluster.

In four of the five clusters, a significant amount of support and friendship is provided by other coop members in the cluster. In the St. Vital cluster, Janelle and her family have received very little support from their fellow cluster members. The eleven cluster households that provide support vary considerably. For

instance, in 1984 one was a household of two young men. One was composed of a single parent and three children. Six were composed of two parents and children (1, 1, 2, 2, 3 and 4 children). Two were composed of a husband and wife. In three clusters, there were cluster members who have an employment background in human services.

In Tyndall Park and Grant Park, the supports provided among households is generally worked out within the cluster and heavily involves the individuals with developmental special needs living in the clusters. In Adsum, arrangements are worked out within the cluster, but with significant involvement and control exercised by Arnold's brother who lived with him and by his family. Significant amounts of additional support are provided by an extra support person who does not live in the coop and the friends and family of people close to Arnold. The L'Avenir Coop is also involved. In Southdale, much more control and direction is exercised by L'Avenir and the family. In St. Vital, the Dubois family with the help of L'Avenir has arranged support from people and organizations outside of the cluster.

The quality of support provided depends on the same factors involved in support in the households - the involvement of the individuals with handicaps, the knowledge and abilities of other cluster members, the involvement of families and L'Avenir.

The continuity of the support offered by other cluster households was much more stable than that provided within households in 1984. Only one of the families involved in providing support had left the coop, but that family did not leave the neighbourhood and continues to be involved as good neighbours.

Since that time, families or individuals in three clusters have left the coop. Marriages, career changes, and housing aspirations have had their effects both on the handicapped members and other households in clusters. In two of the three clusters, the new families appear to have become involved to somewhat the same extent as those who left.

It is also evident that, at least in one cluster, changes in the lives of two families have meant somewhat less involvement in the lives of their neighbours with handicaps.

c. Supports provided by people and organizations outside the coop.

Members of the PHC with developmental special needs are involved in employment, education, and a range of other community activities. Some of these involvements include day care staff, teachers, social workers, job training staff, fellow workers and others. In some cases, the individuals, families and coop have decided to sever the involvements of other agencies because they have been experienced as detrimental to the lives and futures of the individuals. In some cases, there is a concerted effort to coordinate outside agency involvements in support of the

individual. This is especially true for Janelle and Arnold.

The involvement of L'Avenir, and to some extent a job placement agency in Winnipeg, have clearly led to the development of jobs and meaningful day activities for three individuals. CAMR-Winnipeg has provided work opportunities for several other members on a part-time or temporary basis.

Within the Prairie Housing Cooperative, the major mechanisms for ensuring continuity and quality of supports are the same as those for safeguarding values - the recruitment process, values sessions, by-laws and formal statements, informal interactions, and the involvements of the individuals, their families and L'Avenir as central determiners of the supports provided. This is supplemented, for some, by the development of individual plans for support. In some instances, the plan development process is formal and involves representatives from other agencies. In some instances, the process is facilitated by a representative from L'Avenir or another person (such as involving independent consultants in discussing John and Arnold's situations), and bringing together the family, coop members and others involved.

Of the three types of support, that provided within households appears to be the most vulnerable in that a large number of changes have occured. This is further aggravated by the lack of secure funding for the involvement of L'Avenir in the process of arranging, developing, monitoring, and funding supports both in homes and in the community.

The leadership of the Prairie Housing Cooperative is considering these issues. They are discussing a number of alternatives for the future, including:

* securing stable funding for and recognition of the L'Avenir Cooperative so that it can secure people and funding for individual support arrangements that require outside resources;

* more systematically involving either L'Avenir or the Friends of the Coop in playing a role in arranging and monitoring the supports provided to an individual on a voluntary basis. One such approach would be to organize "committees" for each individual. These committees would involve a number of people with a stated commitment to supporting that individual, advocating for that person's rights and arrange for services and supports both within the coop and in the community generally;

* resolving the issue of the status within the coop of people who are paid to provide support. From the continuity point of view, there is a positive inducement for paid supporters to have tenure in the coop. From the quality point of view, however, there is a distinct advantage to seeing paid supporters more as staff than coop members so that they can be hired and fired clearly on the basis of their relation-

ship to the person with a handicap.

* the use of an Advisory Committee to help plan supports for individuals moving into the coop.

The issues involved in the continuity and quality of supports are intimately linked to the identity of the cooperative itself. On the one hand, the cooperative represents a positive alternative to a traditional service approach. The cooperative is dedicated to and expresses its commitment to providing relationships and community. Great emphasis is placed on having individuals determine major aspects of their lives, including what kinds of support they receive, from whom and under what circumstances. The cooperative represents a conscious and planned effort to include handicapped people in the community and to involve the help and support of good neighbours. This "good neighbour" approach is reflected in the predominantly informal style of the PHC - little formal organization, the avoidance of jargon, using individual networks for reaching out into the community, wide discussion of issues, focussing on individuals, and so on.

On the other hand, the PHC is more than the informal involvements of good neighbours and friends in the lives of people with handicaps. People and supports are consciously arranged and recruited. The organization has a formal and written commitment to a set of values, principles and beliefs related to what life should be like for people with handicaps and which it considers essential. Some of the people providing support are paid to do so. Individuals within the coop, and through involvements with L'Avenir and families, have committed themselves to developing and organizing appropriate supports.

The coop, then, is a delicately balanced mix of an informal community committed to individuals and a human service organization. Much more emphasis is consciously placed on the former than the latter. When discussing various alternatives for ensuring that members understand the mission and values of the PHC, that quality supports are provided and monitored, and so on, the preferred alternative is to articulate ideas better, to tighten up on informal arrangements, and to ensure the involvement of families and L'Avenir, rather than creating more formalized approaches common to agencies - selection committees, formal and required training events, staff or volunteers with designated responsibilities, job descriptions for support providers, case conferences, and the like.

Much of the informal working out of supports within clusters depends on leaders within the coop who live in or relate to those clusters, and family members. There have been some excellent examples of these individuals responding to crises within the clusters and altering arrangements which were not working out, but the challenge is still great.

5. CONSOLIDATION AND EXPANSION CAPABILITIES

The Prairie Housing Cooperative is a small, but complex organization and community. Its houses are dispersed throughout Winnipeg, a positive feature in terms of the integration of handicapped people, but one that also adds some complexity to the management of finding, purchasing and financing houses. The focus of PHC, however, requires much more than simply arranging housing. It involves putting together opportunities for relationships to develop and supports for individuals with special needs.

Clearly, the PHC has made a significant and positive change in the quality of life experienced by the individuals with handicaps that live in the coop. It is also clear that the PHC is still "getting it together" for a number of individuals. Some individuals want to live on their own, and remain within the coop. The supports provided to some have to be stabilized, improved, and changed both in response to the current strengths and needs of the individuals and their changing needs.

There are good reasons for the PHC to continue making and improving arrangements with and for individuals with handicaps who live in the coop. There is also considerable pressure for the coop to respond to the needs of other citizens with handicaps who are in crisis and awaiting quality experiences.

These pressures for consolidation and expansion relate both to the situations of individuals and to general administrative considerations.

The leadership of the coop has considered the ideal size of the coop to be about thirty houses. This would permit, from a budget point of view, the hiring of a half-time administrator/property manager. The idea would be to phase the additional twelve houses over two years, placing priority on 3 or 4 in the near future. Many of the financial operations of the coop are being computerized which will aid in dealing with the administrative complexity. The PHC is working actively to develop a way of consolidating the mortgages on the existing houses so that they are dealt with and renewed as a group rather than individually.

The coop is also considering other ways of arranging housing and support. For instance, the coop now owns 3 houses in a condominium. It could also make arrangements with other cooperative and social housing programs to provide a unit or units. Supportive neighbours could be recruited within the existing community of neighbours or additional units could be arranged for people recruited by the PHC. This would expand the range of alternatives available for individuals. It would also involve another set of different agreements with other housing organizations.

The feeling within the coop leadership is that the PHC is getting easier and easier to manage. Considerable experience has been gained and routines established with respect to the housing aspects of the coop. Momentum is building within the coop but also

in terms of the support and involvement of the wider community. Building on this base, the leadership thinks the 30 house limit is manageable.

Expansion beyond the 30 houses could involve the creation of branches. The idea of branches would be developed using the existing clusters as a base. Existing clusters would expand in their areas of the city, not the neighbourhoods in which they are located, so that more houses would be dispersed over the city. Legislation permits the creation of such branches under a central board. The central board would be responsible for administration and ownership. The branches would be responsible for membership decisions and day-to-day operations.

The other alternative would be to create new cooperatives, but this is a long and arduous process.

The Prairie Housing Cooperative, because it dispersed its housing and has a small number of houses, is at a disadvantage in terms of CMHC procedures and support. Usually, cooperatives develop by the one-time purchase or construction of a set number of units. The entire set of units is processed at one time. The PHC, on the other hand, must apply for each of its houses. Many cooperatives get going by purchasing development assistance from cooperative resource groups. This purchase of service is funded by CMHC, up to 3% of the capitalization for the project. This approach is of limited usefulness for PHC because of its size and the phasing of its housing purchases.

Additional complexity resulted when some of the houses cost more than CMHC would allow. Arrangements were made with CMHC to exclude some costs from the purchase price, so the houses were purchased, but extra funds had to be raised to cover the costs not covered by CMHC.

Despite these complexities, and because of some of the alternatives being developed, the coop leadership thinks that further expansion is manageable. There is on-going concern within the leadership, however, about the PHC's ability to expand, and at the same time consolidate and improve the quality of existing arrangements.

In 1984, in terms of the two individuals who wanted to live on their own within the coop, expansion would also have meant consolidation. Additional units would be arranged for these individuals and thereby improve the match between their needs and the housing provided. This would also involve making new arrangements in the households from which these individuals would leave. In fact, one of those individuals left the coop. For John and Arnold, however, sustaining and improving the quality of their arrangements <u>may</u> involve considerable efforts. John and Arnold require considerable support. As they adjust to their current situations, there is an on-going need to monitor, review and adjust those situations. Any dramatic changes in their own lives or the lives of those providing them with support will require

careful and considerable attention. If the energy of those involved in paying attention is divided because of expansion, their situations could be jeopardized.

The PHC is carefully considering the issues of consolidation and expansion. There are on-going concerns about the compromises already made in arrangements for individuals. Improving the arrangements for some individuals may necessitate expansion to some degree. Safeguarding and improving the arrangements for others will require on-going commitment of time and energy. There are a number of individuals known by the PHC who also need the kinds of support that the PHC can offer. Their needs represent positive pressure to expand.

IV. AN OVERVIEW

The Prairie Housing Cooperative was designed and is dedicated to providing housing organized on a cooperative basis, but also, and fundamentally, to meeting the needs of people with developmental special needs for housing, supportive relationships, and control and ownership of their housing arrangements.

Towards this end, the PHC has purchased eighteen houses which are located in five neighbourhood clusters dispersed throughout Winnipeg. Each cluster is made up of from two to six households within walking distance of one another. In February 1985, fifty four people were living in the coop, including nine people with special needs. An additional twenty six people, including four with handicaps, have lived in the coop since August 1982.

Fundamentally, the life of the cooperative centres on individuals with special needs. The needs of these individuals play a major role in the development of houses, households, other houses in the clusters, the supports offered by fellow coop members, and additional supports provided to the individuals. In this way, the cooperative is far more than just housing organized on a cooperative basis - it is a community of support for individuals with developmental special needs.

The support offered to individuals with special needs includes help and assistance from their coop neighbours, from non-handicapped individuals living in their households, and from family and friends. This help and assistance is organized in various ways, including discussions and decisions by members of clusters, the involvement of family, the involvement of the L'Avenir Community Living Cooperative, and the assistance of community groups and organizations. The individuals with special needs, or family members and advocates speaking on their behalf, exercise considerable control over their housing and supports.

This report presents and discusses numerous aspects of the cooperative and the lives of the people who make it up. By way of overview, however, the following are some of the major positive features and issues associated with the cooperative, as seen at this point in time.

* The Prairie Housing Cooperative represents an improved standard of living and quality of life for its members with special needs. The individuals consistently report that they like their houses, the people who live with them, other coop members, their neighbours, their neighbourhood, and life in the coop generally. For some, the coop represents a significant change from the much more controlled lives they lived in institutions, group homes, apartment programs or their families. For one young girl, it has meant the chance to continue to live with her family and go to a day care centre with other kids in her neighbourhood. For one young man, it has meant leaving an institution, sharing his new home with his brother, and becoming once again a participating

member of the community. For four individuals, it has represented an opportunity to move out of a program controlled by an agency and into their own homes where they have significantly more control over life decisions. For two people, it has represented a chance to get married. All of the individuals live in rather typical suburban houses, built within the last decade. Except for the married couple, they all have their own bedrooms. All of the adults with special needs are poor, but they all live in decent houses, in good neighbourhoods, and in good health.

* For at least five individuals, the Prairie Housing Cooperative has meant that they are at far less risk of living in an institution. In fact, for two young people this has meant living in their families or with a family member. For another, there is now the potential for breaking the cycle he has experienced throughout his 27 years - moving twenty times, living in ten different places, spending fifteen years in institutional settings, and since the age of eleven, not living in any one place for more than 1 or 2 years.

* A significant amount of the support given to individuals with special needs is from good neighbours and the people who live with them in their houses. Many of the non-handicapped members of the coop speak positively about the opportunity it provides to be good neighbours, to share life with and learn from people with handicaps, and to be good citizens. All speak positively of the part they are playing in helping their fellow citizens to integrate into the community. Most of the people with handicaps call on their coop neighbours for help, advice and friendship. These natural supports from good neighbours are supplemented, for some individuals, by people who live with the people with handicaps. In some instances, they are paid to provide support.

* The individuals with special needs are neither segregated, congregated nor isolated in their neighbourhoods or community. They live in and as part of the community, though not to the fullest extent possible. In no household are there more than two individuals with handicaps. There are only two households in which all of the people living in them are people with handicaps. Everyone interacts with their neighbours, especially their fellow coop neighbours. Everyone uses the services and facilities in the neighbourhood. Everyone maintains contact with families and friends. Most of the individuals with handicaps are involved to a significant degree in work, school or day care in the community.

* There is an overriding sense of purpose and mission behind the Prairie Housing Cooperative, and that sense is firmly based on a set of principles that value people with handicaps. The Prairie Housing Cooperative has chosen intentionally to develop itself in ways that are not always the easiest. This has required a considerable amount of energy and commitment by the leadership. To ensure integration and prevent congregation, the PHC has developed its housing throughout the city with small groupings in clusters within neighbourhoods. This has resulted in greater than usual administrative complexity in the context of cooperative housing.

The leadership has sought out and recruited a large number of families and individuals to participate in the cooperative. The selection of members has not been based simply on a commitment to cooperative living, but on a commitment to cooperative living in support of specific individuals with special needs. The development of relations between good neighbours has not been left to chance, but based on careful selection and refinement. Some selections have not been the best for the individual requiring support, and steps have been taken to remedy them. Some of the individuals with special needs require a considerable amount of support. Current government programs to fund the supports that cost money have not always been available or available in ways consistent with the principles of the cooperative. This has required some compromises, raising funds independently, and advocacy.

* While each is being discussed and potentially addressed with the cooperative, some of the practices of the Prairie Housing Cooperative and the current obstacles placed in its way by other organizations, potentially or actually, compromise the principles upon which the cooperative is based and the on-going quality of life experienced by individuals with special needs in the cooperative. These practices and obstacles include the following:

- The practice of purchasing mainly three bedroom houses has meant that two individuals who are fully capable of living on their own, and who wanted to live on their own within the cooperative had to share their houses with other people. Mortgage payments and subsidy arrangements, coupled with the fact that one person living in a three bedroom house does not constitute "modest and appropriate housing," prevents the current houses from responding appropriately to these and other individuals. In response, the PHC is giving active consideration to developing a wider range of housing options within the cooperative so that more individualized arrangements are possible, but this has not been resolved.

- Compared to the other clusters, a relatively large number of handicapped people (5) live in one of the clusters. While no more than five people with handicaps have lived in the cluster at any one time, a total of eight different people lived there since August 1982. There is also some risk that at least one of the support people living in the cluster could be seen by other community members as being handicapped. There is some risk, then, that people with handicaps will be seen as a group, rather than as individuals, in this neighbourhood and treated in stereotypical ways. There is, however, no indication that this has happened.

- In one household, the support people are designated "caregivers" for one member with special needs under the Approved Home Program of the provincial government. Under this arrangement, the person with a handicap pays room and

board to the caregiver, not rent to the coop. Technically, in this case, the house and the tenure in the coop belongs to the "caregiver," not the handicapped person. Technically, this arrangement means that the support person is seen more as an agency/ service provider, than as a friend and supporter. The supervision and control over the "caregiver" is formally the responsibility of a government social worker, not the handicapped person, his family or advocate. Practically, however, this situation is well safeguarded. The family of the young man with special needs and the L'Avenir Cooperative carefully supervise the support people and have good relationships with them. In addition, the availability of the houses themselves is controlled by the PHC and its by-laws about members acting in the best interest of handicapped people.

- The L'Avenir Cooperative, in conjunction with families, plays a major role in the organization of supports for three individuals with most significant needs. The lack of government recognition and funding of the L'Avenir Cooperative has resulted in less than appropriate funding mechanisms (the Approved Home Progam) being used in less than appropriate ways; the supplementary funding of some supports by family members; the supplementary funding of some supports through private donations; and less than adequate funding to develop, implement and monitor plans. Individuals have been recruited to provide support to these individuals, but fragile and inappropriate funding arrangements potentially do not provide for security and the ability to flexibly respond to changing circumstances. The fact that the Government is willing to enter into contractual arrangements with L'Avenir may alleviate this problem.

- The success of the coop's recruiting methods has been mixed. Nevertheless, in one cluster the family with a handicapped child is not receiving sufficient support from the cluster. This judgement is based on the mother's identification of what she needs by way of support. This situation will test the degree of support that good neighbours can or will provide, and be expected to provide. In other clusters, there has been considerable turnover in terms of both support people living in households with people with special needs and coop neighbours. For at least one person, support people have been of questionnable usefulness, and others have been recruited to take their places. It is clear that neighbours will provide acceptance, neighbourly support, and/or personal support, and usually all three. There are indications in one of the clusters, where these issues are relevant, that good neighbours and other coop members can be called upon for respite and crisis support.

- It can be anticipated and observed that the lives of members of the cooperative change over time, and that these

changes result in people having or choosing to move out of the cooperative. The cooperative is also facing serious pressures to expand the number of houses and the supports it offers. In keeping with its focus on community and support from good neighbours, the coop has some formal and many informal ways of ensuring the continuity of values supported by its members and leadership, and the quality of supports offered to individuals with special needs. While these mechanisms have ensured a considerable degree of quality in the lives of people with special needs, there are also areas which need improvement. As change continues to take place in the lives of members, these mechanisms will be further tested in terms of their adequacy.

- The administrative complexity of the PHC, because of the principled way it has decided to proceed, coupled with the fragility of funding arrangements for supports, seriously tests the capacity of the PHC to expand, and at the same time, guarantee the quality of existing arrangements. A number of actions are being taken and investigated to improve both problems, but until they are resolved, the leadership will be required to continue in the efforts that have been described as "super-human."

BY AND LARGE, THE VERY POSITIVE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE PHC ARE BASED ON THE INVOLVEMENTS OF DECENT, DEDICATED, AND EXTREMELY ENERGETIC PEOPLE. THE ISSUES CURRENTLY BEING FACED IN THE COOPERATIVE WHICH HAVE POTENTIALLY NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES, ON THE OTHER HAND, HAVE EMERGED AS A RESULT OF THE SPEED WITH WHICH THE COOPERATIVE HAS DEVELOPED, THE PREPONDERANCE OF CMHC INCENTIVES THAT SUPPORT LARGER COOPERATIVES ORGANIZED ON SINGLE SITES, AND THE LACK OF ADEQUATE SUPPORT BEING PROVIDED BY GOVERNMENT TO THE L'AVENIR COOPERATIVE. TO SOME EXTENT, AS WELL, THE INFORMAL STYLE AND ARRANGEMENTS WHICH HAVE EMERGED IN A NUMBER OF AREAS OF THE COOP'S OPERATIONS MAY POSE THREATS FOR THE FUTURE, ESPECIALLY IN TERMS OF THE QUALITY AND CONTINUITY OF SUPPORTS AND RELATIONSHIPS.

* The Prairie Housing Cooperative has organized itself, and taken advantage of the benefits of a cooperative structure to ensure that people with handicaps and their family members who speak on their behalf have significant decision making power in terms of both housing and supports. The board of the PHC is the most active formal decision making body within the cooperative, and the majority of its members are individuals with handicaps or their family members. Members with handicaps participate in annual meetings and think they are listened to in those meetings, though they are generally not aware of the details of the coop's organization or of organizational decisions. They do report, however, that they have significant involvement in decisions within their households and clusters, the decisions that most affect their everyday lives.

In conclusion, the Praire Housing Cooperative is based and

operates on a series of beliefs. It has made significant and successful efforts to be true to those beliefs. It also recognizes that there are serious issues that must be addressed continuously. This case study has chronicled and explored the Prairie Housing Cooperative's attempts to meet the challenges faced by those citizens of Winnipeg who have developmental special needs, but the story, both in terms of challenges and successes, is far from over.

Perhaps the most fitting closing for this report is the delineation of the Prairie Housing Cooperative's principles.

PRAIRIE HOUSING COOPERATIVE LTD. - STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES

We believe that:

I. all persons have the right to be welcomed and included as full participants in society and to be accorded full citizenship therein;

II. all persons, particularly the most vulnerable, are entitled to the safeguards necessary to preserve their legal and human rights, their dignity and development, and their place in the community;

III. the rights and interests of persons are more likely to be safeguarded when they have control over the decisions and circumstances which affect their lives. Therefore, we are committed to

   a. creating opportunities for individuals to exercise autonomy.

   b. insuring each member's equal participation in decisions which affect the design, governance and operation of the system that is the basis of his/her housing.

   c. exploring ways to assist and encourage each person to represent himself/herself.

   d. insuring that individuals who require active representation, guardianship and/or a voice in the person of another are represented by a family member or a personally chosen or appointed citizen advocate; and that this representative is not in conflict of interest (i.e., is in alliance with the individual).

IV. the rights and interests of persons are more likely to be safeguarded when they are in the midst of valued citizens who know and care about them. Real investment in and involvement with people at a personal level may be the most powerful way to begin to change the life experience of socially marginalized people from one of rejection to one of welcome.

V. interdependence is a fact of human existence. The principles of cooperation and mutual support lie at the heart of a cooperative community; utilization of natural support systems and freely chosen relationships can help to insure and sustain a high quality of life and valued participation in the community.

All persons have the right to be present in and to participate in the communities of their choice; persons who have developmental special needs require and are entitled to live in places which look like, feel like and actually are valued homes in communities and neighbourhoods which are shared by ordinary citizens. They need devoted friends and neighbours; the opportunity to form friendships and to be neighbours to others.

VI. all people are entitled to housing which is affordable, congenial, of the persons own choosing, and which interprets them positively; housing which offers permanence and security and fosters continuity of place and relationships.

VII. all people are entitled to financial security.

VIII. persons who require specific support services such as personal assistance, assistance in learning, assistance in managing a household are entitled to these supports in a manner which is regular, reliable and effective in meeting their changing needs. Intensive or highly specific assistance is not expected to be provided through the natural relationships in the cooperative; but should be met through formal service arrangements, which <u>may</u> be administered through the cooperative.

IX. all persons need and are entitled to opportunities for growth and learning.

X. all persons are entitled to expect that their basic human needs will be met.

XI. all persons need and are entitled to opportunities for spiritual nourishment and participation in a spiritual community of their choice, if they so choose.

XII. people's needs should be met in ways which are as culturally valued as possible in order to establish, enable or support experiences, behaviours, status, interpretations and relationships which are as culturally valued as possible.

National Institute on Mental Retardation
Institut canadien pour la déficience mentale

Kinsmen NIMR Building, York University Campus
4700 Keele Street
Downsview, Ontario M3J 1P3
Canada Tel.: (416) 661-9611

THE PRAIRIE HOUSING COOPERATIVE: A Case Study of a Cooperative, a Community and a Cultural Event

APPENDIX A: The Prairie Housing Cooperative and the Objectives of CMHC's Section 56.1 Social Housing Program

Prepared by:

Bruce Kappel
Senior Program Officer
National Institute on Mental Retardation

December 1985

This project was carried out with the assistance of a grant from Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation under the terms of the External Research Program. The views expressed are those of the author and do not represent the official views of the Corporation.

APPENIX A

The Prairie Housing Cooperative and the Objectives of CMHC's Section 56.1 Social Housing Program

The Non-Profit and Cooperative Housing Programs of the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation (CMHC) were designed to achieve three objectives:

a) to provide modest, affordable, housing appropriate to the needs of low and moderate income families and individuals;

b) to produce housing at minimum costs by implementing appropriate cost controls; and

c) to encourage approved lenders to provide capital for low and moderate income housing needs.

The purpose of this Appendix is to review the information collected in the case study that is relevant to CMHC's objectives.

While it was not the intent of the case study to conduct an evaluation of the Prairie Housing Cooperative (PHC) in light of these objectives, a number of the questions asked during the study were drawn from the CMHC publication Section 56.1 Non-Profit and Cooperative Housing Program Evaluation (November, 1983), particularly in terms of appropriate housing and the social impact of the Cooperative on the lives of people with developmental special needs who are members of it.

Appropriate Housing

In the Section 56.1 evaluation report, three indicators of "appropriate" are identified -- crowding, physical condition, and consumer satisfaction. In terms of "special groups" it is also indicated that people with disabilities may require special design features for their housing to be appropriate to their individual needs.

a) Crowding

There are two indicators of crowding -- i) the number of rooms in a house is less than the number of occupants; and ii) the number of persons per bedroom exceeds two persons. Neither is the case in any Prairie Housing Cooperative house.

The "other side" of crowding is overconsumption of housing, indicated by the number of bedrooms in the house exceeding the number of occupants. In February 1985, three of the houses (each containing three bedrooms) occupied by people with developmental special needs contained more bedrooms than people. In one case, one person was living in the house; and in two other, two

people were living in them. At various points in time over the period of the case study, this was also the case for one other household in which individuals with developmental special needs live, and three households in which no people with special needs live. If all of these instances occured at one point in time, just under 40% of the houses would contain fewer people than bedrooms.

In terms of the four households in which individuals with developmental special needs live, however, there have been reasons for this state of affairs. In one house, attempts have been made to have the individual share her house with at least one other person, but these have been "unsuccessful". In two houses, the changing composition of the households has meant fewer people living in them for varying periods of time. In other words, housemates have moved out of the cooperative and not been immediately replaced. Appropriately, the determining factor related to "who moves in" has been the needs of the individual remaining in the house and/or the individual moving in, not whether or not the number of people would match the number of bedrooms. In the fourth house, two of the three bedrooms are small and have historically been used by one person, while the other uses the larger bedroom.

As mentioned in the final report of the case study, the fact that the Prairie Housing Cooperative has been "locked into" three bedroom houses has reduced its range of action when it comes to matching house size and space to the needs of members of the cooperative.

b) Physical Condition

In the Section 56.1 evaluation report, three indicators were used related to the physical condition of the house -- i) need for major repairs; ii) assessment of interior condition; and iii) assessment of exterior condition. The "occupants" involved in that evaluation reported, by and large, that -- their houses did not require major repairs (92%); the interior condition was good to excellent (88%); and the exterior condition was good to excellent (86%).

Members of the Prairie Housing Cooperative with developmental special needs rated their houses in a similar fashion. All indicated that the interiors and exteriors of their houses were good to excellent. On the other hand, about half of the occupants indicated that "some" major repairs were needed; however, as indicated in the final report of the case study, there was no apparent evidence of such major repairs being needed, except in one instance where a number of renovations have taken place in the house. The question asked in the case study was much simpler than that asked in the CMHC evaluation study.

c) Consumer Satisfaction with neighbourhood and facilities

The Prairie Housing Coop members with developmental special

needs were asked several clusters of questions regarding their satisfaction with the neighbourhoods, and the people and facilities in them.

The first group of questions asked about the location of the house; convenience to stores; liking the neighbourhood; and liking the neighbours. In terms of satisfaction, individuals could indicate "like alot", "like some", dislike some" and "dislike alot". In 1985, except for one individual who reported some dislike for her neighbourhood, 100% of the members with developmental special needs answered these questions positively.

The second group of questions dealt with the convenience, quality and use of neighbourhood services and facilities. Two thirds or more of the cooperative members with developmental special needs who answered the questions indicated that recreation facilities, playgrounds, shopping facilities, schools, and bus service were very convenient. Parks, libraries, and medical facilities were rated less favourably. Two thirds or more of those answering also indicated that the quality of the parks, recreation facilities, playgrounds, shopping facilities, and schools was excellent or very good.

This information is presented in more detail in the final report of the case study (Tables 12 and 13), but the general impression is that the individuals are satisfied with their neighbourhoods given that, by and large, they are in suburban locations which do not have a full range of facilities available in them.

Finally, the members were asked to rate the neighbourhood as a whole, the condition of buildings, quality of air, and safety from crime. In each case, only one of the seven individuals who answered the question gave a less than "good" rating on each question. As indicated in Table 12 in the final report, the changes in ratings from 1984 to 1985 are noticeable. There is no apparent reason for this change, but it does appear, both in the answers and in conversation with the people, that they are becoming more discriminating consumers and have had at least a full year of experience with their new neighbourhoods.

d) Design Features

Housing for people with various types of physical disabilities often requires special design features linked to increasing the individual's abilities to get around the house and engage in various activities within it. With few exceptions, the individuals living in the Prairie Housing Cooperative's houses do not require such modifications. They do, however, often require modifications that are of a different nature -- social modifications.

Many of the questions asked during the course of the case study relate to these types of modifications -- the intentional recruiting of neighbours and housemates to support an individual;

the involvement of the individual in decision making and control over his/her life; the focus on friendship and mutual support; and the assuring of tenure.

All of these features were developed by the Prairie Housing Cooperative in response to the fact that its members are vulnerable. They are at risk of being denied opportunities to belong, choose, participate, and contribute. It is their vulnerability, more than their developmental special needs, that has dictated these special features.

It is in terms of these special design features that members express most satisfaction. They think their houses and neighbourhoods are nice, but fundamentally they are most positive about the relationships, freedom and control over their lives and homes that the Prairie Housing Cooperative has afforded them. For the other members of the Prairie Housing Cooperative, it is these features which keep them involved, although the quality of housing certainly remains an attractive feature.

Affordable Housing

The case study paid far less attention to the issue of modest and affordable housing than it did to the appropriateness of the housing.

Of the eighteen houses, nine cost less than $ 40,000 to acquire and rehabilitate, while another nine cost between $41,000 and $48,000. The monthly occupancy charges for the houses in 1983 ranged between $400 and $500 per month (not including utilities), nine of the households required 56.1 assistance to meet these costs.

In 1983, the Manitoba Affordale New Homes program indicated that an affordable home should cost no more than $68,000. While this ceiling relates to new homes, and the Prairie Housing Cooperative has purchased only existing homes, it does indicate a degree of affordability based on local standards.

Information about the annual incomes of members of the Prairie Housing Cooperative was collected during the case study, but was not of sufficient quality to permit calculations and judgements about the percentage of income spent by individuals and households on housing. There was, however, no indication that members felt themselves burdened by the cost of their housing in the cooperative. One member experienced a slight rise in housing costs when she joined the cooperative because she had to pay utilities, whereas in her last place of residence the utilities were included. All other members of the cooperative indicated that the quality and cost of the housing was a positive feature of the Prairie Housing Cooperative.

Certainly the assistance available through Sectionm 56.1 make it possible for the members with developmental special needs

to live in appropriate housing which they would be unable to afford otherwise. For a number of the non-handicapped members who are students, one career families, and young couples, the quality of housing they are able to afford because of the Prairie Housing Cooperative is significantly greater than would otherwise be the case.

Social Impact

The Section 56.1 evaluation study examined additional impacts of non-profit and cooperative housing in a number of areas, including improved housing conditions and social impacts--

> Improved Housing Conditions: About 50 percent of the program recipients indicated an improvement in their housing condition, while a further 30 percent identified no change from their previous dwelling.
>
> Social Impacts: Forty-five percent of program recipients indicated that their life as a whole had improved since their entry into the programs, while a further 42 percent identified no effect. Most occupants (80 percent) interact with other residents in their projects. High levels of occupant participation in management and decision-making were found especially in cooperatives (page 6 of Executive Summary).

All of the information from the case study indicates that there have been significant and positive outcomes in these areas for PHC members with developmental special needs. Their answers to questions about their satisfaction with their current housing compared with their previous place of residence consistently indicate improved levels of satisfaction. While only one-third ranked their last places of residence highly, and more than one-third ranked them quite low, the vast majority (all in 1984, and 8 out of 10 in 1985) ranked their PHC houses very highly.

In response to the questions "how satisfied are you with the coop as a place to live?" and "how about the last place you lived?" no member expressed neutrality or dissatisfaction with the Prairie Housing Cooperative, and the majority (5 out of 7 in 1985, and 6 out of 8 in 1984) were very satisfied. In contrast, the majority (6 out of 8) were dissatisfied with their last place of residence, and most of them were very dissatisfied.

These rankings, however, do not capture the dramatic differences some individuals have experienced. For many, life in a modest three-bedroom house is dramatically different from the life they experienced in institutions and group homes.

In response to a series of questions about the effect that living in the Prairie Housing Cooperative has had on various aspects of their lives, the members indicated that living in the cooperative either had improved or had no effect on various aspects of their lives. In fact, the vast majority (86%)

indicated that their lives had improved in terms of the quality of their housing, their health, and their life as a whole. The one married couple indicated improvement in their marriage as well. In terms of their financial situations and relations with families (families who do not live with them), 43% indicated their situations had improved.

Another series of questions addressed changes in how individuals feel about themselves, how they get along with the people with whom they live, and their abilities to make decisions about their lives. In terms of "how you feel about yourself", 86% reported improvement, and the remainder stated that their feelings were the same. In terms of getting along with others and making decisions, 71% reported improvements, and the remainder indicated no change.

Again, these responses do not capture the dramatic changes which have taken place, especially for those members whose needs are quite challenging. The final report of the case study presents these changes in much greater detail than would be appropriate here.

Concluding Remarks

From the point of view of this case study and the intent and operation of the Prairie Housing Cooperative, it would be inappropriate to stretch too far the relationship between the PHC and the objectives of CMHC's Section 56.1 Social Housing Program. The objectives of the PHC and CMHC are, in a number of aspects, complimentary, but from the point of view of our fellow citizens with developmental special needs who are involved in the PHC, the relationship between PHC and CMHC is secondary.

The intent and purposes of the Prairie Housing Cooperative go far beyond those of CMHC's Section 56.1 program. By traditional measures of "modest, affordable and appropriate housing" the relationship has, by and large, served both parties well. It has allowed the Prairie Housing Cooperative to provide housing that is decent, affordable and integrated, as well as involving people with special needs in control and ownership of their housing arrangements. It has provided the context for developing the supportive relationships that are at the heart of the cooperative.

As discussed in the final report of the case study, the Prairie Housing Cooperative has not had a profound impact on the needs of Winnipeg citizens with developmental special needs for modest, affordable, and appropriate housing. It has, however, had a profound impact in two very important areas:

1. the lives of its members and the chances that they will continue to belong, exercise choice, support one another, participate and contribute to the life of their community; and

2. the understanding of many Canadians about what "community living" can really be about for people with developmental special needs.

The PHC's creative use of Section 56.1 and its insistent efforts to be true to its mission have demonstrated that it is possible to provide opportunities for people with developmental special needs, including those who have quite challenging needs, to not only live in the community, but to be a part of the community as supported and supporting members. It has provided the opportunity for people with special needs to live in homes, rather than services; to create households, rather than only be part of a group; to exercise choices and power over their own lives, rather than being controlled by the power of others; and to develop relationships with fellow citizens.

CMHC's assistance to cooperative housing efforts has provided the foundation upon which these opportunities could be built. The housing is socially and financially accessible. The cooperative nature of the project has provided a fundamental opportunity for control and ownership, and in many ways, an opportunity which would not exist under other tenure arrangements. The cumbersome but necessary ability to purchase housing in various neighbourhoods has allowed both the recruiting of supportive neighbours and fellow coop members, and increased opportunities for developing relationships with other neighbours.

Because the Prairie Housing Cooperative has built itself on a set of values and the needs of individuals with developmental special needs, it has demonstrated a very effective way of combining the various possibilities permitted within Section 56.1 programs to achieve high quality outcomes.