

**North East LHIN**

# FLHS CAPACITY REPORT

FEBRUARY, 2020



French Language  
Health Services Network  
of Eastern Ontario

POWERED BY

The logo for Ozi features the word 'Ozi' in a bold, sans-serif font. The 'O' is white with a black outline, while the 'zi' is solid black. The letters are set against a solid black rectangular background.



# CAPACITY REPORT

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1	FOREWORD	5
1.2	CONTEXT	5
1.3	RESPONSIBILITY LEVELS	6
<b>2</b>	<b>ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR ASSESSING CAPACITY</b>	<b>8</b>
2.1	FLHS RESPONSIBILITY	9
2.2	ORGANIZATIONAL PRACTICES CONDUCIVE TO THE PROVISION OF FLHS	9
2.3	FLHS OPPORTUNITIES	10
2.3.1	Human Resources with French Language Proficiency	10
<b>3</b>	<b>DATA COLLECTION METHOD</b>	<b>12</b>
3.1	ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES	13
3.2	RESOURCES	13
3.3	DATA COLLECTION	13
3.4	DATA LIMITATIONS	14
3.5	EVOLUTION OF RESULTS OVER TIME	14
<b>4</b>	<b>COMMENTS</b>	<b>15</b>
4.1	PRESENTATION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE DATA PACKAGE	16
4.2	PRESENTATION OF RESULTS	16
4.2.1	LHIN Overview	16
4.2.2	Overview of the LHIN's Local Areas	16
4.2.3	FLHS Responsibility	16
4.2.4	Organizational Practices Conducive to the Provision of FLHS	17
4.2.5	FLHS Opportunities	17
<b>5</b>	<b>RESULTS</b>	<b>18</b>
5.1	FLHS CAPACITY IN THE LHIN	19
5.1.1	LHIN Overview	19
5.1.2	FLHS Responsibility - North East LHIN	20
5.1.3	Organizational Practices Conducive to the Provision of FLHS – North East LHIN	22
5.1.4	FLHS Opportunities – North East LHIN	24
5.2	FLHS CAPACITY PER LOCAL AREA	26
5.2.1	Overview of North East LHIN's Local Areas	26
5.2.2	Algoma	27
5.2.3	Cochrane	33
5.2.4	James and Hudson Bay Coasts	39
5.2.5	Nipissing-Temiskaming	45
5.2.6	Sudbury-Manitoulin-Parry Sound	51
<b>6</b>	<b>APPENDICES</b>	<b>57</b>
	Appendix 1 Acronyms, Abbreviations and Glossary of Terms	58
	Appendix 2 FLS Proficiency Profiles	61
	Appendix 3 Definition of Indicators	63
	Appendix 4 Reporting Templates	67
	Appendix 5 Regional Data Spreadsheet	(see attached)

# 1

# INTRODUCTION

## 1.1

## FOREWORD

The Ontario health care system relies on evidence-based data to make informed decisions on issues that affect the health of the population. As such, health service planning takes into account the state of health of Ontarians as well as their use of health care services.

At present, however, the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care<sup>1</sup> (MOHLTC), Local Health Integration Networks (LHINs) and French Language Health Planning Entities (Entities) possess limited standardized information on the services offered in French. This lack of consistent data hampers efficient planning of French language health services (FLHS) across the continuum of care and impedes the development and measurement of robust accountability with regards to the provision of FLHS.

To address this issue, the French Language Health Services Network of Eastern Ontario (the Réseau) has developed the OZi Portal, an online data management solution to collect and analyze data on FLHS provision at the provincial, local, and sectoral levels.

The MOHLTC recognizes the importance of data on FLHS capacity, as well as the Réseau's expertise on this matter, and has mandated the latter to conduct a province-wide analysis of Ontario's FLHS capacity.

The Réseau collected data from 1428 LHIN funded health service providers (HSPs) using the OZi Portal. HSPs had the obligation to fill out and submit one of two French Language Services (FLS) reporting templates, in accordance with 15 indicators identified as part of the data collection project. This operation was carried out in collaboration with all 14 LHINs, as well as all six Entities.

The data collected has enabled the Réseau to produce 14 Capacity Reports and 14 Dashboards – one for each LHIN. The current document contains the Capacity Report for the North East LHIN. This report is complementary to the North East LHIN Dashboard.

<sup>1</sup> As of June 2019, the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care has been divided into two ministries: the Ministry of Health and the Ministry of Long-Term Care. In this report, the acronym MOHLTC refers to both organizations.

The Dashboard has been designed to allow LHIN senior management to monitor their performance and provide direction on FLHS enhancement. It presents a high-level view of the local provision of FLHS, framed in four themes: "LHIN Overview", "FLHS Responsibility", "Organizational Practices", as well as "FLHS Opportunities".

The Capacity Report presents a detailed view of the local provision of FLHS, with analyses available by local areas and sectors of care. It has been designed to help LHIN planners make decisions in order to fulfill their obligations, as set out in the MOHLTC's [Guide to Requirements and Obligations Relating to French Language Health Services](#)<sup>2</sup> (Guide to FLHS, 2017).

Finally, while these analyses are meant to inform planning decisions, it is worth noting that this report only provides an analysis of the current state of capacity; and that further analysis by the LHIN and Entity is required to understand local demand for FLHS.

## 1.2

## CONTEXT

Offering French language health services (FLHS) derives from an obligation under the French Language Services Act (FLSA), whereby all Ontario government services must be provided in French. In the health care system, this responsibility was reaffirmed in the MOHLTC's Guide to FLHS (2017); all system stakeholders (the MOHLTC, LHINs, Entities and HSPs) have specific roles to uphold in order to provide a reasonable access to local FLHS across the entire continuum of care.

As specified in the MOHLTC's Guide to FLHS (2017), LHINs have two roles in the planning and provision of FLHS:

- To "plan, fund, integrate, and deliver local health services for the Francophone community";
- And to "promote health equity, reduce health disparities and inequities, and respect (...) the requirements of the French Language Services Act (FLSA), in the planning, design, delivery and evaluation of services."

<sup>2</sup> Document accessible at this address: [http://www.health.gov.on.ca/en/public/programs/flhs/docs/Guide\\_to\\_FLHS\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.health.gov.on.ca/en/public/programs/flhs/docs/Guide_to_FLHS_FINAL.pdf)

LHINs also have the responsibility to:

- “Hold HSPs accountable for the provision of FLHS and reporting of the provision of FLHS as per the terms of LHIN-HSP Service Accountability Agreements”;
- To “ensure that information about available FLHS is made accessible to the public”;
- And to “liaise with the MOHLTC and work with the Entities and HSPs on the identification of HSPs and HSPs seeking designation”.

To accomplish the latter, LHINs must:

- “Work with health system partners to identify HSPs for the provision of FLHS”; “work with health system partners to determine the readiness of identified HSPs for designation under the FLSA”;
- “Review the current status of identified HSPs who have not obtained FLS designation, and make a determination on the suitability of the HSP for the identification/designation”;
- And “work with health system partners to follow the designation process for HSPs seeking designation in a consistent and effective manner, and in accordance with Ministry of Francophone Affairs (MFA) criteria”.

The Entities’ role is to “provide advice on local FLHS to the LHINs in specific geographic areas”. To do so, Entities have the following responsibilities:

- “Support the LHINs’ mandate and collaborate to ensure the effective delivery of FLHS at the local level”, namely by “identifying FLHS available to the Francophone community” and “encouraging, educating and supporting HSPs to plan and deliver FLHS”;
- “Liaise with the LHINs on the FLS identification of HSPs and HSPs seeking FLS designation”; to “work with health system partners to provide advice to LHINs on the identification of HSPs for the provision of FLHS”, and on the “readiness of identified HSPs for FLS designation”; and to “work with health system partners to follow the FLS designation process of HSPs seeking FLS designation in a consistent and effective manner and in accordance with MFA criteria”;
- “Engage with the Francophone community to inform the Entity’s advice to the LHIN on key priorities”; and to “provide advice to each LHIN on: methods of engaging the Francophone community; the health needs and priorities of the Francophone community

(...), the health services available to the Francophone community; the identification and designation of HSPs for the provision of FLHS, strategies to improve access to, accessibility of and integration of FLHS in the local health system; and the planning for and integration of health services”;

- “Develop a Joint Action Plan with the LHIN”; “collaborate with the LHIN in the planning, integration and implementation of FLHS strategies (...) in order to improve access to FLHS”; and “provide advice on any other matters that the LHIN considers appropriate”, and on “matters the Entity considers appropriate, with respect to the Francophone community, as it relates and/or impacts (...) the health of Francophone residents”.

To help LHINs and Entities fulfill these roles and responsibilities, and to support HSPs who are either designated under the FLSA or identified for designation meet the criteria set out by the MFA, the Réseau developed a reporting template based on the 34 designation requirements. This template was integrated into the OZi Portal and used as the French Language Services Report (FLS Report) for all LHIN funded designated and identified HSPs in the North East region.

The Réseau also developed a second template specifically for HSPs that are not involved in the designation process (non-identified HSPs). This template, which was used as the FLS Report for all LHIN funded non-identified HSPs in the North East region, also provides these HSPs with an overview of their own FLHS capacity and supports LHIN planning decisions.

### 1.3

## RESPONSIBILITY LEVELS

**R**esponsibility for French language services is exercised through designation, a legal and administrative procedure that follows the rules and procedures prescribed by the FLSA, Ontario Regulation 398/93 and MFA directives. This legislative and regulatory framework enables HSPs to demonstrate that they have the capacity to provide French language services on a permanent basis while meeting the specific needs of the Francophone population they serve (this only applies to the services included in their designation).

The Guide to FLHS indicates that all providers within a given region may contribute to the provision of French language services. All HSPs should therefore be included when determining the FLHS capacity of a region. It is not necessary that all HSPs be able to offer FLHS with the same degree of coverage of the care continuum, but their efforts must be combined to arrive at an efficient provision of FLHS all along the continuum of services and care. To achieve this, the Guide to FLHS assigns different levels of responsibility to HSPs.

For the purpose of this report, it is worth recalling the different levels of responsibility that HSPs may have – according to their designation status – with regards to the provision of FLHS.

Designated HSPs have an obligation to provide all their services in French on a guaranteed and permanent basis, in compliance with the 34 designation requirements. They must also submit a statement of compliance to the MFA on a three-year basis to demonstrate they are still compliant with the designation requirements. It is worth noting that a designated HSP is considered to have full capacity to provide services in French and its presence is analogous to the existence of effective FLHS delivery. However, an HSP can be partially designated. Partial designation occurs when a regulation designating a public service agency limits the designation's application only to specific services provided by the agency, or specifies services that are excluded from the designation.

Identified HSPs have been selected to work toward designation under the FLSA. These HSPs have a responsibility to develop a French Language Services Plan and to provide services in French in accordance with existing FLHS capacity. The progress these HSPs make toward designation tells us about the development of FLHS in the region.

Non-identified HSPs are neither identified for designation nor designated under the FLSA. Although there is no expectation for these HSPs to have FLHS capacity, they still have a responsibility to develop and implement a plan to address the needs of their local Francophone community. This includes the provision of information on health services available in French in their region. To this end, they should adopt certain organizational practices conducive to the provision of French language services. These practices will be further explored in section 2 ("Analytical Framework for Assessing Capacity").

In the current report, the concept of responsibility for FLHS thus corresponds to an HSP's designation status and encompasses the above-mentioned obligations with regards to FLHS. The data collected through the OZi Portal and presented in this report consequently reflects the responsibility level, as this information is indicative of local FLHS capacity.

# 2

# ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR ASSESSING CAPACITY

**T**hree essential components were analyzed to show whether or not there is capacity: HSPs' level of responsibility for the provision of FLHS, organizational practices conducive to the provision of FLHS, and FLHS opportunities. These elements correspond to the grouping of certain indicators with regards to the provision of FLHS.

As specified in the previous section, all HSPs within a given region must contribute to the provision of FLHS, in accordance with their level of responsibility. This obligation gives rise to the concept of FLHS capacity. "Capacity" refers to the ability to provide FLHS and may be examined at different levels: in an HSP, in a local area, by sectors of care, or across a LHIN.

At the LHIN level, capacity is ensured through distribution of responsibility toward FLHS. At the HSP level, capacity is ensured through sufficient HR with an adequate level of French language proficiency. For the purpose of this report, designated HSPs are considered to have full FLHS capacity, while identified HSPs are considered to have a certain capacity that could be developed through designation. Non-identified HSPs are not considered to have the capacity to offer FLHS, though they may have some human resources (HR) with varying levels of French language proficiency.

As for organizational practices, these complementary variables can be used to measure active offer of FLHS. These variables also inform on practices that can be

applied by HSPs with no FLHS capacity to ensure some provision of FLHS.

In accordance with LHIN planning, we have adopted the distribution of HSPs by geographic local areas and sectors of care. The distribution by sectors of care provides an overview of FLHS capacity across the continuum of care. The five care sectors considered are: hospitals, mental health and addiction services (MHA), long-term care (LTC), community support services (CSS) and community health centres (CHC).



## 2.1

## FLHS RESPONSIBILITY

Among the 15 indicators<sup>3</sup> identified as part of the OZi data collection project to assess capacity, the following provide information on responsibility for FLHS:

- Indicator 1: Number of HSPs per responsibility level*
- Indicator 2: FLS Report submission rate*
- Indicator 3: Percentage of LHIN funded continuum of service with an FLHS obligation*
- Indicator 4: Average completion of designation requirements*

Grouped together, the indicators in this section give a detailed overview of local capacity. This information will support LHIN decision making when reviewing the distribution of responsibility across all local areas and sectors.

Indicator 1 informs on responsibility volumes, namely by measuring the number of HSPs that have an obligation to provide FLHS (designated HSPs) or develop their capacity to provide FLHS (identified HSPs), while Indicator 2 informs on the number of HSPs who fulfilled their reporting obligations.

Indicator 3 measures the percentage of services available in French across the continuum of care. This indicator is based on the number of LHIN funded direct patient service functional centres (referred to as direct patient services in the current report) that are either identified or designated. Since LHINs have the obligation to ensure reasonable offer of FLHS across the continuum of care, this indicator informs on the availability of FLHS for all direct patient services funded by the North East LHIN.

Indicator 4 informs on the ongoing development of local capacity through designation. To approach or reach full compliance with the 34 designation requirements, identified HSPs must implement a series of practices that enable them to build a full capacity to provide FLHS on an active and permanent basis; the same can be said for designated HSPs to maintain their full compliance.

<sup>3</sup> A definition and calculation method for each indicator is given in Appendix 3

These indicators should therefore help the LHIN determine if there is enough capacity to ensure provision of FLHS.

## 2.2

## ORGANIZATIONAL PRACTICES CONDUCTIVE TO THE PROVISION OF FLHS

Active offer is a concept widely used in the context of government services, namely when it comes to the provision of FLHS. Active offer can be defined as a regular and permanent provision of FLHS – delivered at a quality that is comparable to that of services provided in English – offered systematically and proactively to Francophone clients across the continuum of care. To ensure an active and structured offer of FLHS, HSPs must implement a series of organizational practices. These practices are also designation requirements. The following indicators inform on the implementation of these practices:

- Indicator 5: Percentage of HSPs who identify Francophone clients*
- Indicator 6: Percentage of HSPs who refer Francophone clients*
- Indicator 7: Percentage of HSPs that capture client satisfaction regarding FLHS*
- Indicator 8: Percentage of HSPs who align Francophone clients to their HR with FLHS capacity*

These indicators give insight on how FLHS are delivered in the field. They inform on patient experience for Francophone clients, namely how their language needs are taken into account by HSPs.

Identifying Francophone clients (Indicator 5) is a sine qua non condition for active offer of FLHS. If clients are not identified as Francophones, there is very little chance that they will be offered FLHS. Likewise, if HSPs have no defined practices that allow for systematic alignment of Francophone clients to available HR proficient in French (Indicator 8), provision of FLHS is left entirely to chance.

The same logic applies to client referrals (Indicator 6). HSPs that do not have the capacity to provide FLHS can still adopt practices conducive to the provision of FLHS, namely by referring Francophone clients to other HSPs that have such capacity. (While not optimal, this practice

can still ensure some access to FLHS). However, some defined organizational practices must be implemented (i.e., identification of Francophone clients; knowledge of local capacity, etc.) to ensure these referrals result in effective provision of FLHS. Indicator 6 thus provides insight on the navigation of Francophone clients across the local health care system.

Finally, measurement of client satisfaction with regards to FLHS (Indicator 7) is indicative of an HSP's commitment to quality assurance and continuous improvement of FLHS and Francophone patient experience.

### 2.3

## FLHS OPPORTUNITIES

The indicators in this section aim to highlight opportunities for further analysis and enhancement of FLHS. To develop these indicators, three information components have been factored in: use of services by Francophone clients, distribution of services delivered by HSPs with no obligation to provide FLHS, and distribution of HR with French language proficiency within designated, identified and non-identified HSPs.

The following indicators focus on opportunities to enhance provision of FLHS across the continuum of care, as well as access to FLHS by Francophone clients:

*Indicator 9: Percentage of non-identified services*

*Indicator 10: Percentage of Francophone clients served by non-identified HSPs*

*Indicator 11: Percentage of Francophone clients served by identified or designated HSPs*

Indicator 9 measures the percentage of LHIN funded direct patient service functional centres with no FLHS obligation (non-identified services). This indicator can be used to outline direct patient services that are not offered in French.

Furthermore, by analyzing whether available FLHS within designated or identified HSPs are currently being used by Francophone clients – compared to services offered by non-identified HSPs –, FLHS opportunities can come into sight. Indicators 10 and 11 demonstrate whether responsibility with regards to FLHS has been distributed to serve the needs of Francophone clients.

### 2.3.1

## Human Resources with French Language Proficiency

HR with proficiency in French are the foundation for the provision of FLHS. Designated and identified HSPs must include a Human Resources Plan (HR Plan), which

contains the French language proficiency levels of staff, in their [designation plan](#)<sup>4</sup>. This requirement ensures that a designated HSP has a sufficient number of health professionals with the necessary language skills to provide FLHS.

An employee's French language proficiency is determined through linguistic evaluation by an accredited firm. According to the Government of Ontario, staff can be classified according to seven levels of oral and written proficiency: "No Proficiency" (not collected in the present report) "Elementary", "Intermediate", "Advanced Minus", "Advanced", "Advanced Plus" and "Superior"<sup>5</sup>.

To comply with designation requirements, identified and designated HSPs must demonstrate – in their HR Plan – that designated positions are held by staff with one of the following proficiency levels: "Advanced Minus", "Advanced", "Advanced Plus" or "Superior". The presence of employees with these proficiency levels is thus indicative of an HSP's actual FLHS capacity.

As for non-identified HSPs, since their staff is not subjected to linguistic evaluation, they have provided self-reported proficiency levels. Staff members were presented with a definition of each of the "Elementary", "Intermediate", "Advanced Minus", "Advanced", "Advanced Plus" and "Superior" linguistic profiles, and asked which of these best reflected their level of French language proficiency.

While staff members with an "Intermediate" proficiency level are not deemed capable of providing FLHS, it is worth noting they represent a potential capacity that could – with appropriate language training – be tapped into by HSPs to develop their FLHS capacity. Staff

<sup>4</sup> Document accessible at this address:

<http://www.forms.ssb.gov.on.ca/mbs/ssb/forms/ssbforms.nsf/>

<sup>5</sup> A description of each linguistic profile is shown at Appendix 2

members with an “Elementary” proficiency level, on the other hand, represent a limited capacity.

The following indicators thus inform on the effective FLHS capacity of identified and designated HSPs. They also provide a broader overview of the available HR with a self-reported FLHS capacity within non-identified HSPs, whether it is an actual one (“Advanced Minus” to “Superior”), a potential one (“Intermediate”), or a limited one (“Elementary”):

*Indicator 12: Percentage of HR able to provide FLHS in non-identified HSPs*

*Indicator 13: Percentage of HR with “Elementary” French language proficiency*

*Indicator 14: Percentage of HR with “Intermediate” French language proficiency*

*Indicator 15: Percentage of HR with “Advanced Minus” to “Superior” French language proficiency*

These indicators thus demonstrate whether HR with actual FLHS capacity are distributed in a given region, local area or sector of care, in accordance with HSPs’ level of responsibility; they shine light on non-identified HSPs that have created favourable conditions to the development of FLHS capacity.

Finally, this analysis further outlines available resources, untapped potential resources, and opportunities for enhancing FLHS capacity through redistribution or augmentation of responsibility across the continuum of care.

# 3 DATA COLLECTION METHOD

The data collected for the purpose of this report was submitted through the OZi Portal by 1428 LHIN funded HSPs across Ontario. The data collection was led by the Réseau and carried out in collaboration with the MOHLTC, the 14 LHINs, and the six Planning Entities.

HSPs were asked to fill out and submit one of two FLS reporting templates<sup>6</sup>:

- The first template was designed for identified and designated HSPs. This reporting template was based on the designation plan. It included data on: Francophone clients, the progress status of all 34 requirements for compliance, HR in designated bilingual positions, and additional questions with regards to organizational practices.
- The second template was designed for non-identified HSPs. This reporting template captured data on Francophone clients, HR with French language proficiency, and additional questions with regards to organizational practices.

The data collected through these reporting templates thus enabled the Réseau to generate the 15 indicators identified as part of the OZi data collection project to assess capacity, which are presented in the current report.

---

<sup>6</sup> The two models are shown in Appendix 4. HSPs Individual reports are available within the Ozi portal

## 3.1

## ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The following roles and responsibilities were assigned through a joint project charter to the different parties involved in the collection project (Réseau, LHINs and Entities) to ensure all the necessary regional supports were in place to allow HSPs to complete and submit their FLS Reports by the established submission date.

The Réseau had the responsibility to manage the data collection project and other major milestones, such as overseeing OZi deployment. It also provided training, technical support for OZi users, data compilation and analysis, and evaluation of user experience.

The LHINs had the responsibility to ensure HSP accountability with regards to their FLS reporting obligations. They also had the following responsibilities:

- Provide up-to-date lists of identified, designated and non-identified HSPs<sup>7</sup>, as well as the names and information of their contact persons.
- Provide other relevant information on HSPs in the region, such as the sector of care and the local area in which they operate.
- Ensure reports are submitted and conduct follow-ups with HSPs.
- Help provide guidance to HSPs on report completion.
- Validate the completion of FLS Reports in collaboration with the Entity, according to a standardized procedure.

The Planning Entities had the responsibility to provide support and guidance to HSPs on completion of FLS Reports. They also had the responsibility to validate the completion of FLS Reports in collaboration with the LHIN.

<sup>7</sup> This list is shown in the regional data calculation sheet which is presented in Appendix 5

## 3.2

## RESOURCES

To support HSPs, LHINs and Entities with the fulfillment of their responsibilities, the Réseau developed a series of resources. These included: bilingual training webinars specific to each OZi reporting template, help features and “cheat sheets” integrated in the OZi reporting templates, and a “Resources” section integrated in the OZi Portal. The latter included video recordings of the training webinars and other supporting documentation, such as guides, one pagers and FAQs.

The Réseau also provided technical support to OZi users during the deployment phase; the technical support service also answered HSPs’ report completion questions when Entities or LHINs were unable to do so.

Finally, the Réseau also provided LHINs and Entities with a procedure for validating the completion of FLS Reports. This procedure was specific to each of the two reporting templates.

## 3.3

## DATA COLLECTION

To ensure the highest rate of data collection and validation, the Réseau established a project management structure carried out in five different phases of deliverables. Among these phases, the deployment phase was the most complex and crucial phase of the data collection. This phase included: communication to all HSPs regarding the OZi Portal, creation of user accounts, deployment of user accounts, technical support, submission and validation of the completion of FLS Reports, and evaluation of the user experience. The deployment phase was executed between February 2019 and July 2019.

## 3.4

## DATA LIMITATIONS

This report is based on data collected for administrative purposes related to health services delivery. As a result, there may be limits related to:

- differences in the definitions of the concepts;
- a level of data quality control;
- a lack of complete data.

To reduce the anticipated effects of these limits, we implemented a training and support procedure for the staff responsible for collecting the data. Evaluation of this procedure has shown that it benefited HSPs and contributed to the gradual improvement of data quality.

The data collected is relevant to the extent that it provides a portrait of FLHS capacity. The data will also serve as a baseline for evaluation of FLHS provision. Furthermore, as some indicators are based on percentages, the sample size must be taken into consideration.

Finally, the following caveats should be noted:

- Indicators 10 and 11 are only available at the LHIN level; therefore, these indicators have been excluded from the analyses and figures pertaining to specific local areas.
- Some LHINs chose not to extend the OZi data collection project to their Indigenous HSPs, while other LHINs invited their Indigenous HSPs to take part in the data collection project on a voluntary basis. For the purpose of this report, Indigenous HSPs who submitted an FLS Report were included in the figures and analyses, while Indigenous HSPs who did not submit an FLS Report were excluded.
- The distribution of HSPs by local areas and sectors of care means that a single HSP may be counted a number of times if it operates in several local areas or sectors. The number of HSPs counted by local areas or sectors may thus be greater than the total number of HSPs actually present in the LHIN.

## 3.5

## EVOLUTION OF RESULTS OVER TIME

In order to properly compare the results between the 2017-18 period and the 2018-19 period, it is necessary to highlight some factors that may have an impact on the results. Note that in order to ensure temporal consistency, the data collection and processing methods remains unmodified for this reporting period.

However, as highlighted in section 3.4 on Data Limitations, the availability and the quality of the data along with the interpretation of the definitions naturally evolve. As HSPs and LHINs gain a more thorough understanding of the measurements, and as practices become more standardized, it is normal to expect that the measurement methods used within the organizations improved. Thus, the accuracy of the reported data is expected to improve over time.

Also, in an effort to integrate user feedback and improve user satisfaction and the quality of the data collected, some adjustments were made to the OZi Portal. The more notable changes were:

- An online tool that allows the LHINs to validate the allocation of care sectors and local areas for each HSP. Previously, this was only done via email.
- The data entry method for human resources in non-identified HSPs was modified to allow a count for job positions filled with HR with French language proficiency. Previously, a unique entry was required for each position filled. This method was already in place for identified and designated HSPs.

The area in which we observe the greatest evolution is in the assignment of care sectors and local areas for each HSP. For the current period, some of these assignments were changed to be more reflective of the reality. As a result, some of the year-over-year changes are not caused by a trend in FLHS, but rather due to the changes in number and categorization of HSPs. The effect on the results is more noticeable when the sampling size is smaller, such as at the local area level, and less so at the provincial level.

# 4 COMMENTS

---

## 4.1

### PRESENTATION OF THE COMPREHENSIVE DATA PACKAGE

**F**our levels of data are featured in the current report, as well as in the attached comprehensive data package: the Dashboard, the Capacity Report, the Regional Data Spreadsheet, and the OZi Portal.

The Dashboard can be read as a high-level standalone document intended for LHIN senior management. Its purpose is to provide direction on local FLHS enhancement and enable performance monitoring. The Dashboard focuses on 10 of the 15 indicators identified as part of the OZi data collection project to assess capacity.

The current Capacity Report is comprised of all 15 indicators, including those presented in the Dashboard. Complementary to the latter, the Capacity Report contains further analyses, namely by presenting the indicators for each local area and sector of care. The Capacity Report has been designed to support LHIN planners in their decision making.

The Regional Data Spreadsheet (available in Appendix 5) was prepared for the North East LHIN. This accompanying document can be cross-referenced with the Dashboard and Capacity Report and allows for LHIN planners and analysts to further extend their analyses through the use of regular spreadsheet functions, such as filters and pivot tables.

Finally, LHINs and Entities can also consult individual FLS Reports collected through the OZi Portal. This option enables planners and analysts to focus on particular HSPs and to view the results for all the questions included in the reporting templates.

---

## 4.2

### PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

**T**o facilitate comprehension of results, figures and analyses have been grouped according to the following themes: “FLHS Responsibility”, “Organizational Practices Conducive to the Provision of

FLHS”, and “FLHS Opportunities”. These results are presented at the LHIN level and by local area. A description of each section and subsection is available below.

---

### 4.2.1

#### LHIN Overview

This subsection presents the distribution of HSPs by responsibility levels, local areas, and sectors of care, as well as the report submission rate.

This subsection also provides information on local demographics, namely the number of individuals living in the LHIN’s catchment area and the size of the local Francophone population.

---

### 4.2.2

#### Overview of the LHIN’s Local Areas

This subsection presents a detailed distribution of HSPs by responsibility levels and sectors of care for each local area. It also provides information on the distribution of Francophones across the LHIN’s different local areas.

---

### 4.2.3

#### FLHS Responsibility

The indicators in this subsection provide information on FLHS responsibility: the number of HSPs per responsibility level, the FLS Report submission rate, the percentage of LHIN funded continuum of service an FLHS obligation, and the average completion of designation requirements.

These indicators inform the LHIN on its responsibility for FLHS. Namely, they inform on the number of HSPs that have a responsibility to provide FLHS, or that must develop their capacity to do so. They also inform on the capacity for designated HSPs to continue to comply with the designation requirements over time, as well as on identified HSPs’ progression with regards to their completion of designation requirements.



These analyses are presented at the LHIN level and by local area. It is worth noting that some local areas do not include HSPs from all care sectors. In such cases, care sectors with no HSPs are not represented in the figures.

---

#### 4.2.4

---

### Organizational Practices Conducive to the Provision of FLHS

The purpose of this subsection is to analyze whether organizational practices necessary to the active offer of FLHS are implemented by HSPs, according to their responsibility level. The following indicators are analyzed: the percentage of HSPs who identify Francophone clients; the percentage of HSPs who refer Francophone clients; the percentage of HSPs that capture client satisfaction regarding FLHS; and the percentage of HSPs who align Francophone clients to their HR with FLHS capacity. These indicators inform on the use of available HR with French language proficiency, as well as on the commitment to improve FLHS.

These analyses are presented at the LHIN level and by local area. It is worth noting that some local areas do not include HSPs from all care sectors. In such cases, care sectors with no HSPs are not represented in the figures.

---

#### 4.2.5

---

### FLHS Opportunities

This subsection aims to highlight opportunities for further analysis and enhancement of FLHS. For this purpose, the following indicators are analyzed: non-identified services; Francophone clients served by non- identified HSPs compared to those served by identified and designated HSPs; and HR able to provide FLHS within non-identified HSPs.

By measuring the number of services with no FLHS obligation, one can outline an absence of direct patient FLHS, prompting further investigation as to whether augmentation or redistribution of responsibility could enhance FLHS capacity.

The number of Francophone clients served by non-identified HSPs informs on opportunities to increase

FLHS provision according to Francophones' use of services.

The number of HR with an actual or potential capacity to provide FLHS within non-identified HSPs is indicative of available resources that can be optimized.

These analyses are presented at the LHIN level by local areas, with the exception of Indicators 10 and 11, which are only available at the LHIN level.

It is worth noting that some local areas do not include HSPs from all care sectors. In such cases, care sectors with no HSPs are not represented in the figures.

# 5

# RESULTS

## 5.1

## FLHS CAPACITY IN THE LHIN

The results were analyzed by examining indicators belonging to each of the three essential components of FLHS capacity described in the analytical framework, with HSPs being distributed by local area and care sector.

## 5.1.1

### LHIN Overview


The North East LHIN is responsible for planning, integrating and funding health services for 541,705 people living in its catchment area. There are 121,740 Francophones in this region. These Francophones make up 22.5% of the total population distributed across the LHIN's local areas (Statistics Canada, 2016 Census).

The LHIN has 117 HSPs, distributed across five local areas and five care sectors (Table 1).


Table 1. Distribution of HSPs by local areas and sectors - North East LHIN

Responsibility level	Number of HSPs										
	Local Areas					Sectors					LHIN
	Algoma	Cochrane	James and Hudson Bay Coasts	Nipissing-Temiskaming	Sudbury-Manitoulin-Parry Sound	Hosp	MHA	LTC	CSS	CHC	n (%)
Designated	1	20	0	11	10	11	20	7	12	5	42 (36%)
Identified	15	8	1	15	15	11	14	13	18	0	50 (43%)
Non-Identified	4	1	0	4	16	2	1	16	8	0	25 (21%)
All	20	29	1	30	41	24	35	36	38	5	117 (100%)

**Fig. 1.1. Number of HSPs by sectors and responsibility levels - North East LHIN**



**Fig. 1.2. Percentage of LHIN funded continuum of service with an FLHS obligation by sectors and responsibility levels - North East LHIN**



5.1.2

**FLHS Responsibility – North East LHIN**

In this LHIN, there were designated HSPs in all five sectors. There were identified HSPs in four sectors (hospitals, MHA, LTC and CSS) (Fig. 1.1). Identified and designated HSPs made up the majority of HSPs in the region. There were also non-identified HSPs in four sectors (hospitals, MHA, LTC and CSS), with a heavier concentration in the LTC sector (Fig. 1.1).

With respect to the service continuum, between 44% and 100% of direct patient services were designated in all five sectors. In the four sectors with identified HSPs, between 56% and 74% of direct patient services were identified (Fig. 1.2). The lowest rate was in the LTC sector.

All HSPs submitted their FLS Report (Table 2). The response rate for FLS Reports in the North East LHIN was calculated on a total of 117 HSPs.

*Table 2. FLS Report submission rate by sectors and responsibility levels - North East LHIN*

Responsibility level	HSPs Percentage				
	Hosp	MHA	LTC	CSS	CHC
Designated	100% (11)	100% (20)	100% (7)	100% (12)	100% (5)
Identified	100% (11)	100% (14)	100% (13)	100% (18)	-
Non-Identified	100% (2)	100% (1)	100% (16)	100% (8)	-

The average designation requirement completion rate for designated HSPs was between 73% and 90% in all five sectors. The average designation requirement completion rate for identified HSPs ranged from 21% to 36% in the four sectors with identified HSPs (Fig. 1.3). The lowest rate was in the LTC sector.





Fig. 1.4. Percentage of HSPs who identify Francophone clients by sectors and responsibility levels - North East LHIN




5.1.3


Organizational Practices Conducive to the Provision of FLHS – North East LHIN

Two of the four practices considered for this analysis – identification of Francophone clients and capture of client satisfaction with FLHS – were implemented by the majority of HSPs in all five care sectors (Fig. 1.4 and 1.6). Alignment of Francophone clients with French-speaking staff was also reported in all five sectors, but less often (Fig. 1.7). As for referral of Francophone clients to other HSPs, this was practised in four sectors by a few HSPs, including some designated HSPs (Fig. 1.5).


Fig. 1.5. Percentage of HSPs who refer Francophone clients by sectors and responsibility levels - North East LHIN



**Fig. 1.6. Percentage of HSPs that capture client satisfaction regarding FLHS by sectors and responsibility levels - North East LHIN**



**Fig. 1.7. Percentage of HSPs who align Francophone clients to their HR with FLHS capacity by sectors and responsibility levels - North East LHIN**




5.1.4

**FLHS Opportunities – North East LHIN**


A proportion of 44% of direct patient services in the LTC sector were non-identified. In the CSS sector, this proportion was 21% (Fig. 1.8). This significant proportion of services with no FLHS obligation corresponds to an opportunity for FLHS development in these sectors. The absence of non-identified services in the CHC and MHA sectors, along with the low proportion of non-identified services in the hospital sector, is evidence of FLHS provision in these sectors.

The presence of HR with varying levels of French language proficiency was reported in all sectors (Fig. 1.9 to 1.12). Of these HR, the highest proportion of those with the capacity to offer FLHS worked in designated HSPs in three sectors (hospitals, MHA and CHC). This proportion ranged from 82% to 100% (Fig. 1.9). In the LTC sector, the highest proportion of those with the capacity to offer FLHS worked in identified HSPs. This proportion was 26%. In the CSS sector, the highest proportion of those capable of offering FLHS also worked in identified HSPs; this proportion was 57%.


**Fig. 1.8. Percentage of non-identified services by sectors - North East LHIN**



**Fig. 1.9. Percentage of HR with 'Advanced Minus' to 'Superior' French language proficiency among all HR who reported some level of FLS proficiency, distributed by sectors and by responsibility levels - North East LHIN**



**Fig. 1.10. Percentage of HR with 'Elementary' French language proficiency in non-identified HSPs, by sectors - North East LHIN**







Among non-identified HSPs, French-speaking HR were reported in three of the four sectors with non-identified HSPs (hospitals, LTC and CSS) (Fig. 1.10 to 1.12). Of these HR, between 36% and 50% had the capacity to offer FLHS (Fig. 1.12). The highest proportion was in the hospital sector. The only non-identified HSP in the MHA sector did not report having any French-speaking HR.

In the CHC sector, all Francophone clients were served by designated HSPs, as were the great majority of Francophone clients in three sectors (hospitals, MHA and CSS) (Fig. 1.13). In the LTC sector, Francophone clients were served about equally by identified HSPs, designated HSPs and non-identified HSPs.


**Fig. 1.11. Percentage of HR with 'Intermediate' French language proficiency in non-identified HSPs, by sectors - North East LHIN**



**Fig. 1.12. Percentage of HR with 'Advanced Minus' to 'Superior' French language proficiency in non-identified HSPs, by sectors - North East LHIN**



**Fig. 1.13. Percentage of Francophone clients served by HSPs, by sectors and responsibility levels - North East LHIN**



## 5.2

## FLHS CAPACITY PER LOCAL AREA

## 5.2.1

### Overview of North East LHIN's Local Areas

This LHIN is divided into five local areas, the names of which are shown in Table 3. This table also shows HSPs' FLHS responsibility level along with their distribution by sector

Table 3. Distribution of HSPs by local areas and sectors - North East LHIN

Local Areas	Responsibility level	Number of HSPs				
		Hosp	MHA	LTC	CSS	CHC
Algoma	Designated	1	0	0	0	0
	Identified	3	8	4	4	0
	Non-Identified	0	0	3	2	0
Cochrane	Designated	6	12	3	3	1
	Identified	2	1	1	4	0
	Non-Identified	0	0	1	0	0
James and Hudson Bay Coasts	Designated	0	0	0	0	0
	Identified	0	0	0	1	0
	Non-Identified	0	0	0	0	0
Nipissing-Temiskaming	Designated	3	5	3	4	2
	Identified	3	3	5	5	0
	Non-Identified	0	0	4	1	0
Sudbury-Manitoulin-Parry Sound	Designated	1	3	1	5	2
	Identified	3	2	3	8	0
	Non-Identified	2	1	8	5	0

## 5.2.2

## Algoma

According to data from the 2016 Census of Canada, the total population of this local area was 98,790, including 5,555 Francophones. Francophones made up 5.6% of the population.

## A. FLHS Responsibility – Algoma

In this local area, the majority of HSPs were identified. They were found in four sectors (hospitals, MHA, LTC and CSS). There was only one designated HSP, in the hospital sector. Non-identified HSPs were present in two sectors (LTC and CSS). There were no HSPs in the CHC sector (Fig. 2.1).

With respect to the service continuum, between 57% and 100% of direct patient services were identified in the four sectors. Only 1% of direct patient services in the hospital sector were designated (Fig. 2.2).


All HSPs submitted their FLS Report (Table 4).

The designation requirement completion rate for identified HSPs was between 18% and 43% in the four sectors. The only designated HSP in the hospital sector reported a rate of 35% (Fig. 2.3).

Table 4. FLS Report submission rate by sectors and responsibility levels - Algoma

Responsibility level	HSPs Percentage				
	Hosp	MHA	LTC	CSS	CHC
Designated	100% (1)	-	-	-	-
Identified	100% (3)	100% (8)	100% (4)	100% (4)	-
Non-Identified	-	-	100% (3)	100% (2)	-

**Fig. 2.1. Number of HSPs by sectors and responsibility levels - Algoma**



**Fig. 2.2. Percentage of LHIN funded continuum of service with an FLHS obligation by sectors and responsibility levels - Algoma**






Fig. 2.3. Average completion of designation requirements by sectors and responsibility levels - Algoma




## B. Organizational Practices Conducive to the Provision of FLHS – Algoma

Two of the four practices considered – identification of Francophone clients and capture of client satisfaction with FLHS – were implemented by the majority of HSPs in all four care sectors (Fig. 2.4 and 2.6). Alignment of Francophone clients with French-speaking staff was also practised in all four sectors, but less often (Fig. 2.7). Referral of Francophone clients to other HSPs was only rarely practised by a few HSPs in a single sector (Fig. 2.5).


Fig. 2.4. Percentage of HSPs who identify Francophone clients by sectors and responsibility levels - Algoma




**Fig. 2.5. Percentage of HSPs who refer Francophone clients by sectors and responsibility levels - Algoma**




**Fig. 2.6. Percentage of HSPs that capture client satisfaction regarding FLHS by sectors and responsibility levels - Algoma**




**Fig. 2.7. Percentage of HSPs who align Francophone clients to their HR with FLHS capacity by sectors and responsibility levels - Algoma**



**Fig. 2.8. Percentage of non-identified services by sectors - Algoma**



**Fig. 2.9. Percentage of HR with 'Advanced Minus' to 'Superior' French language proficiency among all HR who reported some level of FLHS proficiency, distributed by sectors and by responsibility levels - Algoma**




## C FLHS Opportunities - Algoma


Ove 40% of direct patient services in the LTC sector were non-identified (Fig. 2.8). This significant proportion of services with no FLHS obligation corresponds to an opportunity for FLHS development in this sector. The absence of non-identified services in the hospital and MHA sectors, along with the low proportion of non-identified services in the CSS sector, is evidence of FLHS provision in these sectors.

The presence of HR with varying levels of French language proficiency was reported in all four sectors (hospitals, MHA, LTC and CSS) (Fig. 2.9 to 2.12).


**Fig. 2.10. Percentage of HR with 'Elementary' French language proficiency in non-identified HSPs, by sectors - Algoma**



**Fig. 2.11. Percentage of HR with 'Intermediate' French language proficiency in non-identified HSPs, by sectors - Algoma**



**Fig. 2.12. Percentage of HR with 'Advanced Minus' to 'Superior' French language proficiency in non-identified HSPs, by sectors - Algoma**



Of these HR, the highest proportion of those with the capacity to offer FLHS worked in identified HSPs. This proportion ranged from 76% to 100% in all four sectors (Fig. 2.9). With respect to the only designated hospital, it had only 24% of the HR with the capacity to offer FLHS in the hospital sector.

French-speaking HR were also reported by non-identified HSPs in two sectors (LTC and CSS) (Fig. 2.10 to 2.12). Of these HR, up to 83% of those reported had the capacity to offer FLHS (Fig. 2.12).



## 5.2.3

## Cochrane

According to data from the 2016 Census of Canada, the total population of this local area was 77,090, including 36,445 Francophones. Francophones made up 47.3% of the population.

## A. FLHS Responsibility – Cochrane

In this local area, the majority of HSPs were designated. They were present in all sectors (Fig. 3.1). There were identified HSPs in four sectors (hospitals, MHA, LTC and CSS). There was only one non-identified HSP, in the LTC sector.

With respect to the service continuum, between 62% and 100% of direct patient services were designated in all sectors. The proportion of identified direct patient services ranged from 11% to 80% in four sectors (hospitals, MHA, LTC and CSS) (Fig. 3.2).


All HSPs submitted their FLS Report (Table 5).

The designation requirement completion rate for designated HSPs ranged from 77% to 97% in all five sectors. For identified HSPs, the rate was between 3% and 88% in three of the four sectors with identified HSPs (Fig. 3.3). The identified HSPs in the CSS sector did not report their completion rate.


Table 5. FLS Report submission rate by sectors and responsibility levels - Cochrane

Responsibility level	HSPs Percentage				
	Hosp	MHA	LTC	CSS	CHC
Designated	100% (6)	100% (12)	100% (3)	100% (3)	100% (1)
Identified	100% (2)	100% (1)	100% (1)	100% (4)	-
Non-Identified	-	-	100% (1)	-	-


**Fig. 3.1. Number of HSPs by sectors and responsibility levels - Cochrane**



**Fig. 3.2. Percentage of LHIN funded continuum of service with an FLHS obligation by sectors and responsibility levels - Cochrane**




**Fig. 3.3. Average completion of designation requirements by sectors and responsibility levels - Cochrane**




## B. Organizational Practices Conducive to the Provision of FLHS - *Cochrane*

Identification of Francophone clients was implemented by the great majority of HSPs in all care sectors (Fig. 3.4). Capture of client satisfaction with FLHS and client alignment with French-speaking staff were implemented by the great majority of HSPs in four sectors (Fig. 3.6 and 3.7). Referral of Francophone clients to other HSPs was reported by only a single HSP in the hospital sector (Fig. 3.5). The designated HSP in the CHC reported only a single practice.


**Fig. 3.4. Percentage of HSPs who identify Francophone clients by sectors and responsibility levels - Cochrane**




**Fig. 3.5. Percentage of HSPs who refer Francophone clients by sectors and responsibility levels - Cochrane**




**Fig. 3.6. Percentage of HSPs that capture client satisfaction regarding FLHS by sectors and responsibility levels - Cochrane**




**Fig. 3.7. Percentage of HSPs who align Francophone clients to their HR with FLHS capacity by sectors and responsibility levels - Cochrane**



**Fig. 3.8. Percentage of non-identified services by sectors - Cochrane**



**Fig. 3.9. Percentage of HR with 'Advanced Minus' to 'Superior' French language proficiency among all HR who reported some level of FLS proficiency, distributed by sectors and by responsibility levels - Cochrane**




## C FLHS Opportunities - Cochrane

The absence of non-identified direct patient services in all five sectors is evidence of FLHS provision in this local area (Fig. 3.8).


The presence of HR with varying levels of French language proficiency was reported in all sectors (Fig. 3.9 to 3.12). Of these HR, the highest proportion of those with the capacity to offer FLHS worked in designated HSPs. This proportion was between 59% and 100% in all sectors (Fig. 3.9). For identified HSPs, it did not exceed 29% (Fig. 3.9)

With respect to the only non-identified HSP in the local area, 75% of its HR who reported French language proficiency had the capacity to offer FLHS (Fig. 3.10 to 3.12).


**Fig. 3.10. Percentage of HR with 'Elementary' French language proficiency in non-identified HSPs, by sectors - Cochrane**



**Fig. 3.11. Percentage of HR with 'Intermediate' French language proficiency in non-identified HSPs, by sectors - Cochrane**



**Fig. 3.12. Percentage of HR with 'Advanced Minus' to 'Superior' French language proficiency in non-identified HSPs, by sectors - Cochrane**



## 5.2.4

## James and Hudson Bay Coasts

According to data from the 2016 Census of Canada, the total population of this local area was 7,735, including 35 Francophones. Francophones made up 0.5% of the population.

### A. FLHS Responsibility - James and Hudson Bay Coasts

In this local area, there was only a single HSP. It was identified and was found in the CSS sector (Fig. 4.1). There were no HSPs in the other four sectors (hospitals, MHA, LTC and CHC).

With respect to the service continuum, 100% of direct patient services were identified in the only HSP in the local area (Fig. 4.2). There were thus no identified or designated services in the other four sectors.


This HSP submitted its FLS Report (Table 6).

This HSP did not report its designation requirement completion rate (Fig. 4.3).


Table 6. FLS Report submission rate by sectors and responsibility levels - James and Hudson Bay Coasts

Responsibility level	HSPs Percentage				
	Hosp	MHA	LTC	CSS	CHC
Designated	-	-	-	-	-
Identified	-	-	-	100% (1)	-
Non-Identified	-	-	-	-	-

**Fig. 4.1. Number of HSPs by sectors and responsibility levels - James and Hudson Bay Coasts**




**Fig. 4.2. Percentage of LHIN funded continuum of service with an FLHS obligation by sectors and responsibility levels - James and Hudson Bay Coasts**






**Fig. 4.3. Average completion of designation requirements by sectors and responsibility levels - James and Hudson Bay Coasts**




## **B.** Organizational Practices Conducive to the Provision of FLHS – *James and Hudson Bay Coasts*

Three of the four practices considered in this analysis – identification of Francophone clients, capture of client satisfaction with FLHS and client alignment with French-speaking staff – were implemented by the only HSP in this local area (Fig. 4.4, 4.6 and 4.7). Referral of Francophone clients to other HSPs was not reported (Fig. 4.5).


**Fig. 4.4. Percentage of HSPs who identify Francophone clients by sectors and responsibility levels - James and Hudson Bay Coasts**




**Fig. 4.5. Percentage of HSPs who refer Francophone clients by sectors and responsibility levels - James and Hudson Bay Coasts**



**Fig. 4.6. Percentage of HSPs that capture client satisfaction regarding FLHS by sectors and responsibility levels - James and Hudson Bay Coasts**



**Fig. 4.7. Percentage of HSPs who align Francophone clients to their HR with FLHS capacity by sectors and responsibility levels - James and Hudson Bay Coasts**




## C FLHS Opportunities – James and Hudson Bay Coasts


The absence of non-identified direct patient services at the HSP in the CSS sector is evidence of FLHS provision in this sector (Fig. 4.8).

All HR reported by the only HSP in the local area were capable of offering FLHS (Fig. 4.9).


**Fig. 4.8. Percentage of non-identified services by sectors - James and Hudson Bay Coasts**




**Fig. 4.9. Percentage of HR with 'Advanced Minus' to 'Superior' French language proficiency among all HR who reported some level of FLS proficiency, distributed by sectors and by responsibility levels - James and Hudson Bay Coasts**




**Fig. 4.10. Percentage of HR with 'Elementary' French language proficiency in non-identified HSPs, by sectors - James and Hudson Bay Coasts**



**Fig. 4.11. Percentage of HR with 'Intermediate' French language proficiency in non-identified HSPs, by sectors - James and Hudson Bay Coasts**



**Fig. 4.12. Percentage of HR with 'Advanced Minus' to 'Superior' French language proficiency in non-identified HSPs, by sectors - James and Hudson Bay Coasts**



## 5.2.5

## Nipissing-Temiskaming

According to data from the 2016 Census of Canada, the total population of this local area was 136,595, including 28,590 Francophones. Francophones made up 20.9% of the population.

### A. FLHS Responsibility – Nipissing-Temiskaming

In this local area, designated HSPs were present in all sectors. There were identified HSPs in four sectors (hospitals, MHA, LTC and CSS). There were also some non-identified HSPs, in the LTC and CSS sectors (Fig. 5.1).

With respect to the service continuum, between 12% and 100% of direct patient services were designated in all sectors. The proportion of identified services ranged from 56% to 100% in the four sectors with identified HSPs (Fig. 5.2).


All HSPs submitted their FLS Report (Table 7).

The average designation requirement completion rate for designated HSPs ranged from 82% to 96% in all five sectors. For identified HSPs, this rate ranged from 28% to 66% in the four sectors with identified HSPs (Fig. 5.3).

Table 7. FLS Report submission rate by sectors and responsibility levels - Nipissing-Temiskaming

Responsibility level	HSPs Percentage				
	Hosp	MHA	LTC	CSS	CHC
Designated	100% (3)	100% (5)	100% (3)	100% (4)	100% (2)
Identified	100% (3)	100% (3)	100% (5)	100% (5)	-
Non-Identified	-	-	100% (4)	100% (1)	-

**Fig. 5.1. Number of HSPs by sectors and responsibility levels - Nipissing-Temiskaming**



**Fig. 5.2. Percentage of LHIN funded continuum of service with an FLHS obligation by sectors and responsibility levels - Nipissing-Temiskaming**






Fig. 5.3. Average completion of designation requirements by sectors and responsibility levels - Nipissing-Temiskaming




## B. Organizational Practices Conducive to the Provision of FLHS – Nipissing-Temiskaming

Identification of Francophone clients and capture of client satisfaction with FLHS were the most common practices. They were adopted in all five sectors by the majority of HSPs (Fig. 5.4 and 5.6). Alignment of Francophone clients with French-speaking staff was also implemented in all five sectors, but less often (Fig. 5.7). Client referral to other HSPs was reported in only one sector by a single HSP (Fig. 5.5).


Fig. 5.4. Percentage of HSPs who identify Francophone clients by sectors and responsibility levels - Nipissing-Temiskaming



**Fig. 5.5. Percentage of HSPs who refer Francophone clients by sectors and responsibility levels - Nipissing-Temiskaming**




**Fig. 5.6. Percentage of HSPs that capture client satisfaction regarding FLHS by sectors and responsibility levels - Nipissing-Temiskaming**





**Fig. 5.7. Percentage of HSPs who align Francophone clients to their HR with FLHS capacity by sectors and responsibility levels - Nipissing-Temiskaming**




## C FLHS Opportunities – Nipissing-Temiskaming


The absence of non-identified direct patient services in four sectors (hospitals, CHC, CSS, MHA) is evidence of FLHS provision in these sectors (Fig. 5.8). In the LTC sector, 33% of direct patient services were non-identified. This significant proportion of services with no FLHS obligation corresponds to an opportunity to develop FLHS in this sector.

The presence of HR with varying levels of French language proficiency was reported in all sectors (Fig. 5.9 to 5.12). Of these HR, the highest proportion of those with the capacity to offer FLHS worked in designated HSPs in three sectors (hospitals, MHA and CHC). This proportion ranged from 72% to 100% (Fig. 5.9).


**Fig. 5.8. Percentage of non-identified services by sectors - Nipissing-Temiskaming**




**Fig. 5.9. Percentage of HR with 'Advanced Minus' to 'Superior' French language proficiency among all HR who reported some level of FLS proficiency, distributed by sectors and by responsibility levels - Nipissing-Temiskaming**




**Fig. 5.10. Percentage of HR with 'Elementary' French language proficiency in non-identified HSPs, by sectors - Nipissing-Temiskaming**



**Fig. 5.11. Percentage of HR with 'Intermediate' French language proficiency in non-identified HSPs, by sectors - Nipissing-Temiskaming**



**Fig. 5.12. Percentage of HR with 'Advanced Minus' to 'Superior' French language proficiency in non-identified HSPs, by sectors - Nipissing-Temiskaming**



In the LTC and CSS sectors, the highest proportion of those with the capacity to offer FLHS worked in identified HSPs. The proportions were 63% and 64%, respectively.

Among non-identified HSPs, French-speaking HR were reported in the two sectors with non-identified HSPs (Fig. 5.10 to 5.12). Of these HR, 24% of those reported in the LTC sector had the capacity to offer FLHS (Fig. 5.12). This proportion was zero in the CSS sector.

## 5.2.6

## Sudbury-Manitoulin-Parry Sound

According to data from the 2016 Census of Canada, the total population of this local area was 221,500, including 51,110 Francophones. Francophones made up 23.1% of the population.

### A. FLHS Responsibility – Sudbury-Manitoulin-Parry Sound

Almost all of the HSPs of this local In this local area, designated HSPs were present in all five sectors. There were also identified HSPs. They were found in four sectors (hospitals, MHA, LTC and CSS). As for non-identified HSPs, they were also found in four sectors (hospitals, MHA, LTC and CSS) (Fig. 6.1).

With respect to the service continuum, between 41% and 100% of direct patient services were designated in all five care sectors. The proportion of identified direct patient services ranged from 20% to 58% in four sectors (hospitals, MHA, LTC and CSS) (Fig.6.2).


All HSPs submitted their FLS Report (Table 8).

The average designation requirement completion rate for designated HSPs ranged from 6% to 84% in all sectors. The average designation requirement completion rate for identified HSPs was between 1% and 11% in the four sectors with identified HSPs (Fig. 6.3). In all cases, the lowest completion rate was in the LTC sector.


Table 8. FLS Report submission rate by sectors and responsibility levels - Sudbury-Manitoulin-Parry Sound

Responsibility level	HSPs Percentage				
	Hosp	MHA	LTC	CSS	CHC
Designated	100% (1)	100% (3)	100% (1)	100% (5)	100% (2)
Identified	100% (3)	100% (2)	100% (3)	100% (8)	-
Non-Identified	100% (2)	100% (1)	100% (8)	100% (5)	-


**Fig. 6.1. Number of HSPs by sectors and responsibility levels - Sudbury-Manitoulin-Parry Sound**



**Fig. 6.2. Percentage of LHIN funded continuum of service with an FLHS obligation by sectors and responsibility levels - Sudbury-Manitoulin-Parry Sound**




**Fig. 6.3. Average completion of designation requirements by sectors and responsibility levels - Sudbury-Manitoulin-Parry Sound**




## B. Organizational Practices Conducive to the Provision of FLHS – *Sudbury-Manitoulin-Parry Sound*

Identification of Francophone clients and capture of client satisfaction with FLHS were the most common practices. They were implemented in all five sectors (Fig. 6.4 and 6.6). Alignment of Francophone clients with French-speaking staff was also practised in all five sectors, but less often (Fig. 6.7). Client referral to other HSPs was reported in only three sectors by a few HSPs (Fig. 6.5).


**Fig. 6.4. Percentage of HSPs who identify Francophone clients by sectors and responsibility levels - Sudbury-Manitoulin-Parry Sound**




**Fig. 6.5. Percentage of HSPs who refer Francophone clients by sectors and responsibility levels - Sudbury-Manitoulin-Parry Sound**



**Fig. 6.6. Percentage of HSPs that capture client satisfaction regarding FLHS by sectors and responsibility levels - Sudbury-Manitoulin-Parry Sound**



**Fig. 6.7. Percentage of HSPs who align Francophone clients to their HR with FLHS capacity by sectors and responsibility levels - Sudbury-Manitoulin-Parry Sound**




## C FLHS Opportunities – Sudbury-Manitoulin-Parry Sound


In the LTC sector, 42% of direct patient services were non-identified. This proportion was 27% in the CSS sector. This significant proportion of services with no FLHS obligation corresponds to an opportunity for FLHS development in these two sectors. The absence of non-identified services in the MHA and CHC sectors, along with the low proportion of non-identified services in the hospital sector, are evidence of FLHS provision in these sectors (Fig. 6.8).

The presence of HR with varying levels of French language proficiency was reported in all sectors (Fig. 6.9 to 6.12). Of these HR, the highest proportion of those with the capacity to offer FLHS worked in designated HSPs in three sectors (hospitals, MHA and CHC).


**Fig. 6.8. Percentage of non-identified services by sectors - Sudbury-Manitoulin-Parry Sound**




**Fig. 6.9. Percentage of HR with 'Advanced Minus' to 'Superior' French language proficiency among all HR who reported some level of FLS proficiency, distributed by sectors and by responsibility levels - Sudbury-Manitoulin-Parry Sound**




**Fig. 6.10. Percentage of HR with 'Elementary' French language proficiency in non-identified HSPs, by sectors - Sudbury-Manitoulin-Parry Sound**



**Fig. 6.11. Percentage of HR with 'Intermediate' French language proficiency in non-identified HSPs, by sectors - Sudbury-Manitoulin-Parry Sound**



**Fig. 6.12. Percentage of HR with 'Advanced Minus' to 'Superior' French language proficiency in non-identified HSPs, by sectors - Sudbury-Manitoulin-Parry Sound**



This proportion ranged from 86% to 100% (Fig. 6.9). In the CSS sector, the highest proportion of those with the capacity to offer FLHS worked in identified HSPs. This proportion was 59%.

Among non-identified HSPs, French-speaking HR were reported in three of the four sectors with non-identified HSPs (hospitals, LTC and CSS) (Fig. 6.10 to 6.12). Of these HR, between 36% and 50% had the capacity to offer FLHS (Fig. 6.12). The highest proportion was in the hospital sector. No French-speaking HR were reported in the MHA sector.



# 6

# APPENDICES

1. Acronyms, Abbreviations and Glossary of Terms
2. Linguistic Profiles
3. Definition of Indicators
4. Reporting Templates
5. Regional Data Spreadsheet

## APPENDIX 1

## ACRONYMS, ABBREVIATIONS AND GLOSSARY OF TERMS

## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

<b>CHC:</b>	Community health centre
<b>CSS:</b>	Community support services
<b>Entities:</b>	French Language Health Planning Entities
<b>FLHS:</b>	French language health services
<b>FLS:</b>	French language services
<b>FLSA:</b>	French Language Services Act
<b>HR:</b>	Human resources
<b>HSP:</b>	Health service provider
<b>LHIN:</b>	Local health integration network
<b>LTC:</b>	Long-term care
<b>MFA:</b>	Ministry of Francophone Affairs
<b>MHA:</b>	Mental health and addiction services
<b>MOHLTC:</b>	Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care

## GLOSSARY OF TERMS

**Active offer:** Active offer can be defined as a regular and permanent provision of French language health services – delivered at a quality that is comparable to that of services provided in English – offered systematically and proactively to Francophone clients across the continuum of care. To ensure an active offer of French language health services, health service providers must implement a series of organizational practices. These practices are also designation requirements.

**Actual capacity:** According to designation requirements, staff members with one of the following French language proficiency levels are considered able to provide services in French and can hold designated bilingual positions: “Advanced Minus”, “Advanced”, “Advanced Plus” or “Superior”. The presence of human resources with these proficiency levels thus corresponds to a health service provider’s actual capacity to provide FLHS.

**Continuum of care:** The continuum of care is composed of different components of the health care system that are structured to ensure that a patient or client can be cared for without any interruption or rupture of services. In Ontario, the continuum of care is comprised of the following sectors of care: hospitals,

mental health and addiction services, long-term care, community health centres, and community support services.

**Designated HSP:** Designated health service providers have an obligation, under the French Language Services Act, to provide services in French on a guaranteed and permanent basis, in compliance with the 34 designation requirements. (This obligation only applies to the services for which the HSP is designated). Designated HSPs must also submit a statement of compliance to the Ministry of Francophone Affairs on a three-year basis to demonstrate they are still compliant with the designation requirements. For the purpose of this report, designated HSPs are considered to have a full capacity to provide French language health services. However, an HSP can be partially designated. Partial designation occurs when a regulation designating a public service agency limits the designation to apply only to specific services provided by the agency, or specifies services that are excluded from the designation.

**Designation:** A legal and administrative procedure that follows the rules and procedures prescribed by the French Language Services Act, Ontario Regulation 398/93 and Ministry of Francophone Affairs directives. This legislative and regulatory framework enables health service providers to demonstrate that they have the

capacity to provide French language services on a permanent basis while meeting the specific needs of the Francophone population they serve.

**Designation plan:** To become designated, health service providers must submit a designation plan, which demonstrates how they comply with the 34 designation requirements. The designation plan contains the Human Resources Plan.

**Designation requirements:** To become designated, health service providers must comply with 34 requirements established by the Ministry of Francophone Affairs. These requirements are based on the following five criteria: The agency must offer quality services in French on a permanent basis, which is ensured by employees with the requisite French language skills; access to services must be guaranteed and follow the principle of an active offer; provisions for effective representation of Francophones on the board of directors and its committees are included in the administrative by-laws and must reflect the proportion of the Francophone population within the community served; the senior management team must have an effective representation of Francophones; the board of directors and the senior management team must be accountable with respect to the quality of French language services.

**FLHS capacity:** Capacity can be defined as the ability to provide FLHS in order to ensure that LHIN funded services meet the needs of the local Francophone population. At the LHIN level, capacity is ensured through distribution of responsibility toward FLHS. At the HSP level, capacity is ensured through sufficient HR with an adequate level of French language proficiency (“Advanced Minus”, “Advanced”, “Advanced Plus” and “Superior”). For the purpose of this report, designated HSPs are considered to have full FLHS capacity, while identified HSPs are considered to have a certain capacity that could be developed through designation. Nonidentified HSPs are not considered to have the capacity to offer FLHS, though they may have some HR with varying levels of proficiency. HR with the “Advanced Minus”, “Advanced”, “Advanced Plus” and “Superior” levels are considered to have effective capacity to provide FLHS, while HR with the “Intermediate” proficiency level are considered to have potential capacity that could be developed through language

training. HR with the “Elementary” proficiency level are considered to have a limited capacity to provide FLHS.

**FLHS responsibility:** In the current report, the concept of responsibility for FLHS corresponds to an HSP’s designation status. Responsibility encompasses the FLHS obligations assigned to designated HSPs, identified HSPs and non-identified HSPs, as set out in the Guide to FLHS.

**FLS Report:** For the purpose of this report, LHIN funded HSPs had to submit a French Language Services Report through the OZi Portal. Two different reporting templates were used: one for designated and identified HSPs, which was based on the 34 designation requirements (and included the HR Plan), and one for non-identified HSPs.

**French language proficiency:** An employee’s French language proficiency is determined through linguistic evaluation by an accredited firm. According to the Government of Ontario, staff can be classified according to seven levels of oral and written proficiency (or linguistic profiles): “No Proficiency” (not collected in the present report) “Elementary”, “Intermediate”, “Advanced Minus”, “Advanced”, “Advanced Plus” and “Superior”. Employees with the following proficiency levels are considered capable of providing FLHS: “Advanced Minus”, “Advanced”, “Advanced Plus” and “Superior”. A detailed description of each linguistic profile is available in Appendix 2.

**French Language Services Act:** Ontario Regulation 13.60 398/93. The French Language Services Act was first passed by Ontario Legislative Assembly in 1986 and came into effect in 1989. The legislative and regulatory framework for designation are comprised in the French Language Services Act.

**Guide to FLHS:** A document published by the Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care and released in November 2017. The Guide to FLHS details the requirements and obligations of LHINs, health service providers and Planning Entities with regards to French language health services.

**Human Resources Plan:** The Human Resources Plan (HR Plan) is submitted as part of the designation plan. The purpose of this document is to demonstrate that designated positions are held by staff members who possess the necessary French language proficiency levels

(“Advanced Minus”, “Advanced”, “Advanced Plus” or “Superior”) to provide FLHS.

**Identified HSP:** Identified HSPs have been selected to work toward designation under the FLSA. Identified HSPs have a responsibility to develop a French Language Services Plan and to provide services in French in accordance with existing FLHS capacity. For the purpose of this report, identified HSPs are considered to have a certain capacity to provide FLHS; this capacity is to be enhanced through the designation process.

**Inclusive Definition of Francophone (IDF):** A definition used by the Government of Ontario to identify the Francophone population. According to this definition, Francophones are individuals whose mother tongue is French, plus those whose mother tongue is neither French nor English but have a particular knowledge of French as an Official Language and use French at home.

**Limited capacity:** For the purpose of this report, staff member with an “Elementary” French language proficiency level are considered to have a limited capacity to provide FLHS. While this capacity could eventually be enhanced through French language training, these human resources do not, at the moment, contribute significantly to an HSP’s FLHS capacity.

**Non-identified HSP:** Non-identified health service providers are neither identified for designation nor designated under the French Language Services Act. While they have no obligation to provide French language health services nor to submit a designation plan, these HSPs still have a responsibility to develop and implement a plan to address the needs of their local Francophone community. This plan includes the provision of information on health services available in French in their region. For the purpose of this report, non-identified HSPs had to submit a French Language Services Report through the OZi Portal. In the current report, on-identified HSPs are not considered to have the capacity to offer FLHS.

**OZi Portal:** An online data management solution created by the Réseau to collect and analyze data on the provision of French language health services at the provincial, local, and sectoral levels. The OZi Portal was deployed to 1464 LHIN funded health service providers

between February and June of 2018 to collect data for the purpose of this report.

**Planning Entity:** French Language Health Planning Entities (sometimes referred to in this report as Entities or Planning Entities) were established by Ontario Regulation 515/09 Engagement with the Francophone Community. Entities have the responsibility to advise LHINs on FLHS, namely by engaging with the local Francophone community. There are currently six Planning Entities in Ontario.

**Potential capacity:** For the purpose of this report, staff member with an “Intermediate” French language proficiency level are considered to have a potential capacity to provide FLHS. This capacity could be developed through French language training.

**Réseau:** The French Language Health Services Network of Eastern Ontario, also known in French as Réseau des services de santé en français de l’Est de l’Ontario. The Réseau is the Planning Entity for the Champlain and South East regions. The Réseau created the OZi Portal and also managed the data collection and analysis project for the purpose of this report.

**Statement of compliance:** Designated health service providers must submit a statement of compliance to the Ministry of Francophone Affairs on a three-year basis to demonstrate they are still compliant with the 34 designation requirements.

## APPENDIX 2

# FLS PROFICIENCY PROFILES

### ORAL

### WRITTEN

---

#### *Elementary level*

At this level one has no real autonomy of expression. The ability to speak is limited to some memorized material on familiar topics related to work. One is able to verbalize isolated words, expressions of two or three words, and express simple, unconnected sentences. The range of vocabulary is limited and the delivery is slow and awkward. One can handle greetings, leave taking, and other expressions of courtesy. The limited vocabulary, the frequent errors, and slow delivery severely inhibit communication.

---

#### *Elementary level*

At this level one is able to write a few words, maybe sentences on topics related to work, maybe with the help of a dictionary. One can fill in forms, give general information such as time and location of meetings and notices of cancellation using a standard format. Vocabulary is limited to daily use with no mastery of idiomatic expressions. One has no practical communicative writing skills. One cannot produce French text.

---

#### *Intermediate level*

At this level one possesses some ability to work in French. One shows some spontaneity in language production but the fluency is very uneven resulting in halting speech. One is able to participate in simple conversations on a one-to-one basis. The vocabulary is limited to that used in simple, non-technical, daily conversational usage. One can make and answer requests for information or directions, give simple instructions and discuss simple needs. When addressing this person the speaker may have to slow down and repeat if he/she wishes to be understood.

---

#### *Intermediate level*

At this level one is able to write words and simple sentences. One can make and answer simple requests for information. The vocabulary is limited to that of daily general use. One often experiences problems with grammar and spelling. One is able to meet some practical elementary writing needs but cannot produce acceptable French text.

---

#### *Advanced Minus level*

At this level, the individual has the ability to handle a variety of communication tasks. The individual is able to describe and explain in all timeframes in most informal and some formal situations across a variety of familiar topics. The vocabulary often lacks specificity. Nevertheless, the individual is able to use rephrasing and paraphrasing. Although grammatical, lexical and pronunciation errors are evident, the individual can speak with enough accuracy to be understood.

---

#### *Advanced Minus level*

At this level, the individual is able to meet basic workrelated writing needs. The individual is able to narrate and describe in major verb forms or tenses and is able to compose simple summaries on familiar topics. The individual is able to combine and link sentences into paragraphs to form full texts. Writing is understood although some additional effort may be required.

---

#### *Advanced level*

At this level, the individual has the ability to participate in conversations and satisfy many work requirements. The individual can discuss work-related matters with some ease and facility, expressing opinions and offering views. The individual is able to take part in a variety of verbal exchanges and to participate in meetings and discussion groups. However, the individual still needs help with handling complicated issues or situations. The individual is generally good in either grammar or vocabulary but not in both.

---

#### *Advanced level*

At this level, the individual is able to use a variety of sentence types to express general ideas and opinions on non-specialized topics. The individual can write simple letters and reports required by the position. The individual experiences few problems with either grammar or spelling. However, the writing style may represent literal translations. Nevertheless, a sense of organization is emerging and the individual is beginning to sense what is stylistically and grammatically correct in French.

---

---

**Advanced Plus level**

At this level, the individual is able to give oral presentations in both formal and informal settings. The individual is able to present a fairly detailed outline of his/ her line of reasoning on general or work-related topics in formal and informal settings, in meetings and in discussion groups. Some mastery of idioms and of specific vocabulary appropriate to a variety of contexts is evident. Grammar is generally appropriate. Deficiencies in vocabulary are compensated for by synonyms and paraphrases. Problems may be encountered when discussing more specialized topics, but the individual at this level has very little difficulty in making himself / herself understood.

**Advanced Plus level**

At this level, the individual is able to write about a variety of topics with significant precision and detail. The individual can handle informal and formal correspondence according to appropriate conventions, and write summaries and reports of a factual nature. The individual can also write extensively about topics relating to particular interests and specialized areas of competence, although their writing tends to emphasize the concrete aspects of such topics.

---

**Superior level**

At this level, the individual has the ability to speak the language with sufficient structural accuracy, fluency and vocabulary to participate effectively in most formal and informal conversations on practical, social and professional topics. The individual is able to use idioms and specific vocabulary relevant to a variety of contexts and to give verbal presentations in both formal and informal settings.

**Superior level**

At this level, the individual is able to express him/herself effectively and accurately in most formal and informal writing tasks/assignments on practical, social and professional topics. The individual is able to recognize awkwardness in sentence structure and paragraphs. Errors in grammar and spelling are minor and infrequent.

---

### APPENDIX 3

## DEFINITION OF INDICATORS

Group	Indicator	Indicator description	Calculation method	Level of reporting	
			Calculation	Responsibility level	
FLHS Responsibility	1	Number of HSPs per responsibility level	This indicator presents the number of HSPs according to their responsibility level : identified HSPs, designated HSPs and non-identified HSPs. This indicator informs on the number of HSPs that have a responsibility to provide FLHS (designated HSPs), as well as on the number of HSPs that must develop their capacity to provide FLHS (identified HSPs). It also informs on the number of HSPs that have no obligation to provide FLHS (non-identified HSPs).	Number (N) of designated HSPs + N of identified HSPs + Number (N) of non-identified HSPs	Ni/Id/D
	2	FLS Report submission rate	This indicator presents the percentage of HSPs that have submitted their FLS Report.	<b>Numerator:</b> Number (N) of HSPs that have submitted their FLS Report <b>Denominator:</b> Total N of HSPs	Ni/Id/D
	3	Percentage of LHIN funded continuum of service with an FLHS obligation	This indicator presents the percentage of direct patient service functional centres offered in designated or identified HSPs. This indicator informs on the extent of the continuum of services being developed or offered in French	<b>Numerator:</b> N of direct patient service functional centres offered in designated or identified HSPs. <b>Denominator:</b> Total number of LHIN funded direct patient service functional centres	Id/D
	4	Average completion of designation requirements	This indicator presents the compliance rate of identified and designated HSPs with regards to designation requirements. The percentage of the 34 designation requirements reported by an HSP to have been completed is used to establish that HSP's compliance rate. This indicator informs on the capacity for designated HSPs to continue to comply with the requirements over time, as well as on the compliance rate progression for identified HSPs.	<b>Numerator:</b> Sum of the requirements for compliance completed by each HSP <b>Denominator:</b> Sum of the requirements for compliance to be completed by all the HSPs	Id/D

Organizational Practices	5	Percentage of HSPs who identify Francophone clients	This indicator presents the percentage of HSPs that have adopted a method of identifying their Francophone clients, compared to all HSPs. This indicator informs on the capacity for HSPs to identify Francophone clients, a practice which is a prerequisite to the active offer of FLHS. It also informs on the capacity for HSPs to reliably take count of their Francophone clientele.	<b>Numerator:</b> N of HSPs who identify Francophone clients <b>Denominator:</b> Total N of HSPs	NI/Id/D
	6	Percentage of HSPs who refer Francophone clients	This indicator presents the percentage of HSPs that refer their Francophone clients to another HSP	<b>Numerator:</b> N of HSPs who refer clients <b>Denominator:</b> Total N of HSPs	NI/Id/D
	7	Percentage of HSPs that capture client satisfaction regarding FLHS	This indicator presents the percentage of HSPs that collect data on client satisfaction with regards to FLHS. This indicator informs on HSPs' commitment to adopt quality control mechanisms with regards to FLHS.	<b>Numerator:</b> N of HSPs that capture client satisfaction regarding FLHS <b>Denominator:</b> Total N of HSPs	NI/Id/D
	8	Percentage of HSPs who align Francophone clients to their HR with FLHS capacity	The indicator presents the percentage of HSPs that align their Francophone clients with staff members with French language proficiency. This indicator informs on whether HSPs use available HR with French language proficiency to respond to requests for FLHS.	<b>Numerator:</b> Number of HSPs who align Francophone clients to their HR with FLS capacity <b>Denominator:</b> Total N of HSPs	NI/Id/D

NI - Non-identified

I - Identified

D - Designated

N - Number

HR - Human Resources

HSPs - Health Service Providers

FLHS - French language health services

FLS - French language services



FLHS Opportunities	9	Percentage of nonidentified services	This indicator presents the percentage of direct patient service functional centres only available in non-identified HSPs. This indicator informs on the opportunities to extend the continuum of services being developed or offered in French.	<b>Numerator:</b> N of direct patient service functional centres only available in non-identified HSPs <b>Denominator:</b> Total number of LHIN funded direct patient service functional centres	NI
	10	Percentage of Francophone clients served by nonidentified HSPs	This indicator presents the percentage of Francophone clients served by non-identified HSPs, compared to those served by all HSPs. The Francophone characteristic was determined by each HSP, in accordance with the latter's internal policy. This indicator informs on the utilization of health services by Francophone clients, namely with regards to HSPs that haven't necessarily developed an active offer of FLHS.	<b>Numerator:</b> N of Francophone clients served by non-identified HSPs <b>Denominator:</b> Total N of Francophone clients served by all HSPs (identified, designated and non-identified)	NI
	11	Percentage of Francophone clients served by identified or designated HSPs	This indicator presents the percentage of Francophone clients served by identified or designated HSPs, compared to those served by all HSPs. This indicator informs on use of FLHS by Francophone clients. This information is presented in accordance with HSPs' responsibility level with regards to the provision of FLHS.	<b>Numerator:</b> N of Francophone clients served by designated or identified HSPs (N of Francophones clients served by identified HSPs + N of Francophone clients served by designated HSPs) <b>Denominator:</b> Total N of Francophone clients served by all HSPs (identified, designated and non-identified)	Id/D
	12	Percentage of HR able to provide FLHS in nonidentified HSPs	This indicator presents the percentage of HR with actual FLHS capacity within non-identified HSPs (ie, staff with "Advanced Minus", "Advanced", "Advanced Plus" or "Superior" French language proficiency). It informs on opportunities for improving the local provision of FLHS by reviewing these HSPs' responsibility level with regards to the provision of FLHS.	<b>Numerator:</b> N of HR with one of the following French language proficiency levels in nonidentified HSPs: "Advanced Minus", "Advanced", "Advanced Plus" or "Superior" <b>Denominator:</b> Total N of HR with French language proficiency in non-identified HSPs	NI
	13	Percentage of HR with "Elementary" French language proficiency	This indicator presents the percentage of positions filled by staff members with "Elementary" French language proficiency within non-identified HSPs, compared to all staff members with any level of French language proficiency. This indicator informs on the percentage of HR with limited French language capacity, as well as on existing FLHS capacity gaps within non-identified HSPs	<b>Numerator:</b> N of HR with "Elementary" French language proficiency in non-identified HSPs <b>Denominator:</b> Total N of HR with French language proficiency in non-identified HSPs	NI
	14	Percentage of HR with "Intermediate" French language proficiency.	This indicator presents the percentage of positions filled by staff members with "Intermediate" French language proficiency within non-identified HSPs, compared to all positions filled by staff members with any level of French language proficiency. This indicator informs on the percentage of HR with potential French language capacity (ie, employees who could, with French language training, attain actual capacity) within non-identified HSPs	<b>Numerator:</b> N of HR with "Intermediate" French language proficiency <b>Denominator:</b> Total N of HR with French language proficiency in non-identified HSPs	NI
	15	Percentage of HR with "Advanced Minus" to "Superior" French language proficiency	This indicator presents the percentage of positions filled by staff members with "Advanced Minus", "Advanced", "Advanced Plus" or "Superior" French language proficiency, compared to all positions filled by staff members with any level of French language proficiency. This indicator informs on the percentage of HR with actual French language capacity (ie, staff members that have the necessary proficiency to offer FLHS).	<b>Numerator:</b> N of HR with one of the following French language proficiency levels: "Advanced Minus", "Advanced", "Advanced Plus" or "Superior" <b>Denominator:</b> Total N of HR with French language proficiency	NI/ Id/D

---

## METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

---

### **General Considerations:**

Number of HSPs	The common denominator is calculated on the basis of the total number of HSPs that had the obligation to submit a FLS Report.
Designated HSPs	The number of designated HSPs includes both HSPs designated to provide all their programs and services in French and those designated to provide only specific programs or services in French.
OZi Portal:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ A value of "0" was attributed to all questions in the FLS reporting template for which no responses were provided.</li> <li>■ The responses provided in FLS Reports with an "In Development" submission status were taken into account in the data analysis.</li> </ul>

### **Considerations Specific to Certain Indicators:**

Indicators 5 and 7	HSPs that responded to the questions on identification of Francophone clients and to those on client satisfaction with FLHS by checking the "Other" field in the template were included.
Indicators 6 and 8	HSPs that responded to the questions on alignment of Francophone clients with their HR proficient in French and to those on referral of Francophone clients to other HSPs by checking the "Other" field in the template were excluded.
Indicators 3 and 9	Only functional centres with a direct impact on frontline services were included. In the case of partially designated HSPs, the services that were not designated were considered as identified services. The functional centres denominator corresponds to the sum of the unique functional centres (all sectors and designation statuses combined) in the LHIN or local area concerned.
Indicators 10 and 11	Some HSPs reported a number of Francophone visits but did not report having any Francophone clients.
Indicators 13, 14 and 15	The data on HR with French language proficiency are based on oral skills only. Among designated HSPs, the level "Advanced Minus" was attributed to all HR occupying positions requiring language proficiency for which the appropriate fields in the template were left empty. Among identified and non-identified HSPs, HR for which the appropriate fields in the template were left empty were excluded.

## APPENDIX 4 REPORTING TEMPLATES

### FLS REPORT - IDENTIFIED/ DESIGNATED HSPs

#### Section 1 - Information about the agency or organization

##### 1.1 Name according to the letters patent

##### 1.2 Address

- Unit Number
- Street Number
- Street
- P.O. Box
- City
- Province
- Postal Code

##### 1.3 Person(s) responsible for the plan:

- First Name
- Last Name
- Initials
- Title
- E-mail
- Phone
- Ext.
- Fax

##### 1.4 Resource Person(s):

- First Name
- Last Name
- Initial
- Title
- E-mail
- Phone
- Ext.
- Fax

##### 1.5 Organizational type or category:

- Community Health Centre
- Community Support Services
- Hospital Services
- Long-Term Care Home
- Mental Health and Addiction Services

##### 1.6 The services covered by the designation are offered to a clientele that is:

- 100% Francophone: All clients are Francophone
- A Francophone minority: 49% and less of clients are Francophone
- Both Anglophone and Francophone: 50/50 clients are Anglophone and Francophone
- Mostly Francophone: 51% to 99% are Francophone

##### 1.7 Brief description of the background of the agency or organization:

#### Section 2 - Information about the designation

##### 2.1 Specify the type of application or existing designation:

- Full designation
- Partial designation
- Expansion to full
- Expansion to partial

##### 2.2 List of all the programs or services offered by the organization:

##### 2.3 If the designation is partial, specify which programs or services are the subject of the application:

##### 2.4 Indicate whether the agency offers services – which are not covered by this application – on behalf of another ministry (new designation only):

##### 2.5 Indicate whether the agency provides services on behalf of another ministry under its designation (assessment only):

##### 2.6 Provide a brief description of any expertise or unique service offered by the agency (new designation only):

#### Section 3 - Information on the community

##### 3.1 Name of the city(ies) and/or region(s) served:

- City / Region 1:
- City / Region 2:
- City / Region 3:

##### 3.2 Electoral District:

##### 3.3 Population:

- Region
- City/Town
- Total Population
- Francophone Population
- Percentage

##### 3.4 Clientele:

- Year
- **Visits**
  - Total number of visits
  - Number of visits by Francophone clients
  - Percentage
- **Unique clients**
  - Total number of unique clients
  - Number of unique Francophone clients
  - Percentage

#### Section 4 - Requirements for Compliance with the Designation Criteria ©

##### 4.1 Elements to incorporate to administrative by-laws

- 4.1.1 A detailed statement on the delivery of French language services (FLS) ) (repeat contents of this section for each section from 4.1.2 to 4.5.8)

##### Activities

- Person Responsible
- Status
  - Not Started
  - In Progress
  - Deferred
  - Completed

- Exempted
- Not Applicable
- Start Date
- Anticipated End Date
- Additional Information

**Realizations**

- Final Product Description
- End Date
- Comments
- Other
- Supporting Documents

---

4.1.2 The existence of a policy and a committee on French language services (FLS)

---

4.1.3 Choose one of the three options. (Section 3 must first be filled first)

---

4.1.4 A statement describing the responsibilities of the board of directors and the senior management team with respect to French language services

---

**4.2 Direct services to clients**

4.2.1 All telephone services, including voice messages and interactive response systems, are actively offered\* in French

---

4.2.2 The reception and services, at the time of the initial greeting and at each subsequent point of contact are actively offered in French

---

4.2.3 A mechanism is in place to determine the linguistic identity of the client from the very first point of contact

---

4.2.4 Professionals responsible for treatment at the agency are proficient in French

---

4.2.5 Volunteer services within the agency are actively offered\* in French

---

4.2.6 Contracts signed with third parties that offer services on behalf of the agency contain a clause stating their obligation to ensure the offer of French language services (if no contract was signed with a third party, indicate 'not applicable' (NA) in the box to the right)

---

4.2.7 A mechanism, such as a survey or complaint process, is available in French and is clearly communicated to clients so that they can evaluate the quality of French language services offered.

---

**4.3 Visual identity and communications**

4.3.1 The website of the organization is available in French

---

4.3.2 The exterior signage is available in French or in both official languages. If the name of the agency is in English, the signage must indicate that French language services are available

---

4.3.3 The interior signage is available in French, in both official languages or features pictograms. If the agency offers partial French language services, French signage must guide the public to the locations where French language services are offered

---

4.3.4 Admission forms and other documents intended for clients are available in French and actively offered to the French-speaking clientele

---

4.3.5 Employees who are proficient in French wear tags which clearly allow members of the public to identify them

---



---

4.3.6 Business cards of employees who are proficient in French are available in French or printed with information in each official language on one side of the card

---

4.3.7 The letterhead on the correspondence of the agency is available in French or in both official languages

---

4.3.8 Communications and publications intended for the public concerning services covered by the designation, such as pamphlets, brochures, public notices and press releases are available in French

---

4.3.9 The agency responds in French to correspondence received in French

---

4.3.10 A mechanism is in place to translate and correct documents in French intended for the public

---

4.3.11 The agency implements the necessary tools and software required for quality communication in French

---

**4.4 Governance and Accountability**

4.4.1 A report on the status of French language services is submitted annually to the board of directors for approval

---

4.4.2 There is effective representation of Francophones within the senior management team

---

4.4.3 A senior manager has been designated to assume responsibility for the delivery of French language services

---

4.4.4 A mechanism has been put in place to manage complaints concerning French language services

---

**4.5 The human resources policy incorporates specific measures and mechanisms concerning the staffing of employees with the required French language competencies**

4.5.1 Staffing of personnel proficient in French in order to guarantee that French language services are offered on a permanent basis during business hours

---

4.5.2 Identifying the number of positions designated as bilingual and the number of employees required for delivery of French language services

---

4.5.3 Identification of the linguistic profile required for each position.

---

4.5.4 Recruitment of employees proficient in French

---

4.5.5 Evaluation of the oral and written French skills of candidates by accredited language assessment services.

---

4.5.6 Hiring of personnel proficient in French

---

4.5.7 An offer of training for employees who do not meet the linguistic requirements for the position

---

4.5.8 In the human resources plan, identify each of the positions designated as bilingual, indicating the required linguistic profile and the number of employees with the requisite level of proficiency in French

---

**Section 5 - Community Support**

- Supporting Documents

**Section 6 - Additional Information**

How do you identify your Francophone clients?

- We do not identify Francophone clients
- Clients self-identify as Francophone
- Mother tongue
- Official language spoken

- Official language in which they are most comfortable
- Language of preference
- Language spoken at home
- Other
  - If you chose "Other", please specify

*What do you do when you receive a request for services in French?*

- A caregiver, volunteer or staff member acts as interpreter
- Professional interpretation service is offered
- We match clients with staff members who have French language skills
- The client is referred to another service provider
- The client is referred to another provider who offers services in French
- We indicate to our clients that we are unable to provide services in French
- Other
  - If you chose "The client is referred to another provider who offers French language services", please list these providers
  - If you chose "Other", please specify

*How do you measure client satisfaction with the French language services offered by your organization?*

- We do not measure client satisfaction with services rendered
- We use a survey of overall client satisfaction with services rendered
- We use a survey of client satisfaction with French language services or another form of evaluation specifically related to French language services
- Other
  - If you chose "Other", please specify

## HUMAN RESOURCES PLAN

Unit	Program / Service	Position	Total Employees			Employees required to provide French language services			Employees with proficiency in regards to the language profile			Number of employees that have not been assessed			Linguistic profile	
			Full Time	Part Time	Casual	Full Time	Part Time	Casual	Full Time	Part Time	Casual	Full Time	Part Time	Casual	Oral	Written

## FLS REPORT - NON-IDENTIFIED HSPs

### Section 1 - Information about the agency or organization

#### 1.1 Name according to the letters patent

#### 1.2 Address

- Unit Number
- Street Number
- Street
- P.O. Box
- City
- Province
- Postal Code

#### 1.3 Person(s) responsible for the plan:

- First Name
- Last Name
- Initial
- Title
- E-mail
- Phone
- Ext.
- Fax

#### 1.4 Resource Person(s):

- First Name
- Last Name
- Initial
- Title
- E-mail
- Phone
- Ext.
- Fax

#### 1.5 Organizational type or category:

- Community Health Centre
- Community Support Services
- Hospital Services
- Long-Term Care Home
- Mental Health and Addiction Services

### Section 2 - Information on the community

- Clientele
- Year

#### Visits

- Total number of visits
- Number of visits by Francophone clients
- Percentage

#### Unique clients

- Total number of unique clients
- Number of unique Francophone clients
- Percentage

### Section 3 - Human Resources Plan

Please only enter employees with French language proficiency.

- Department
- Program / Service
- Position
- Level of French

### Section 4 - Additional Information

*How do you identify your Francophone clients?*

- We do not identify Francophone clients
- Clients self-identify as Francophone
- Mother tongue
- Official language spoken
- Official language in which they are most comfortable
- Language of preference
- Language spoken at home
- Other
  - If you chose "Other", please specify

*What do you do when you receive a request for services in French?*

- A caregiver, volunteer or staff member acts as interpreter
- Professional interpretation service is offered
- We match clients with staff members who have French language skills
- The client is referred to another service provider
- The client is referred to another provider who offers services in French
- We indicate to our clients that we are unable to provide services in French
- Other
  - If you chose "The client is referred to another provider who offers French language services", please list these providers
  - If you chose "Other", please specify

*How do you measure client satisfaction with the French language services offered by your organization?*

- We do not measure client satisfaction with services rendered
- We use a survey of overall client satisfaction with services rendered
- We use a survey of client satisfaction with French language services or another form of evaluation specifically related to French language services
- Other
  - If you chose "Other", please specify