

# Recommendations from long-term care reports, commissions, and inquiries in Canada

Eric KC Wong MD 1,2  
Trina Thorne NP MN 3,4  
Carole Estabrooks RN PhD 3,4  
Sharon E Straus MD MSc 1,2

1. Knowledge Translation Program, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital, 209 Victoria Street, Toronto, Ontario, M5B 1W8, Canada
2. Institute for Health Policy Management and Evaluation, Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Ontario, Canada
3. Faculty of Nursing, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, T6G 1C9, Canada
4. Translating Research in Elder Care (TREC) program, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, T6G 1C9, Canada.

**Corresponding author:** Sharon Straus, [sharon.straus@utoronto.ca](mailto:sharon.straus@utoronto.ca)

**Funding:** The study had no direct funding support. Dr. Wong is supported by the Clinician Scientist Training Program at the University of Toronto, the Vanier Scholarship from the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, and the Knowledge Translation Program at St. Michael's Hospital. Trina Thorne is supported by an Alberta SPOR Graduate Studentship, jointly funded by Alberta Innovate and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research. Dr. Estabrooks and Dr. Straus are supported by a Tier 1 Canada Research Chairs.

**Competing interests:** The authors have no competing interests to declare.

**Word count:** 2398 of 2500

## 34 Abstract

## 35 Background

36 Multiple long-term care (LTC) reports over the last 30 years issued similar recommendations for  
37 improvement across Canadian LTC homes. Our primary objective was to identify the most  
38 common recommendations made over the past 10 years. Our secondary objective was to estimate  
39 the total cost of studying LTC issues repeatedly over the past 30 years.

## 40 Methods

41 The qualitative and cost analyses were conducted in Canada from July to October 2020. Using a  
42 list of reports, inquiries and commission from The Royal Society of Canada Working Group on  
43 Long-Term Care, we coded recurrent recommendations in LTC reports. We contacted the  
44 sponsoring organizations for a cost estimate, including direct and indirect costs. All costs were  
45 adjusted to 2020 Canadian dollar values.

## 46 Results

47 Of the 80 Canadian LTC reports spanning the years of 1998 to 2020, twenty-four (30%) were  
48 based on a national level and 56 (70%) were focused on provinces or municipalities. Report  
49 length ranged from 4 to 1491 pages and the median number of contributors was 14 (interquartile  
50 range, IQR, 5–26) per report. The most common recommendation was to increase funding to  
51 LTC to improve staffing, direct care and capacity (67% of reports). A median of 8 (IQR 3.25–  
52 18) recommendations were made per report. The total cost for all 80 reports was estimated to be  
53 \$23,626,442.78.

54 **Interpretation**

55 Problems in Canadian LTC homes and their solutions have been known for decades. Despite  
56 this, governments and non-governmental agencies continue to produce more reports at a  
57 monetary and societal cost to Canadians.

58

59

60

## 61 Introduction

62           The COVID-19 pandemic led to a high proportion of deaths in Canadian long-term care  
63 homes (LTCH) compared with those of other developed countries. The proportion of deaths from  
64 COVID-19 in LTCH in Canada was 81% compared with a mean of 42% in other Organisation  
65 for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries [1]. This statistic is surprising  
66 since Canada is considered to have a relatively low number of COVID-19 deaths overall [2].  
67 There were also significant differences between provinces that were attributed to pandemic  
68 preparedness, integration of services (LTCH, public health and hospitals), funding and resources,  
69 daily care hours for residents, comprehensiveness of inspections and differences in ownership  
70 model (profit versus non-profit) [3].

71           Residential LTCHs provide living accommodations for people who require full-time  
72 supervised care [4]. The founding of long-term care (LTC) in Canada was based in the  
73 Elizabethan Poor Law of 1601 that grouped older adults with other disadvantaged populations in  
74 housing that was run by various organizations and not centrally regulated [5]. LTC is not situated  
75 within the Canada Health Act [4], which resulted in different care models and resource allocation  
76 across organizations and homes. This variation has been associated with significantly different  
77 outcomes during the current pandemic [6].

78           During the early months of COVID-19, the media reported a shortage of direct care  
79 providers and personal protective equipment (PPE) in Canadian LTCHs, which led to residents  
80 suffering from a lack of basic personal care and delays in identifying medical problems [7].  
81 Reduced staffing levels and wage compression in Canada's LTC sector compelled individuals to  
82 work at more than one facility to make a living wage. An Ontario study comparing for-profit and  
83 non-profit facilities found lower staffing levels in for-profit LTCHs, which was associated with

84 worse COVID-19 outcomes [8], although this may not be the case elsewhere in the country [9].  
85 Working at multiple nursing homes contributed to the spread of COVID-19 infection [6], and  
86 although restricting employment to one facility reduced the number of outbreaks, it also  
87 exacerbated pre-existing work force shortages [10]. Furthermore, lower staffing levels and direct  
88 care hours are associated with increased rates of infection and hospital admission among  
89 residents [11], with this same trend observed in LTCHs with COVID-19 outbreaks [3,6,12].

90 In April, the Royal Society of Canada Working Group on Long-Term Care was tasked  
91 with reviewing the current state of LTC in the face of COVID-19 [5]. Their report found 103  
92 LTC reports, commissions, and inquiries, 80 of which were unique reports based in Canada. The  
93 review found recurrent themes of longstanding deficiencies in the LTC sector that contributed to  
94 the magnitude of the COVID-19 crisis in LTCHs. Despite the wealth of evidence, little change  
95 has been implemented and in COVID's wave 2, LTCHs are again being devastated by outbreaks  
96 [16]. LTCHs continue to account for the majority of outbreaks and deaths in Canada; as of Nov 7  
97 there were 2,026 COVID-19 outbreaks in LTCHs [13]. The Canadian Red Cross has been called  
98 in to support care in 7 Ottawa LTCHs [14]. Since June, LTCHs across Canada have seen a 19%  
99 increase in the number of deaths [2]. The opportunity to support residents and care providers  
100 between wave 1 and wave 2 has passed. Sadly, the consequences of the lack of action will be  
101 disproportionately carried by the most vulnerable residents and the lowest paid, most  
102 marginalized members of the LTC workforce, personal support workers (PSW), who provide  
103 90% of the direct care [15].

104 The primary **objective** of this study was to examine the recurring recommendations over  
105 the past 10 years. Our secondary objective was to calculate the total costs of generating all of the

106 LTC reports, commissions, and inquiries in Canada over the last 30 years. We aimed to put the  
107 cost of repeatedly studying the same problems into context of the current pandemic.

## 108 **Methods**

109         Qualitative and quantitative analyses were based on Canadian LTC reports and  
110 commissions identified from The Royal Society of Canada Working Group on Long-Term Care  
111 [5], which was done using a literature search and environmental scan over the last 30 years. Our  
112 analysis took place from July to October 2020. Content analysis was used to determine the  
113 presence of certain words, themes, or concepts within reports published in the past 10 years. Two  
114 reviewers independently reviewed 5 reports, and a consensus coding scheme was created. For the  
115 cost analysis, we excluded follow-up reports and included cost estimates in the original larger  
116 report.

### 117 **Estimation of report cost**

118         We contacted the author or sponsoring organizations of the 80 Canadian LTC reports to  
119 inquire about the estimated cost of producing each report. We requested both direct and indirect  
120 costs. Direct costs included consultancy fees, salaries, compensation for expert witnesses,  
121 graphics, layout, printing, and dissemination. Indirect costs included time donated from authors  
122 who volunteered their time to produce the report. When an estimated budget was not available,  
123 we searched online for global budget reports from the sponsoring organization. Total annual  
124 expenses for research, advocacy, or reports were divided by the number of reports published that  
125 year by the organization to generate an estimated cost. We also searched for media reports about  
126 costs of commissions or coroner's inquests. If no costs were available, the estimate was based on  
127 length, depth of research, inclusion of external experts/witnesses, and the sponsoring

128 organization of similar LTC reports. Costs were in Canadian dollars and adjusted to 2020 values  
129 according to the Bank of Canada Inflation Calculator [16].

### 130 Data abstraction and analysis

131 Report characteristics were extracted, including title, sponsoring organization,  
132 publication year, geographic region, scope of report, number of contributors, number of pages,  
133 and duration of the project. The primary outcome was recurrent recommendations. Secondary  
134 outcomes included contributors, total costs of producing the reports and median page count.

### 135 Ethics approval

136 No ethics approval was required for this analysis.

## 137 Results

138 The list of Canadian LTC reports from the Royal Society commission spans the years  
139 1998 to 2020 (n=80). There was an increase in the number of reports over time, with 10 reports  
140 in the first half of 2020 (Figure 1). Most of the reports were focused at a provincial level (n=55,  
141 68.8%), 24 reports were based on a national level (30.0%). We found one municipal report and  
142 no reports from the territories. Ontario (n=31, 55.0%) produced the majority of the provincial  
143 reports, followed by British Columbia (n=11, 19.6%) (Table 1). More reports were funded by  
144 provincial governments (n=26) compared with the federal government (n=9). Non-profit  
145 organizations (e.g. Canadian Association for Long Term Care, Canadian Institute of Health  
146 Information) and professional unions (e.g. Canadian Federation of Nurses Unions, Canadian  
147 Union of Public Employees) or associations (e.g. Registered Nurses' Association of Ontario,  
148 Canadian Medical Association) authored the remaining 45 reports. No reports were funded by  
149 the private sector. Most of the reports focused solely on LTC (68.8%), but some reports focused

150 on continuing care, older adults, or the health care system as well. The median report length was  
151 40 pages (interquartile range, IQR, 21–84), with 16 reports (20.0%) over 100 pages. The median  
152 number of contributors, including authors, witnesses, and consultants, was 14 (IQR 5–26).

### 153 Common recommendations in reports

154         Reviewing the reports from the last 10 years (n=48), we identified a median of 8 (IQR  
155 3.25–18) recommendations per report. Numerous recommendations were repeated in these  
156 reports (Table 2). Overall, the most frequent recommendations were: (i) to increase or  
157 redistribute funding to improve staffing, direct care, and capacity (66.7%), (ii) to standardize,  
158 regulate and audit LTC quality of care (58.3%), and (iii) to standardize, regulate or reform  
159 education and training for LTC staff (52%). Improving staff education and training, increasing  
160 behavioural supports, and modernizing infection control measures were universally  
161 recommended in reports by governments, non-profits, professional association and unions.

162         Government-authored reports (n=35) focused on using improving data collection (n=8,  
163 22.9%), improving education and training of staff (n=8, 22.9%) and standardizing LTC quality  
164 of care (n=8, 22.9%). Professional union reports (n=11) focused on regulating for-profit LTCHs  
165 (n=4, 36.4%) and standardizing LTC quality of care (n=4, 36.4%). The most common  
166 recommendation made by non-profits (n=19) was to improve training and education for staff  
167 (n=9, 47.4%). Professional associations reports (n=20) most commonly recommended  
168 standardizing staffing mix (n=10, 50.0%) and increasing funding for direct care (n=10, 50.0%).  
169 The least common recommendation made by professional associations was for improved  
170 transparency, reporting and tracking of critical incidents (n=1, 5.0%).

171         Critical incidents received the most attention from governments (n=6, 17.1%), followed  
172 by non-profits (n=2, 10.5%) and a professional association (n=1, 5.0%). Recommendations

173 regarding quality of care or data utilization were more likely to be made by government (n=18,  
174 51.4%) or professional associations or unions (n=20, 64.5%) than by non-profits (n=3, 15.8%).  
175 Staff wellness support was most recommended by non-profits (n=7, 36.8%), followed by  
176 professional associations or unions (n=6, 19.4%), then government (n=3, 8.6%). The  
177 appointment of commissions or inquiries was mostly recommended by professional associations  
178 or unions (n=7, 22.6%) then by government (n=2, 5.7%) and no commissions were  
179 recommended by non-profits.

180 Although recommendations to improve resident quality of life were mentioned in 12  
181 reports, they mostly overlapped with other recommendations such as increasing direct care,  
182 optimizing staff mix, increasing quality of life data collection, and improving quality of care.  
183 Only one report discussed specific recommendations to improve quality of life, such as  
184 increasing decision-making capacity (e.g. choice over when to bath), improving privacy with  
185 single rooms, and prioritizing relational care over medical tasks and interventions [17].

186 The full list of reports in Supplementary table 1.

## 187 Cost of reports

188 Nearly half of the reports (45%) had cost estimates by the sponsoring organization or by  
189 publicly available budget or media reports. The total cost for all 80 reports was estimated to be  
190 \$23,626,442.78 (Table 1). The median cost per report was \$15,203.48 (IQR \$10,000–  
191 \$53,147.81). Details of each report's cost estimate are shown in Supplementary table 2. The  
192 lowest cost was estimated at \$500 for each of the Canadian Army Joint Task Force reports,  
193 which accounts for the administrative costs of writing the reports even if the services were  
194 provided on military order, but the cost of military deployment was not included [7]. The highest  
195 cost was \$9,046,255.51 for the Public Inquiry into the Safety and Security of Residents in the

196 Long-Term Care Homes System (The Wettlaufer Report) in 2019, which involved 79  
197 contributors, witnesses, and experts [18].

## 198 Discussion

199 This analysis highlights the efforts of multiple organizations, both governmental and non-  
200 governmental, to address the longstanding challenges and quality issues in Canada’s LTCHs.  
201 The Royal Society Briefing Report concluded that the unresolved issues in Canada’s nursing  
202 homes have been known for decades. According to our analysis, there are numerous sound  
203 recommendations backed by evidence, yet little action has followed. This inaction has  
204 contributed to the devastating loss of life during the COVID-19 pandemic and to lower quality of  
205 life in LTCHs. Our analysis further shows the substantial cost of studying the problem repeatedly  
206 over the years.

207 Duplicate investigation of known findings reduces value and increases waste [19]. From  
208 the LTC reports, issues regarding understaffing, undertraining, and the negative impact of for-  
209 profit LTC homes were repeatedly mentioned [5]. Policy change often requires persistence [20],  
210 but the cost of advocating for change should be viewed from a societal context (financial and  
211 moral). Commissions and inquiries into LTC issues, like those happening or slated to begin  
212 around the country [21–23], can solidify our determination for policy change, but do not replace  
213 the need for policy implementation – action.

214 Several provinces have increased wages and provided full-time employment with more  
215 appropriate compensation and benefits to stabilize the LTC workforce [24]. The Ontario  
216 government went further to commit 4.00 hours per day of direct care for each LTC resident by  
217 2024 [25], bringing the total care hours above the national average (3.30 hours) [26]. However,  
218 increasing direct care hours, while essential, is only one of the many recommendations from

219 existing reports. Identifying the right staff mix and care team composition, providing proper  
220 education and training, and supporting staff wellness are also critical to developing a long-term  
221 workforce that has sufficient resilience to confront future crises [27]. Furthermore, we should  
222 focus more attention on resident quality of life, which should be the ultimate goal of our efforts.

223         Although the total cost of \$23 million in generating LTC reports may seem insignificant  
224 compared to a government budget, it represents a lost opportunity to continually improve  
225 Canadian LTCHs. Studying the same problems repeatedly means Canadian experts are confined  
226 to fixing critical deficiencies in LTC instead of innovating new care models.

227         There are several strengths of this study. Two reviewers extracted key recommendations  
228 from each LTC report in the last 10 years and created a consensus coding scheme. We  
229 systematically tracked down the cost of each report by contacting the sponsoring organization or  
230 consulting their global budgets. The total costs, including time donated of experts authoring  
231 these reports, were accounted for. For reports that did not have available cost data, we estimated  
232 the total cost by using reports with known costs with similar length and depth.

233         The main limitation of this study was the lack of true cost estimates for half of the LTC  
234 reports. Some organizations lacked transparency about costing, and others lacked detailed  
235 accounting of spending. Staff turnover and record keeping practices were barriers to accessing  
236 data, particularly for the reports produced over 10 years ago. For government agencies, we often  
237 had to call multiple departments and speak with numerous representatives and noted  
238 considerable variation in the level of disclosure. For the two military reports during COVID-19,  
239 we likely underestimated the cost since they were generated as part of military duty. However,  
240 there were still considerable costs incurred by the public by having the military deployed to those  
241 LTCHs [28]. We also grouped reports on health system improvement and care of older adults in

242 general in this analysis because LTC is intricately tied to the health system at large. Leaders in  
243 senior care such as Denmark also design LTC policy as in integral part of their health system  
244 [29].

## 245 Conclusion

246 Over the last two decades, Canadian governments and non-government organizations  
247 have repeatedly investigated longstanding LTC issues and have largely drawn the same  
248 conclusions. Had the recurring recommendations been implemented, we would not only have  
249 improved working conditions, quality of care and quality of life, but would also have prevented  
250 unnecessary deaths due to COVID-19. Instead of continuing to investigate LTC issues, we  
251 should focus our resources on implementing the recommendations in the identified reports.

252  
253 **Tables 1, 2 and Figure 1: separate file**  
254 **Supplementary table 1: separate file**  
255 **Supplementary table 2: separate file**  
256  
257

258 **References**

- 259 [1] Canadian Institute for Health Information. *Pandemic Experience in the Long-Term Care*  
260 *Sector: How Does Canada Compare With Other Countries?* Ottawa, ON: 2020.
- 261 [2] Comas-Herrera A, Zalakaín J, Lemmon E, Henderson D, Litwin C, Hsu AT, et al.  
262 *Mortality associated with COVID-19 outbreaks in care homes* Mortality associated with  
263 *COVID-19 in care homes: international evidence.* 2020.
- 264 [3] Liu M, Maxwell CJ, Armstrong P, Schwandt M, Moser A, McGregor MJ, et al. *COVID-*  
265 *19 in long-term care homes in Ontario and British Columbia.* *Can Med Assoc J*  
266 *2020;cmaj.201860. doi:10.1503/cmaj.201860.*
- 267 [4] Health Canada. *Long-term facilities-based care.* CanadaCa 2004.  
268 [https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/home-continuing-care/long-term-](https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/home-continuing-care/long-term-facilities-based-care.html)  
269 [facilities-based-care.html](https://www.canada.ca/en/health-canada/services/home-continuing-care/long-term-facilities-based-care.html) (accessed September 15, 2020).
- 270 [5] Estabrooks C, Straus SE, Flood CM, Keefe J, Armstrong P, Donner G, et al. *Restoring*  
271 *Trust: COVID-19 and The Future of Long-Term Care.* R Soc Canada 2020. [https://rsc-](https://rsc-src.ca/en/restoring-trust-covid-19-and-future-long-term-care)  
272 [src.ca/en/restoring-trust-covid-19-and-future-long-term-care](https://rsc-src.ca/en/restoring-trust-covid-19-and-future-long-term-care) (accessed September 15,  
273 2020).
- 274 [6] Stall NM, Jones A, Brown KA, Rochon PA, Costa AP. *For-profit long-term care homes*  
275 *and the risk of COVID-19 outbreaks and resident deaths.* *Can Med Assoc J*  
276 *2020;192:E946–55. doi:10.1503/cmaj.201197.*
- 277 [7] Government of Canada. *Report of observations CAF personnel supporting Long Term*  
278 *Care Facilities (LTCFs) as part of Operation LASER.* CanadaCa 2020.  
279 [https://www.canada.ca/en/department-national-defence/campaigns/covid-19-military-](https://www.canada.ca/en/department-national-defence/campaigns/covid-19-military-response.html#7)  
280 [response.html#7](https://www.canada.ca/en/department-national-defence/campaigns/covid-19-military-response.html#7) (accessed September 15, 2020).
- 281 [8] McGregor MJ, Harrington C. *COVID-19 and long-term care facilities: Does ownership*  
282 *matter?* *CMAJ* 2020;192:E961–2. doi:10.1503/cmaj.201714.
- 283 [9] Carman T. *Canada’s hardest-hit nursing homes lost 40% of residents in just 3 months of*  
284 *the pandemic | CBC News.* CBC News 2020. [https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/nursing-](https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/nursing-home-covid-19-deaths-1.5641266)  
285 [home-covid-19-deaths-1.5641266](https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/nursing-home-covid-19-deaths-1.5641266) (accessed November 16, 2020).
- 286 [10] Duan Y, Iaconi A, Song Y, Norton PG, Squires JE, Keefe J, et al. *Care Aides Working*  
287 *Multiple Jobs: Considerations for Staffing Policies in Long-Term Care Homes During and*  
288 *After the COVID-19 Pandemic.* *J Am Med Dir Assoc* 2020;21:1390–1.  
289 doi:10.1016/j.jamda.2020.07.036.
- 290 [11] Schnelle JF, Simmons SF, Harrington C, Cadogan M, Garcia E, Bates-Jensen BM.  
291 *Relationship of Nursing Home Staffing to Quality of Care.* *Health Serv Res* 2004;39:225–  
292 50. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6773.2004.00225.x.
- 293 [12] Li Y, Temkin Greener H, Shan G, Cai X. *COVID-19 Infections and Deaths among*  
294 *Connecticut Nursing Home Residents: Facility Correlates.* *J Am Geriatr Soc*  
295 *2020;68:1899–906. doi:10.1111/jgs.16689.*
- 296 [13] Public Health Agency of Canada. *Canada COVID-19 Weekly Epidemiology Report.*  
297 Ottawa: 2020.
- 298 [14] CBC News. *Red Cross workers being dispatched to Ottawa-area long-term care homes.*  
299 *CBC News* 2020. [https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/ottawa/red-cross-workers-being-](https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/ottawa/red-cross-workers-being-dispatched-to-ottawa-area-long-term-care-homes-1.5759137)  
300 [dispatched-to-ottawa-area-long-term-care-homes-1.5759137](https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/ottawa/red-cross-workers-being-dispatched-to-ottawa-area-long-term-care-homes-1.5759137) (accessed October 19, 2020).
- 301 [15] Hewko SJ, Cooper SL, Huynh H, Spiwek TL, Carleton HL, Reid S, et al. *Invisible no*  
302 *more: A scoping review of the health care aide workforce literature.* *BMC Nurs*

2015;14:38. doi:10.1186/s12912-015-0090-x.

[16] Bank of Canada. Inflation Calculator 2020. <https://www.bankofcanada.ca/rates/related/inflation-calculator/> (accessed January 9, 2020).

[17] Armstrong P, Daly T. Exercising Choice in Long-Term Residential Care. 2017.

[18] Gillese EE. Final Report - The Long-Term Care Homes Public Inquiry. Long-Term Care Homes Public Inq 2019:1–1491. <https://longtermcareinquiry.ca/en/final-report/> (accessed September 15, 2020).

[19] Correction Chalmers I, Bracken MB, Djulbegovic B, Garattini S, Grant J, Gülmezoglu AM, et al. How to increase value and reduce waste when research priorities are set. *Lancet* 2014;383:156–65. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(13)62229-1.

[20] Tilley H, Shaxson L, Rea J, Ball L, Young J. 10 things to know about how to influence policy with research | Overseas Development Institute (ODI). Overseas Dev Inst 2017. <https://www.odi.org/publications/10671-10-things-know-about-how-influence-policy-research> (accessed September 15, 2020).

[21] Luft A. Quebec ombudsperson to investigate government COVID-19 response in long-term care facilities. CTV News 2020. <https://montreal.ctvnews.ca/quebec-ombudsperson-to-investigate-government-covid-19-response-in-long-term-care-facilities-1.4955029> (accessed November 8, 2020).

[22] Patton J. Ontario long-term care commission provides government recommendations for 2nd wave in homes. Glob News 2020. <https://globalnews.ca/news/7415491/coronavirus-ontario-ltch-commission-government-2nd-wave-coronavirus/> (accessed November 8, 2020).

[23] Johnson L. Alberta to commission third-party review of response to COVID-19. Fort McMurray Today 2020. <https://www.fortmcmurraytoday.com/news/local-news/alberta-to-commission-third-party-review-of-response-to-covid-19> (accessed November 8, 2020).

[24] The Canadian Press. Increasing pay for long-term care home workers high on agenda for Trudeau, premiers. GlobalnewsCa 2020. <https://globalnews.ca/news/6828811/coronavirus-long-term-care-workers-pay-top-up-trudeau/> (accessed November 8, 2020).

[25] Jeffords S. Ontario promises new care standard in long-term care, to be implemented by 2024-2025. GlobalnewsCa 2020. <https://globalnews.ca/news/7436416/ontario-four-hour-care-standard-long-term-care/> (accessed November 8, 2020).


[26] BC Care Providers Association. Filling the Gap: Determining Appropriate Staffing and Care Levels for Quality in Long Term Care. 2019.

[27] OECD. OECD Employment Outlook 2019: The Future of Work. Paris: OECD Publishing; 2019.

[28] The Canadian Press. Canadian troops facing risk of COVID-19 while on duty will receive hazard pay. Glob News 2020. <https://globalnews.ca/news/7088065/canada-care-homes-covid-19-hazard-pay/> (accessed November 16, 2020).

[29] Schulz E, Berlin D. European Network of Economic Policy Research Institutes Assessing Needs of Care in European Nations THE LONG-TERM CARE SYSTEM IN DENMARK. 2010.

**Figure 1:** The number of Canadian reports with LTC recommendations over the span of 1998-2020. LTC = long-term care.



**Table 1:** Report characteristics for 80 LTC reports in Canada from 1998-2020. LTC = long-term care; IQR = interquartile range

Year, n (%)	
2010-2020	32 (40.0)
<2010	48 (60.0)
Region, n (%)	
National	24 (30.0)
Ontario	31 (38.7)
British Columbia	11 (13.7)
Alberta	4 (5.0)
Manitoba	2 (2.5)
New Brunswick	2 (2.5)
Nova Scotia	2 (2.5)
Quebec	2 (2.5)
Prince Edward Island	1 (1.3)
Saskatchewan	1 (1.3)
Funding organization*, n (\$ spent)	
Federal government	9 \$4,461,570.04
Provincial government	26 \$18,270,601.07
National non-profit	13 \$389,067.54
Provincial non-profit	6 \$138,651.74
Professional association	20 \$196,888.44
Professional union	11 \$169,663.95
Research network	1 \$67,753.00
Private sector	0 0
Total cost (80 reports)	\$23,626,442.78
Report focus, n (%)	
Health system	7 (8.7)
Older adults in general	10 (12.5)
Continuing care (home care, assisted living, and LTC)	8 (10.0)
LTC only	55 (68.8)
Page count, median (IQR)	40 (20.8–84.2)
Number of contributors for report, including witnesses and consultants, median (IQR)	14 (5–26)

\*Some reports had more than 1 funding organization

**Table 2:** Recurrent recommendations in LTC reports in the years 2010-2020 (n=48). LTC = long-term care.

<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Number of reports (%)</b>	<b>Reports (see supplementary table 1 for list)</b>
<b>Funding:</b> Increase or redistribute funding to improve staffing, direct care, and capacity	32 (66.7)	1, 2, 6-12, 16, 17, 19, 21-24, 26-29, 31, 32, 34, 37, 40-44, 46-48
<b>LTC quality of care:</b> Standardize, regulate or audit LTC quality of care	28 (58.3)	1, 2, 9-12, 14, 17, 18, 20-23, 26, 27, 29, 30, 34, 35, 39, 40, 42-44, 45-48
<b>Education and training:</b> Standardize, regulate or reform education and training for LTC staff, contractors, or agency staff	25 (52.1)	2, 8, 10-12, 17, 19-21, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 32, 34, 37, 39, 41-44, 46-48
<b>Staffing mix:</b> Standardize, regulate or reform staffing mix in LTC	23 (47.9)	2, 7, 8, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 28, 29, 31, 34, 37, 39-41, 44, 46, 48
<b>Data driven:</b> Collect, standardized, or use data or evidence to improve LTC	22 (45.8)	1, 7, 9, 11, 12, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 27, 29, 30, 35, 37, 38-40, 42, 43, 46, 47
<b>Staff support:</b> Increase resources or funding for LTC staff emotional support, enhancement of well being, supporting tuition/training, supporting staff family/dependents.	16 (33.3)	2, 8, 11, 12, 16, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 26, 34, 37, 43, 44, 47
<b>Behaviours:</b> Increase support, staffing, resources, or training for patients with responsive behaviours	15 (31.3)	7, 8, 11, 12, 17, 26, 28, 32, 37, 42, 43, 46-48
<b>Federal involvement:</b> Standardize, regulate, or increase funding from the federal level	11 (22.9)	2, 6, 11, 12, 21, 23, 27, 30, 34, 40, 47
<b>For-profit homes:</b> Regulate, reduce, or reform for-profit LTC homes	11 (22.9)	1, 2, 9, 20-22, 34, 40, 46-48
<b>Critical incidents:</b> Report, track, or improve transparency about critical incidents in LTC	9 (18.8)	5, 11, 14, 21, 28, 32, 35, 43, 46
<b>Commission:</b> Appointment of a commission, task force, committee or inquiry	9 (18.8)	6, 11, 15, 31, 34, 40, 41, 43, 46,
<b>Infection control:</b> National standard for LTC infection control protocol, PPE, or staffing/visitor policies during outbreaks	5 (10.4)	2, 6, 10, 14, 46