

Cultural Competency Curriculum for Disaster Preparedness and Crisis Response

Field Test Focus Group Report

Prepared for:

Guadalupe Pacheco, Project Officer
Office of Minority Health,
Office of Public Health and Science
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services

Contract:
263-01-D-0050

Prepared by:

SRA International, Inc.

March 20, 2009

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	3
OVERVIEW OF CULTURAL COMPETENCY CURRICULUM FOR DISASTER PREPAREDNESS AND CRISIS RESPONSE (CCC-DPCR).....	3
<i>Description of the Curriculum</i>	4
PURPOSE OF FIELD TESTING	5
METHODOLOGY	6
DATA COLLECTION	6
DATA ANALYSIS.....	7
RESULTS FROM DATA ANALYSIS	8
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA	8
FOCUS GROUP FINDINGS	10
CURRICULUM FEEDBACK	11
<i>Duration and Length</i>	11
<i>Reactions</i>	11
<i>Content</i>	12
<i>Overall Usability and Design</i>	13
FEEDBACK ON SUPPORTING PIECES	13
<i>Video Vignettes</i>	14
<i>Case Studies (Fast Facts and From the Field stories)</i>	15
<i>Taking Vitals</i>	15
<i>Pre- and Post-tests</i>	16
IMPLICATIONS	16
GENERAL COMMENTS	16
AUDIENCE	17
CULTURAL COMPETENCY CONCEPTS/CLAS STANDARDS.....	17
<i>Interactions</i>	17
<i>Applicability</i>	18
OBJECTIVES	18
ACCREDITATION.....	19
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM FOCUS GROUP PARTICIPANTS	19
CURRICULUM CONTENT	19
CURRICULUM FORMAT AND TECHNOLOGY	20
SUMMARY AND NEXT STEPS	20
REFERENCES	22
REFERENCES	22
APPENDIX A: NON-ACADEMIC CCC-DPCR RECRUITMENT SCREENING QUESTIONNAIRE	23
APPENDIX B: ACADEMIC CCC-DPCR RECRUITMENT SCREENING QUESTIONNAIRE	30
APPENDIX C: CCC-DPCR CONSENT FORM FOR FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION	35
APPENDIX D: CCC-DPCR MODERATOR’S GUIDE	36

Introduction

Overview of Cultural Competency Curriculum for Disaster Preparedness and Crisis Response (CCC-DPCR)

The Cultural Competency Curriculum for Disaster Preparedness and Crisis Response (CCC-DPCR) was developed to effectively equip disaster responders in cultural and linguistic competency. The CCC-DPCR is grounded in the national disaster response structure identified in the National Response Plan (NRP) and its successor, the draft National Response Framework (NRF), as well as in the principles outlined in the National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services (CLAS) in Health Care issued by the Office of Minority Health (OMH), Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). This curriculum, designed specifically for disaster response partners, builds on the other current Office of Minority Health sponsored projects, the *Cultural Competency Curriculum Modules (CCCM)* for physicians (released in 2004), and the *Culturally Competent Nursing Modules (CCNM)* for nurses (released in 2007).

As part of its mission of "improving the health of racial and ethnic minority populations through the development of effective health policies and programs that help to eliminate disparities in health," the Office of Minority Health (OMH) commissioned the development of training curricula that would give healthcare providers resources and tools to understand and increase their knowledge of cultural competency; to develop self-awareness about attitudes, beliefs, biases, and behaviors that influence the care they provide; and to enhance their capacity to provide culturally competent care to an increasingly diverse patient population. In the aftermath of catastrophes like the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 and Hurricanes Katrina and Rita in 2005, it became apparent that minorities were disproportionately impacted and affected by disasters. At all levels of disaster response, cultural and language barriers between survivors and responders can undermine relief efforts and the effective delivery of health care, illustrating the applicability of a cultural and linguistic competency training program for disaster response partners. It is for this reason that the OMH expanded their continuing education opportunities to include persons involved in disaster preparedness and crisis response.

According to the Census, the population of the U.S. is increasing in diversity. Non-white and Hispanic ethnic and racial groups currently comprise approximately 35% of the total U.S. population (U.S. Census, 2005). Forty-seven million people aged five and over (18 percent of the population) speak a language other than English at home (Shin, 2003). The growing diversity of the U.S. brings to the forefront the importance of the provision of culturally and linguistically competent services.

Disaster response poses specific challenges in the provision of culturally and linguistically competent services to minority populations. Disaster responders encompass several professional groups that provide a variety of services to populations affected by disasters. Each of these groups may have different levels of training in cultural competence and working with minority populations. Further, during disaster response, structures and supports for culturally competent services may become limited.

Systems Research Applications International, Inc. (SRA International, Inc.) was contracted by the OMH to provide oversight in the development and testing of the Cultural Competency Curriculum for Disaster Preparedness and Crisis Response (CCC-DPCR). This training program is designed to help disaster response partners understand and increase their knowledge of issues related to cultural competency; develop self-awareness about attitudes, beliefs, biases, and behaviors that influence the response and care they provide; and to serve as a tool to enhance their capacity to provide culturally and linguistically competent services to an increasingly diverse population.

A variety of resources were used to develop the content and format of the CCC-DPCR. Needs assessment focus groups and key informant interviews were held with individuals involved in disaster preparedness and crisis response to determine the extent and necessity of such a program. A National Project Advisory Committee (NPAC) of subject matter experts was formed and their input and expertise was collected at NPAC and Consensus Building meetings to provide insight and guide the content of this training program. An extensive Environmental Scan of the literature was also conducted to provide background information on the applicability and relevance of culturally and linguistically appropriate services in disaster response preparedness. The Scan was necessary to determine if the available information provided an adequate base for developing curriculum and if so, to summarize and synthesize that information into a usable format.

In July 2008, a series of five pilot testing focus groups were conducted with 40 individuals involved in disaster preparedness and crisis response in five geographically and culturally diverse locations across the U.S. The focus group participants provided input on specific content areas to be addressed in the Cultural Competency Curriculum for Disaster Preparedness and Crisis Response and the most appropriate delivery methods for achieving the widest dissemination of the training program. Additionally, focus group participants were questioned as to their current knowledge of cultural competency; previous cultural competency-related educational courses taken; and their preferred learning format. A report was written for the Project Officer detailing the results of the Pilot Testing and outlining suggested changes based on the data collected. Following approval from the Project Officer, the changes were implemented, and the site was redesigned for Field Testing.

In February 2009, field testing of the CCC-DPCR commenced. During field testing, a series of six focus groups were conducted in five geographically and culturally diverse locations across the U.S. Forty-nine (n=49) individuals involved in disaster preparedness and crisis response took part in these focus groups. This report provides a summary of the results of the Field Test Focus Groups conducted from February 15-28, 2009.

Description of the Curriculum

The curriculum consists of four Courses. The first Course is designed to be an overview of disaster preparedness and response basics and cultural competency. The second, third, and fourth Courses are organized around the phases of a disaster: prepare, respond, and recover. The curriculum is grounded in the principals of OMH's National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services (CLAS) in Health Care issued in December 2000 (Office of Minority Health, 2001). The curriculum seeks to present the CLAS Standards' applicability outside a health care specific arena and in a disaster preparedness and crisis response setting.

Each Course consists of several modules. Each module includes:

1. Introduction to each section
2. Learning objectives
3. Text-based content
4. Video vignettes
5. Supplemental tools

The text-based content includes learning points and implications for disaster response partners. The modules also include practical examples and tools, such as self-assessment checklists, to help disaster response partners apply the information to their daily work. The list below provides a comprehensive summary of the curriculum tools included as supplementary information to the content:

- **From the Field Stories** provide real life stories that illustrate the applicability of cultural and linguistic competence to the field of disaster preparedness and crisis response.
- **Fast Facts** highlight information, research and statistics related to diversity and cultural competence issues.
- **Cultural Insights** present information and statistics about culturally diverse groups.
- **CLAS Acts** present creative ways to implement the CLAS standards.
- **Taking Vitals** include questions about the case studies and video vignettes, and allow for self-reflection.

Purpose of Field Testing

The Field Test focus groups were conducted by SRA International, Inc. for the Office of Minority Health between February 15, 2009 and February 28, 2009. The results presented here include feedback from five (5) focus groups conducted with participants recruited from the field of disaster preparedness and crisis response, and one (1) focus group conducted with participants in an academic setting from the Institute of Biosecurity at the Saint Louis University School of Public Health.

Focus group field testing of the curriculum with members of the target audience provides valuable feedback about individuals' perceptions of the curriculum, its usability, and the value of the resources and information included. It allows for further tailoring following changes implemented following pilot testing in order to determine if concerns raised at that stage were sufficiently addressed with the changes made to the program. It also allows for the opportunity to further explore whether the content presented met the course objectives. The data collected in the field testing focus groups is used to make final recommendations for revisions and improvements to the curriculum prior to its launch.

The objectives of the focus groups were to:

1. To explore participants' perceived relevance/applicability of cultural competency concepts including CLAS and the Five Elements of Cultural Competence.
2. To explore the cultural issues encountered as a part of daily interactions and the environments in which participants work.
3. To examine whether the DPCR makes participants want to learn more about the topics presented, and whether the curriculum provides a thorough explanation of the format of the program.
4. To explore participants' intentions to provide CLAS based on what is learned from the DPCR Curriculum.
5. To examine if the curriculum raises awareness and encourages self-reflection regarding the provision of CLAS.
6. To examine whether the vignettes and From the Field stories were perceived as useful for illustrating and providing culturally and linguistically appropriate services to diverse populations.
7. To examine participant's opinions on the usability and overall design of the DPCR curriculum.

Methodology

Data Collection

The six focus groups were held at the following five sites: Los Angeles, CA; Portland, OR; St. Louis, MO; Omaha, NE; and Memphis, TN. Two groups were held in St. Louis, MO and one served as the academic site, recruiting graduate students from the Institute for Biosecurity at the Saint Louis University School of Public Health. A total of 49 participants from a variety of backgrounds and work environments took part in the focus groups.

SRA International, Inc. partnered with Metro Research Services (MRS) to recruit participants using a screener developed by SRA International, Inc. and approved by the Project Officer. In addition to recruiting participants, MRS coordinated closely with SRA International, Inc. staff to organize focus group logistics, including participant food and facilities. (Copies of the non-academic and academic screeners used by MRS to recruit participants are available in Appendices A and B, respectively.)

Nine to eleven participants were recruited for each focus group in order to account for no-shows and ensure that each group had between six and nine participants. Despite recruitment efforts and sufficient screening, only five students took part in our academic focus group in St. Louis, MO. Criteria for participation, as outlined in the non-academic recruitment screener included:

- Adults between the ages of 25 and 65;
- Individuals currently working in disaster preparedness or crisis response; or worked actively in disaster preparedness and crisis response within the last two years; (exception for the academic site)
- Had no fewer than 2 years of experience working in disaster preparedness or crisis response;
- Worked routinely with at least 20% of individuals from ethnic/minority backgrounds;
- Had taken more than one continuing education course relating to the profession in the last 5 years;
- Had access to a high-speed internet connection.

Additionally, MRS was asked to recruit a variety of race/ethnicities, education levels, and approximately 50% each male and female in order to fulfill recruitment goals. Prior to each group, MRS provided SRA International staff with demographic information, including:

- Gender
- Age
- Capacity in which they work within disaster preparedness and crisis response
- Current position
- Education
- Percentage of assistance provided to minorities
- Number of years in disaster preparedness and crisis response
- Race/Ethnicity
- Number of continuing education courses taken in the last five years
- Number of cultural competency courses taken in the last five years

Recruited individuals were asked to complete the Cultural Competency Curriculum for Disaster Preparedness and Crisis Response (CCC-DPCR) prior to attending the discussion, and to record the amount of time it took them to complete each Course. Depending on the location and specialty of the group, participants received incentives in the amounts of \$175 to \$275. The incentives were offered to compensate for participant's time spent on completion of the

homework assignment and for focus group attendance. Recruited individuals were informed by facility staff that if they did not complete the homework assignment in full that they would not be able to participate in the discussion and would not be compensated for any part of their time. SRA International monitored and cross checked information regarding registration and completion of the curriculum.

Each focus group lasted approximately two hours and was attended by two staff members. One staff member served as the focus group moderator, while the other staff member served as the note-taker. The note-taker was situated behind a one-way mirror to record participant feedback. All sessions were audio recorded to allow for accurate transcription of all comments made and to ensure the accuracy of the information collected. Prior to the start of all groups, participants were informed that they were being observed and recorded, and that their feedback would be included in a report for the Office of Minority Health. Participants were also informed that no identifying information would be used in any transcriptions or reports that would be produced. All participants signed a consent form agreeing to participate in this project (see Appendix C).

Data Analysis

SRA International created verbatim transcripts of all feedback provided during the focus groups. All identifying information was removed from the transcripts so that no individual could be traced back to a specific comment. The data was then coded and analyzed to examine key and recurring themes. The feedback presented provides the basis for content revisions prior to the launch of the CCC-DPCR.

Based on the data collected and the feedback received, the results of the Field Test focus groups are organized for this report as follows:

Focus Group Findings

1. Curriculum Feedback
 - a. Duration and Length
 - b. Reactions
 - c. Content
 - d. Overall Usability and Design
2. Feedback on Supporting Pieces
 - a. Video Vignettes
 - b. Case Studies
 - c. Taking Vitals
 - d. Pre- and Post-tests

Implications

3. General Comments
4. Objectives
5. Audience
6. Cultural Competency Concepts/CLAS Standards
 - a. Interactions
 - b. Applicability
7. Accreditation

Conclusion and Recommendations

Results from Data Analysis

Demographic Data

Figure 1 presents the demographic data of the professional disaster personnel who participated in the non-academic focus groups. Figure 2 presents the demographics of the students who participated at the St. Louis academic site. A total of 44 disaster professionals participated in the non-academic pilot testing focus groups – 55% (n=24) were men, and 45% (n=20) were women. Of the five academic participants, 20% (n=1) were men, and 80% (n=4) were women.

Among the non-academic participants, the majority were 31 years of age or older; only 11% (n=5) of the non-academic participants were under 30. Not surprisingly, a larger percentage of the academic participants *were* under 30 (40%, n=2). Across the non-academic sites, 25% of participants were 31-40 years old (n=11), 32% were 41-50 years old (n=14), and 32% were 51-60 years old (n=14).

During Pilot Testing, we identified several areas for improvement in the collection of Race/Ethnicity data. Participants were not given categories from which to choose their Race/Ethnicity, and additionally, they were not asked to report both their race and ethnicity. These items may have caused inconsistency in the collection of Race/Ethnicity data during pilot testing, as there was much room for interpretation. For Field Testing, the screener was altered from Pilot Testing to obtain information on ethnicity and race separately as designated by the U.S. Census Bureau and as suggested following the Pilot Test. Despite this change, several markets did not ask the two questions separately, did not provide potential responses to participants in the format we requested, and did not provide the resulting data in the format requested. As a result, the Race/Ethnicity data from Field Testing can only provide us an overall picture of the racial/ethnic make-up of our sample, and the specific data should be interpreted loosely. Keeping this in mind, we see that 98% (n=43) of participants self-identified as Not Hispanic or Latino. Only one participant from all markets (2%) self-identified his/her ethnicity as Hispanic or Latino. With respect to race, our sample for Field Testing was overwhelmingly White, with 77% (n=34) participants self-identifying as such. Twenty percent (n=9) of participants self-identified as Black or African American, and 2% (n=1) self-identified as Other.

Among participants at the non-academic sites, nearly three-quarters (70%, n=31) had a bachelor's degree or higher. This represents an increase in educational level from Pilot Testing, where approximately half the sample had a bachelor's degree or higher. In the Field Testing sample, one participant reported having a high school diploma, six reported having completed some college, four reported having an Associate's degree, fourteen reported having a Bachelor's degree, sixteen reported having a Master's degree, and one reported having a Doctorate. The major differences in educational breakdown between Field and Pilot Testing were that for Field Testing, fewer participants reported Associate's Degrees than during Pilot Testing, and more participants reported Master's Degrees than during Pilot Testing. Among the academic participants, all were in a graduate level program, with one individual pursuing a doctorate degree.

Among the disaster professionals, 43% (n=19) had 2 to 10 years of experience working in disaster preparedness and crisis response. An additional 30% (n=13) had 11 to 20 years experience, and 27% (n=12) had over 20 years of experience. Participants with over 20 years of

experience made up a much higher percentage of this category during Field Testing (27%) than during Pilot Testing (9%).

Figure 1: Non-Academic Participant Demographic Information (N=44)

Gender	Los Angeles, CA Number	Los Angeles, CA Percent	Portland, OR Number	Portland, OR Percent	St. Louis, MO* Number	St. Louis, MO* Percent	Omaha, NE Number	Omaha, NE Percent	Memphis, TN Number	Memphis, TN Percent	Total Number	Total Percent
M	3	33%	4	57%	3	38%	6	67%	8	73%	24	55%
F	6	67%	3	43%	5	63%	3	33%	3	27%	20	45%

Age	Los Angeles, CA Number	Los Angeles, CA Percent	Portland, OR Number	Portland, OR Percent	St. Louis, MO* Number	St. Louis, MO* Percent	Omaha, NE Number	Omaha, NE Percent	Memphis, TN Number	Memphis, TN Percent	Total Number	Total Percent
21-30	1	11%	1	14%	1	13%	--	--	2	18%	5	11%
31-40	2	22%	--	--	2	25%	3	33%	4	36%	11	25%
41-50	3	33%	3	43%	4	50%	2	22%	2	18%	14	32%
51-60	3	33%	3	43%	1	13%	4	44%	3	27%	14	32%

Test

Education	Los Angeles, CA Number	Los Angeles, CA Percent	Portland, OR Number	Portland, OR Percent	St. Louis, MO* Number	St. Louis, MO* Percent	Omaha, NE Number	Omaha, NE Percent	Memphis, TN Number	Memphis, TN Percent	Total Number	Total Percent
HS Diploma	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	11%	--	--	1	2%
Some College	1	11%	1	14%	--	--	2	22%	2	18%	6	14%
Associate's Degree	--	--	--	--	2	25%	--	--	2	18%	4	9%
Bachelor's Degree	3	33%	1	14%	2	25%	4	44%	4	36%	14	32%
Master's Degree	4	44%	5	71%	4	50%	2	22%	1	9%	16	36%
Doctorate Degree	1	11%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	2%

Ethnicity	Los Angeles, CA Number	Los Angeles, CA Percent	Portland, OR Number	Portland, OR Percent	St. Louis, MO* Number	St. Louis, MO* Percent	Omaha, NE Number	Omaha, NE Percent	Memphis, TN Number	Memphis, TN Percent	Total Number	Total Percent
Hispanic or Latino	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	9%	1	2%
Not Hispanic or Latino	9	100%	7	100%	8	100%	9	100%	10	91%	43	98%

Race	Los Angeles, CA Number	Los Angeles, CA Percent	Portland, OR Number	Portland, OR Percent	St. Louis, MO* Number	St. Louis, MO* Percent	Omaha, NE Number	Omaha, NE Percent	Memphis, TN Number	Memphis, TN Percent	Total Number	Total Percent
White	6	67%	6	86%	6	75%	6	67%	10	91%	34	77%
Asian	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Black or African American	3	33%	1	14%	2	25%	2	22%	1	9%	9	20%
Native American	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Other	--	--	--	--	--	--	1	11%	--	--	1	2%

Years in Disaster Preparedness and Crisis	Los Angeles, CA Number	Los Angeles, CA Percent	Portland, OR Number	Portland, OR Percent	St. Louis, MO* Number	St. Louis, MO* Percent	Omaha, NE Number	Omaha, NE Percent	Memphis, TN Number	Memphis, TN Percent	Total Number	Total Percent

Response													
2-10	3	33%	4	57%	3	38%	3	33%	6	55%	19	43%	
11-20	3	33%	--	--	3	38%	3	33%	4	36%	13	30%	
21+	3	33%	3	43%	2	25%	3	33%	1	9%	12	27%	

% of Diverse Patients	Los Angeles, CA Number	Los Angeles, CA Percent	Portland, OR Number	Portland, OR Percent	St. Louis, MO* Number	St. Louis, MO* Percent	Omaha, NE Number	Omaha, NE Percent	Memphis, TN Number	Memphis, TN Percent	Total Number	Total Percent
Less than 20%	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
20-40%	1	11%	5	71%	3	38%	5	56%	2	18%	16	36%
40-60%	5	56%	1	14%	1	13%	4	44%	3	27%	14	32%
60-80%	3	33%	1	14%	3	38%	--	--	2	18%	9	20%
Over 80%	--	--	--	--	1	13%	--	--	4	36%	5	11%

* Non-Academic group only

Figure 2: Academic Participant Demographic Information (N=5)

Gender	St. Louis Academic Number (n=5)	St. Louis Academic Percent (n=5)
M	1	20%
F	4	80%

Age	St. Louis Academic Number (n=5)	St. Louis Academic Percent (n=5)
21-30	2	40%
31-40	--	--
41-50	2	40%
51-60	1	20%

Race	St. Louis Academic Number (n=5)	St. Louis Academic Percent (n=5)
Caucasian	4	80%
African American	1	20%

Number of Previous Cultural Competency Training Courses	St. Louis Academic Number (n=5)	St. Louis Academic Percent (n=5)
None (0)	1	20%
Minimal (1-3)	1	20%
Moderate (4-5)	3	60%
Extensive (6 or more)	--	--

Focus Group Findings

Curriculum Feedback

Duration and Length

As was the case during Pilot Testing, there was a wide variability in the amount of time it took participants to complete the CCC-DPCR curriculum for Field Testing. On average, Field Test focus group participants indicated the program took them approximately four hours to complete in full, with a range of 1.5 hours to 8 hours. Participants indicated that it took them, on average, about an hour to complete each Course, with a range of 25 minutes to 2 hours per Course. Many participants indicated that each Course took between 30 minutes and 1.5 hours to complete.

The range in time is in part attributable to differences in how individuals read the program: some skimmed for overall content and comprehension, while others read word for word. Participants for whom it took longer to complete often indicated that they spent time reading the “Fast Facts” boxes and exploring additional resources cited throughout the program. Some participants indicated that they tried to skim the program simply to get through it and to attend the group discussion.

For the most part, participants indicated that they felt the program was too long; however, a number of them indicated that they expected the program to take less time than it did, and that those expectations may have colored their perceptions of the program’s length. For example:

- “I think my expectation about how long it was supposed to be versus how long it actually was set me up to think it was too long. I thought it was supposed to be a couple hours, so it felt really long. If I had the expectation that it was supposed to take 5 hours, and it took me 4 hours, then I would have felt better about the length.”
- “For me, I felt, I was on a time crunch because I didn’t anticipate it would take that long, and it had to get it done. So I felt I was zipping through it and as a zip through, it was 3.5 to 4 hours.”

Reactions

Overall, the CCC-DPCR was more positively than negatively received. When asked if they would recommend the program to their colleagues, most participants indicated that they would, either as is or provided some changes were made. Representative comments include:

- “I [think] it’s great to have this program for the help of all the people that don’t understand a lot of English. Other people can help them in time of disaster. Misunderstandings, especially with medications and such – it’s really not good. This could save lives.”
- “I liked it a lot. And I would definitely recommend it.”

Some of the feedback included that the program was too wordy and that the text was too dense. Suggested changes included cutting back on the long paragraphs of straight text, bulleting more, highlighting major points better, and cutting back the sections which were redundant and reviews of prior material. Representative comments include:

- “For me, a few things seemed wordy. Where I guess I’m the type who looks for bullet points and more specific information. But overall the content and amount of content was appropriate.”
- “I really liked the content. If the text was organized differently, and on different pages, and reduced, I would highly recommend this, but otherwise I would hesitate.”
- “I would recommend bullet pointing some of the longer paragraphs.”

- “You would have to modify it [before I would recommend it]. Some of the applications were too oversimplified.”

Content

The content of the curriculum as a whole was generally well-received. Although several respondents thought the Course 1 was too basic or too vague, most indicated that it provided a good overview of the concepts and information presented in the rest of the program:

- “It was a good reminder of what you’re doing on a daily basis and who you’re dealing with. Sometimes that gets lost in the routine, day-to-day things.”
- “I enjoyed it because it was the whole picture.”

The self-assessment questionnaire received mixed reviews. A number of participants found it to be a valuable tool, while others did not think it was helpful in promoting self-awareness.

Course 2 received positive and negative reviews equally in all markets. Overall, the participants found the information – pertaining to, for example, communities and communication – to be applicable and relevant, but the presentation of the information to be tedious and wordy. They suggested incorporating examples of lessons learned in order to make the point more clearly.

Representative comments include:

- “It made me realize I need to make sure I’m getting everyone in my community.”
- “This gave me some good tools, like the gap analysis.”
- “Needs to be more refined. Minimize the verbiage.”

Across the board, Course 3 was very well-received. Participants found the content to be relevant and engaging. They found the just-in-time training and meeting basic needs to be particularly useful concepts, as well as the specific facts about different cultures, examples of cultural missteps, and the tools presented to facilitate interaction given a language barrier (the “I speak” cards and the Wong-Baker FACES pain rating scale). For example:

- “I thought it was terrific information for people actually doing hands-on work in communities and health issues.”
- “I liked Course 3 the best. Maybe it’s because I felt like I learned the most from it. I especially appreciated the table about cultures and their views on death and dying. I learned a lot from that. I also liked to see that the Native American population was in there.”

Comments about Course 4 indicated that the respondents found the information to be appropriate and useful but the presentation of the information generally to be mundane and repetitive. Several individuals appreciated learning more about recovery, evaluation, and (re)planning, but many noted that the Course overall did not engage them. Consequently, participants suggested that the program incorporate more case studies and interactive exercises.

Representative comments include:

- “I think that [Recovery] is one of the things that’s forgotten. We think that once the disaster is over, we’re done. There’s a lot for rebuilding, for assessment – that’s just as important, but towards the end, people forget about these shattered lives that are out there, people by themselves. It’s just as important that we follow through and people are taken care of.”
- “It was a good reminder to sit back and evaluate what we’ve done.”
- “I see Course 4 a ‘how-to.’ This is what you’ve learned and how you put it into action. So I like the idea of examples, or resource lists that we could access. That might be a place for case studies to see how people have actually done those things.”

Overall Usability and Design

Users, for the most part, indicated that they liked the overall format and design of the online CCC-DPCR. They found the program easy to navigate and logical to use, regardless of one's level of computer skill. Representative comments included:

- "For someone who isn't a computer genius at all, I found it very pleasant and easy to cope with navigating through it. You know, just as a person who doesn't spend hours [in front of a computer], I was like 'oh, I can do this.'"
- "It was easy to look at. It was laid out well."
- "It was easy to use. It was up-to-date. I haven't seen a format that was that good in a while."
- "It was easy to navigate; there wasn't a lot of scrolling or extra clicking. I thought some of the more useful information was in the links. I bookmarked them. It didn't take me away from the page since it opened in another tab. It didn't stop what I was doing. So I thought it was very easy."

Participants provided conflicting feedback regarding the left navigation bar and the multiple sections per Module and Modules per Course. Some participants were confused by or had difficulty with the left navigation bar, while others said it was easy to follow their progress with them. For instance:

- "I thought it was good. Good is how I would call it. And I could follow on the toolbar on the left where I was because it was highlighted."
- "R₁: Was there actually a table of contents saying there were going to be four (4) courses? I don't remember. R₂: It was not very clear. There was a thing on the left."
- "I didn't like [how it listed Module 1, Part 1 of 6, Part 2 of 6, etc.], but I liked where I could see my progress on the left navigation bar."
- "I would have liked to see my progress, how far I was."

Further, some expressed difficulty tracking their progress throughout each Course and throughout the full program. Some participants had trouble following where they were with the left navigation bar and multiple indications listed on every page (i.e., Course 1, Module 1, and Part 2 of 5). Respondents provided several suggestions regarding options for illustrating one's progress differently than is currently done:

- "In the left hand navigation...make it a drop down situation, so you can get a little more interactive so you can see your progress and that will help people gauge...how much time they have to spend on this."
- "I hear some people saying progress [and] you know, I saw how you could track your progress, but...my experience is that there's just a simple progress bar and it just fills gradually..."

Additionally, when probed by the moderator as to their desire for a progress bar to detail one's progress throughout each Course and the Curriculum as a whole, almost all participants indicated preference for that type of tracker as opposed to the current format.

Feedback on Supporting Pieces

As a whole, the supporting pieces (video vignettes, Fast Facts, From the Field stories, Taking Vitals, Pre- and Post- Test questions, etc.) were positively received. Participants indicated that they were a welcome way to break up the text and that it was nice to have different types of learning tools, as opposed to just reading text. When asked what would help improve the curriculum, one participant said:

- "More scenarios, more video clips. The more interactive stuff made the curriculum come to life and really show its applicability. That's where some of my greatest learning was...Those were very useful."

Video Vignettes

Most participants indicated that they liked the video vignettes, indicating that they were a useful learning tool, they reinforced the concepts presented in the course, they provided tangible examples of how to infuse cultural competency into participants' day-to-day activities, and they enhanced the information presented in the rest of the curriculum. Additionally, participants said that the videos and other supporting pieces were the parts of the curriculum which they retained the most. Representative comments include:

- "In the future when I come across a cultural competency dilemma, I will see these in my mind and think, 'oh yeah, I remember that.'"
- "It showed a tangible example. It made you think, 'How would I fix that?' It provided concrete examples and suggestions and questions you could ask and people you could go to."
- "I thought it was a good way to incorporate a different tool of learning, break up the reading."
- "I'm a visual person and I learn by seeing examples. Seeing a personal experience, I can remember it by reflecting on a similar situation that I've been in. That's the most effective to me."
- "[The deportation video and using the child to interpret] demonstrated the problem. It was a realistic situation. We see that quite frequently. It demonstrated that miscommunication can be very easy."
- "I think the vignette with the African-American woman and the FEMA dude – to me that before and after was better than maybe the rest of the course entirely. To me, that said more to me than almost anything else."

Some of the suggestions for improving the video vignettes included shortening them, providing additional scenarios which take place outside of an office or building environment, using better actors, and showing more realistic examples. Some of the comments include:

- "...when the disaster actually happens, all of [the planning] goes out the window. I don't know why, but it does. If you do those videos, then they need to look more realistic. In the field, you're going to be scrambling and yelling at each other. Make them more realistic, not in an office setting with the bigwigs sitting around the table."
- "They were enjoyable [but] they were all in the office. Have them in different locations...It might be more applicable to see someone that you can relate to, someone in your area of response."
- "...they said it was a real life situation, but obviously this isn't real. I mean, in all of the offices there were no lines...it was obviously very scripted and...it is easy to understand that way, but maybe if you made it a little more realistic. Especially after a disaster there are going to be a lot of people in offices you're not going to be able to come right up and people will be hanging out doing nothing."

A couple of the markets had discussions about the videos illustrating the right and wrong way to handle a situation, and several participants indicated that it would be helpful to see both ways illustrated in the videos. Also, a couple of the markets suggested having a DVD of the videos in case of technical difficulty or for use in group learning in order to hold a discussion about personal experiences in response to the videos or other supplemental materials.

Participants were asked for their reactions to the "decision tree" format used in the video vignettes. Some thought they were a good tool to keep participants engaged in the video and focused on the key learning points. Others indicated dislike for them, saying the correct answers were too predictable and therefore, the exercise in selecting the answer was not a useful learning tool. Some inquired whether the video showed alternate scenarios based on what answer was chosen and suggested that doing so might improve the usefulness of the decision tree as a learning tool. Representative comments regarding the decision tree included:

- "I totally loved it. I mean, I LOVED it. I was like 'oh yes!' and then 'am I right?'"
- "...I thought the questions were pretty obvious...there was one answer that was obviously it and I never really ran into a problem."
- "You could present the scenario, and have the rest of it change depending on your answers."

Case Studies (Fast Facts and From the Field stories)

Across the board, the case studies presenting real world experiences were perceived as a very positive addition to the CCC-DPCR. Participants said they were a great way to break up the text and that the cases were applicable to their roles in disaster preparedness and crisis response. Additionally, they were highlighted as realistic and tangible. Many said they were a good way to reinforce the concepts presented in the curriculum as a whole and that they enhanced the overall learning experience. Representative comments regarding the case studies included:

- "It was a nice jump from theory to reality"
- "Nice break from the text. It was a way of illustrating the point without beating us about the head with it."
- "I'd say if anything, add more of the case studies. I found them to be some of the most useful [parts of the program]."

Several participants also indicated that the case studies provided a platform for self-reflection, and helped them identify real-world situations regarding cultural competency. For instance:

- "I liked the...in the field examples...The cultural misstep [for example]. It was nice to see people...starting to make a mistake and then correcting it ...and I was thinking [about] what I would do differently. I thought those examples were good in that."
- "There were good examples of lessons learned, how mistakes could have been avoided with cultural competency."
- "I thought I was at work for a minute."

A couple of users provided suggestions for improvement on the case studies, such as incorporating more of them throughout the curriculum. Additionally, some participants indicated that they favored the stories that included an "end result" and suggested adding the end result to more stories. For instance:

- "I liked the ones where they followed up with what happened at the end. You know rather than just illustrating the point. They said 'there was a lawsuit and ...' to find out the accountability. Yeah, exactly, I liked that."

Several other markets also appreciated the variety of media throughout the program, such as the audio and video components, and participants liked having both a multi-media option and a transcript/reading option. For instance:

- "The transcript really helped [for the 911 call case study]. I just read it because I had music in the background, multitasking. I didn't listen to the stuff. I just read it."
- "I read the transcript because I couldn't hear the audio."

Lastly, we received a suggestion to add more audio features to the CCC-DPCR, including making more of the case studies auditory:

- "It would make it more interesting to have someone narrate it so you can listen or read about it. That way there's an inflection and that sort of thing. Just to make it more interesting."

Taking Vitals

Overall, the Taking Vitals questions provoked mixed reactions. Many participants disliked them, but they tended to suggest revising them rather than removing them entirely. Additionally, a

number of participants really did like them, and many felt the concept behind them was good, but the execution of the idea needed to be changed to make them a successful learning tool. For instance:

- "I thought: this is great, it breaks up the text, it makes people reflect so they learn more. You think about it and write it down, so it resonates more and you might learn more. In that sense it was good to have."
- "I thought they were useful. They were good because they made me think about what I saw in the video, and then apply when I had learned. In a couple of them, I found that I didn't learn right."
- "Some of them made me think – one of the questions was about who would you contact for help. Then I thought: well, what would I do? But then some of the questions were "did you agree with what they did" and I would just put yes. I didn't learn anything from that. I didn't have to think about it."
- "I hate little essays in the middle of taking a course. I understand that you're trying to make sure you're aware of the concepts, but [different] questions would be better..."
- "I like the concrete questions that made you think... 'what did this person do wrong?' [or] made you think about [what you would do] if you were in the situation. Not just 'Would you use this?'"

Pre- and Post-tests

Participants, for the most part, liked the pre- and post-test questions and their format. They felt the questions highlighted the key material well, and they appreciated that the pre- and post-tests tied the course material together. For example:

- "I liked that it told you what you were going to find out, and you did the pre-test and then it told you in more detail, and then you took the post-test to reiterate it. It was all tied together throughout the program."

A number of participants felt the pre- and post-test questions were not very challenging but did not indicate the lack of challenge to be a major problem. One participant cited her previous cultural competency experience, and another indicated that having the correct answers in the pretest made the post-test less challenging. Representative comments included:

- "...I kind of liked the pre-test/post-test. That was an interesting model. It isn't really challenging because you've already seen the questions, so you know what's coming and you can kind of focus. I like that."

Implications

General Comments

As indicated in the findings, the CCC-DPCR received largely positive feedback during Field Testing. Several participants said that the CCC-DPCR broadened their horizons and made them think about the components of disaster preparedness and crisis response in a new light. For instance:

- "There were some things that came out of it that I had never even thought of before...There were things that I had never realized about my organization's disaster preparedness. I thought 'this is good.' I had never given a thought about how to identify [the people who need assistance or] how to contact them."
- "...the course itself...made me realize that I had missed about 90% of my target population. All of [the different course components] played a role in bringing that to the forefront, so in that sense it achieved its purpose."
- "In my job, we do a lot...but with this I realized, there's even more we could be doing. Being prepared and proactive instead of reactive. We go into these homes, parents have

no idea what the process is or what's going on. Just being able to communicate that during that crisis is very important. We need to be more proactive. We do have an idea of the culture, but it's still important to be more proactive."

Audience

When asked who in their organization would benefit from taking a course on cultural competency, the response across all markets was nearly unanimous that everyone could benefit from such a course. This overwhelming response can be interpreted as indicative of the need for cultural competency training in the overall field of disaster preparedness and crisis response.

We received mixed feedback about for whom the CCC-DPCR is most appropriate. Some participants indicated that a certain section was particularly applicable for a specific profession, while others indicated that the same section was particularly inapplicable. A number of participants suggested that the program need to focus more on a specific target audience in order to be more applicable. We received several suggestions to have each profession receive the same core content, but be able to break the remaining content down by what would be most relevant. Representative comments included:

- "I really think it needs a target audience. I really think you need to break it down into target audience[s]. Because I can see how certain sections [would be really applicable, such as]...first responders using sections at a briefing, but our briefings are a half hour, 45 minutes. But you could take a section and say OK, this is really applicable [and concentrate on that]."
- If you want to use one course for the supervisor and the planning and the knuckle-draggers, you're going to lose the knuckle-draggers. The planning and the supervisors will be all over the wordy, and I'm not...You have to gear how you say it for each group."
- "Have the core content that everyone does, and then break down and go down a 'tree'."
- "...have some [links] especially more applicable to different audiences, so they could use them. That would be great."

The wide range of feedback received about the target audience is indicative of how the program itself was written – so that each course can build on one another, but also be taken independently of one another so as to allow different professions to focus on what is most applicable to their field. For instance, an EMT will likely find the information presented in Course 3 on responding to a disaster particularly relevant, but is not likely to find the information on preparing for a disaster as applicable. Despite concerns from some participants that certain sections were not particularly applicable to them, several participants indicated that they felt it was important to understand other professions' encounters and experiences. For instance:

- "I wouldn't do what an EMT does, but I like to know what their experiences are. It helpful to know what their experiences are. Because if I'm dealing with the mental health portion of it, I'd like to know what else the patient or client has experienced before they got me. It's just good to know and to have a well-rounded viewpoint."
- "Yeah, there's mental health, there's the emergency responders, the first responders, the different personnel...well, I liked how in all of those contexts, that you could still apply those concepts...[and] when a disaster hits, you are cutting across all fields...Those concepts, and what is culturally competent, need to be applied across settings. So, to me, it makes sense to keep it together."

Cultural Competency Concepts/CLAS Standards

Interactions

The discussion regarding participants' interactions was somewhat limited during the Field Test focus groups. However, the focus group participants indicated working with diverse populations,

specifically citing large Hispanic and African-American communities. When asked about the individuals served, responses included:

- "I come across all types of ethnicity on a day-to-day basis."
- "I work in a community-based clinic, so our clientele is lower-income, usually with no insurance, a wide range of populations. I would say it's 50% white and 50% other, because it varies."

Participants discussed the effect the curriculum and the cultural competency concepts presented has and had on their daily and past interactions:

- "When I worked with a family from Bosnia, they offered me coffee and I didn't take it. That was wrong, and I kept thinking about that. If I had had this information before, I wouldn't have done that."
- "It makes me more aware of the differences I see."
- "Made me more aware of how diverse everything is."
- "In the planning aspect, you have to make sure you have access to this, that everyone is exposed to it. As things continue to grow and change, you have to be more sensitive and more aware."

Participants also discussed how the course provided them with an understanding of the importance of applying cultural competency concepts during a disaster:

- "I would say [to my colleagues]: you can be involved in some aspect of disaster preparedness and crisis response, but unless you take something like this [program], you might not realize until a disaster that there's a significant number of your community that you might miss because of cultural issues."
- "Lots of people don't think about this stuff. When you travel, you realize that there are people who don't think how you think. Now you have to think like they think. It takes a whole different thought process. You have to be open to that. The whole course thing – if you take it in your mind, you understand what they're looking for. You have to think like they think; put yourself in their shoes..."

Applicability

Focus group participants throughout the markets discussed how the program allowed them to realize the applicability of culturally and linguistically appropriate services and cultural competency concepts to themselves and their roles in disaster preparedness and crisis response.

Representative comments included:

- "I thought it was great because I thought it helped me think about the fact that even though I am a minority, other minorities have different perspectives."
- "[For me], I felt that it was pretty basic and common sense, but then I was thinking about people I work with who have not been in other cultures. They live in a certain area; they only deal with a certain race and religion. So there are a lot of people who would benefit...But also – it also though made me think of stuff that I don't do. There was stuff to learn."
- "Going into it, I was thinking – ok what is this going to teach me? I've had a lot of experience with different cultures, living in different neighborhoods. Some of it was familiar, but some of it – especially the Native American part, the parts about people who are specifically from another country versus being American with that heritage – was really interesting to me."

Objectives

Overall, feedback received from the Field Test focus groups indicated that the objectives for Field Testing were met. As discussed in the findings section, many participants indicated that the curriculum raised their awareness regarding the necessity of cultural and linguistic competency

within disaster preparedness and crisis response. Participants, for the most part, noted the relevance and applicability of cultural competency concepts, although for many, the specifics of the Five Elements of Cultural Competence were not retained.

As noted in the findings, the Field Test focus groups provided a suitable platform for exploration of participants' intentions to provide culturally and linguistically appropriate services after having taken the curriculum. As was the case in Pilot Testing, the video vignettes and case studies were perceived as a useful way of illustrating the provision of culturally and linguistically appropriate services to diverse populations and participants requested that more videos and case studies be added.

Overall, participants noted that the online platform was generally easy to use. They preferred that the program include more interactive components and made suggestions for breaking up long paragraphs of text to make it more visually appealing and engaging.

Accreditation

When asked how many credit hours would be appropriate for this training course, most participants indicated that they thought it should be accredited for approximately the same number of hours that it took them to complete: on average 4 to 6 credit hours, with each course worth 1 to 1.5 continuing education credits. However, a number of participants indicated they thought it should be worth more, with a range of 4 to 8 hours being cited and with numerous participants saying it should be worth 8 hours. Several participants also indicated that if the training was free that they would take a longer course or take more credit hours. Further, participants indicated that 4 to 6 continuing education credit hours would be appropriate for their continuing education needs.

Conclusion and Recommendations from Focus Group Participants

Recommendations from focus group participants for curriculum revisions are presented below. Content specific revisions are presented in one section, while formatting and technological revisions are presented in another.

Curriculum Content

As was the case in pilot testing, many recommendations received from the focus groups centered on ways to break up the text, as the curriculum was perceived to be too long and too dense. Users requested, as they did in the pilot testing, that the program be even more interactive. As was the case in pilot testing, the supporting pieces (i.e., videos, case studies, etc.) were very positively received, and participants continued to request more be added.

- Reduce density and shorten
 - Use more bulleting
 - Highlight the key points by decreasing the amount of text/narrative and increase visual elements
 - Cut down on sections which review/re-iterate the same information throughout the program; much of the program was perceived as repetitive
- Add more visual elements
 - More charts, graphs, diagrams, and graphics
 - Use pictures to put a face on what is being discussed
- Increase the practicality of what is presented
 - Add more case studies and real-life stories; include failures as well

- Increase the interactivity of the curriculum
 - Offer audio option for all of the case studies (From the Field stories), rather than just the 911 call
 - Consider offering a DVD of the videos or creating tools for facilitated small group sessions to allow for discussions and sharing of ideas (Note: tools for facilitated sessions were suggested by NPAC members, as well)
- Condense Five Elements of Cultural Competency information
 - Reduce the number of times referring to specific Elements of Cultural Competency and include better reference back to the list as a sidebar or inclusion on every page (participants did not retain the information and several indicated frustration at constantly being asked to regurgitate something they didn't see the applicability of)
- Elaborate on the cultural information presented
 - Including religion and other aspects of culture consistently throughout, as opposed to only in the definitions at the beginning of the curriculum

Curriculum Format and Technology

Several participants commented that the program was user-friendly, they liked the structure, and they liked that you could easily navigate back. Suggestions for improvement and changes included:

- Increase the font size and make length of pages more consistent
- Add more visuals/graphics/bullets to break the text up further
- Case Studies/From the Field stories
 - Add more case studies
 - Add audio component to all case studies/From the Field stories to allow for the choice between listening and reading
- Revise Taking Vitals
 - Remove closed-ended questions – they were not perceived as helpful
 - Alter the pop-up confirmation message to bump participants to the next page: participants continued to have difficulty with the confirmation pop-up, and having to scroll to the end of the page after submitting them in order to advance to the next page
 - Consider removing the questions following the video vignettes: for the most part these were not perceived as a helpful avenue for self-reflection
 - Remove repetitious questions
 - Make questions more self-reflective (i.e., how would you have handled this situation?)
 - Include a disclaimer/informational message regarding how the information will be used and confidentiality
 - Provide participants with the ability to by-pass subsequent questions if they indicate that the first is not applicable to them

Summary and Next Steps

Overall, participants felt that the curriculum contained a lot of good information, but for the most part indicated that there was too much of it, and that it was too dense, too repetitive, and that the main points were not highlighted sufficiently. Feedback from the focus groups revealed that the curriculum needs to be made less dense in order to make it stronger and more applicable to our target audiences. Perhaps the most important finding from the field test focus groups is that many participants would recommend the curriculum in its current form, but that quite a few more said they would absolutely recommend it if just a few things were changed (such as density, bulleting, etc.).

The National Project Advisory Committee (NPAC) was consulted regarding the final revisions and their feedback will be included in revisions made at this stage. Concurrent with field testing focus group sessions, members of the NPAC were provided the opportunity to review and provide commentary on the curriculum through the use of a brief survey tool designed using *SurveyMonkey.com*. The feedback received from the NPAC mirrored that received from the Field Test focus group participants. Many of the specific suggested changes, (such as reducing the amount of text and bulleting more), were echoed by NPAC members. Additionally, NPAC members had overall positive comments about the curriculum in its current form, and indicated this to be a substantial improvement from pilot testing. Representative comments from NPAC members included:

- "I thought this was a substantive improvement over the last versions. The content was better, more clearly stated, and the material overall was better written and organized."
- "I feel very good about having been associated with the project and I often become quite judgmental when papers appear logical, academically strong, but are disconnected from real-world disaster contingencies."
- "The curriculum should be offered as a requirement for several government agencies involved in disasters."

The positive reactions from the NPAC, as well as those received from the focus group participants, are indicative that the changes made from pilot testing had a positive impact; however, there are still additional changes which can improve the program prior to its launch. We recommend the following changes be made to enhance the curriculum prior to its launch. Approval of these recommended changes will ensure that the product launched by the OMH this summer is in concert with the other OMH flagship cultural competency programs and is responsive to feedback gathered from both the Field Testing participants and the NPAC.

Recommendations	Project Officer Approval (Y/N)
Increase the font size and make length of pages more consistent	
Add more visuals/graphics/bullets to break the text up further	
Add more case studies	
Add audio component to all case studies/From the Field stories to allow for the choice between listening and reading	
Cut down on sections which review/re-iterate the same information throughout the program	
Highlight the key points by decreasing the amount of narrative text and replacing with bulleted information	
Revise the Taking Vitals questions to remove repetitious and closed ended questions and make the remaining questions more self-reflective	
Consider removing the Taking Vitals questions following the video vignettes (but keeping them throughout the rest of the program): for the most part those following the videos were not perceived as a helpful avenue for self-reflection	

References

Office of Minority Health (OMH). (2001). *National Standards for Culturally and Linguistically Appropriate Services (CLAS): Final report*. Rockville, MD: Department of Health and Human Services. Retrieved March 4, 2009, from <http://www.omhrc.gov/assets/pdf/checked/finalreport.pdf>.

Shin, H. (2003). *Language use and English-speaking ability: 2000*. Census 2000 Brief. U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration. Retrieved March 4, 2009, from <http://www.census.gov/prod/2003pubs/c2kbr-29.pdf>.

U.S. Census Bureau (2005). *United States Census 2000: Redistricting data (Public Law 94-171) Summary File*. Washington, DC: Economics and Statistics Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce. Retrieved March 4, 2009, from <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2000/doc/pl94-171.pdf>.

Appendix A: Non-academic CCC-DPCR Recruitment Screening Questionnaire

Location:

Los Angeles, CA Omaha, NE Portland, OR
 St. Louis, MO Memphis, TN

Date: _____ Gratuity (2 hour group): TBD

Name _____
Street Address _____
City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____
Home Phone: () _____ Work Phone: () _____
Cell Phone: () _____ Fax: () _____
Email: _____

How would you like to receive your confirmation letter?

Mail Email Fax

TO BE ASKED AT THE CONCLUSION OF SCREENING:

Are you currently scheduled for any other market research studies, including focus groups?

Yes, **SEE SUPERVISOR** No, **CONTINUE**

Do you know anyone else coming to this focus group?

Yes, **SEE SUPERVISOR** No, **CONTINUE**

PLEASE REMEMBER TO BRING A PICTURE ID WITH BIRTHDATE FOR REGISTRATION

**GIVE PHONE NUMBER OF FACILITY _____
PARTICIPANTS WILL BE CALLED THE DAY BEFORE TO CONFIRM THEIR ATTENDANCE**

**CONFIRMATION LETTER SENT AND INCLUDES URL ADDRESS FOR TESTING AND
REMINDER TO RECORD TIME IT TOOK TO COMPLETE EACH COURSE?**

DATE _____

REMINDER PHONE CALL MADE AND INCLUDES URL ADDRESS FOR TESTING?

DATE _____

Assumptions for each location:

- Recruit to get between 6-9 participants (across all five locations). Over-recruit 2 participants for each testing group in anticipation of no-shows. Recruitment total=30-45 participants.
- Recruit adults (ages 25-65), currently working in disaster preparedness or crisis response or worked actively in disaster preparedness and crisis response within the last two years, work routinely with at least 20% of patients from ethnic/minority backgrounds, mix of race/ethnicity, mix of education levels, and mix of gender to fulfill recruitment goals.

READ

Hello, this is _____. I am calling from Metro Research Services, a national market research company. We have been hired to speak with disaster response partners in your area and this will only take a few minutes. Please be assured that we are not selling anything—we are only interested in your opinions. No salesperson will call on you as a result of this survey.

If you are interested in participating, and you meet the requirements, we will invite you to come for a discussion group at (**INSERT LOCATION**). The group will meet for about two hours and you will be compensated for your time.

Before the group discussion, you will be asked to review an online disaster preparedness and crisis response training program that emphasizes cultural competency and record **how long it took you to complete each Course** (please emphasize that it is very important that each participant record this information as they are completing the curriculum). Then at the group discussion we will ask for your opinions about the online program. We will use what we learn from these group discussions to revise and improve upon the online continuing education curriculum for cultural competency in disaster preparedness and crisis response.

May I ask you a few questions? **IF YES, GO TO Q1. IF NO, THANK AND END.**

If needed, explain further: Since we need to include people who are a mix of different backgrounds and experiences, there are some requirements that I have to check on for all the people we bring in to participate in the group discussion. I need to ask you a few questions to see if you meet participant requirements.

Date _____ Time _____

1. **RECORD SEX**

Female _____ (**CONTINUE**)

Male _____ (**CONTINUE**)

(TRY AND RECRUIT APPROXIMATELY 50% MALE/50% FEMALE)

2. We would like to get a range of age groups for the focus group. Would you please state your age? **RECORD RESPONSE.**

(NOTE: IF UNDER 25 THANK AND END SCRIPT A or if 66 or older THANK AND END SCRIPT A)

3. In what capacity do you work in Disaster Preparedness and Crisis Response? **READ LIST. PLEASE STOP ME WHEN I MENTION YOUR ROLE/CAPACITY. RECRUIT MIX.**

____ Emergency Medical Services Personnel (EMS, paramedic, etc.)
(CONTINUE)

____ Fire Department **(CONTINUE)**

____ Law Enforcement **(CONTINUE)**

____ General Medical Personnel (doctor, nurse, etc.) **(CONTINUE)**

____ Emergency Management **(CONTINUE)**

____ Volunteer **(IF YES, PLEASE SPECIFY ORGANIZATION)**

If yes, specify if Citizen Corps, FBO, CBO, etc.

____ American Red Cross **(CONTINUE)**

____ Uniformed Public Health Service (Commissioned Corps)
(CONTINUE)

____ Military **(CONTINUE)**

____ Mental Health Professional (Social Worker, Psychologist,
Psychiatrist) **(CONTINUE)**

____ Public Health Professional **(CONTINUE)**

____ Other **(PLEASE DESCRIBE—IF NOT A DISASTER RESPONSE
PARTNER, THANK AND END SCRIPT A)**

4. Please tell me your current position title. **RECORD RESPONSE.**

5. What is the highest level of education that you have completed? **READ LIST. PLEASE STOP ME WHEN I GET TO THE CORRECT RESPONSE.**

____ No degree

____ Some high school

____ High school diploma

____ Some college

____ Associate's degree

____ Bachelor's degree

____ Master's degree

____ Doctorate degree

____ Other

6. Do you have access to a high-speed (DSL, cable modem, broadband) Internet connection?

____ YES **(CONTINUE AND GO TO Q.5)**

____ NO **(THANK AND END SCRIPT A)**

7. In your current disaster preparedness and/or crisis response setting, what percent of patients that you typically care for are from ethnic/minority backgrounds? **(IF NEEDED EXPLAIN FURTHER-- AFRICAN AMERICAN, HISPANIC, ASIAN-AMERICAN, NATIVE HAWAIIAN, AMERICAN INDIAN) READ LIST. PLEASE STOP ME WHEN I GET TO THE CORRECT PERCENT.)**

<Less than 20% (**THANK AND END SCRIPT A**)
 >20% but less than 40% (**CONTINUE**)
 > 40% but less than 60% (**CONTINUE**)
 > 60% but less than 80% (**CONTINUE**)
 > 80 % (**CONTINUE**)

8. How long have you been working in disaster preparedness and crisis response?
READ LIST. PLEASE STOP ME WHEN I MENTION THE CORRECT YEARS.

< 2 Years (**THANK AND END SCRIPT A**)
 2-10 Years (**CONTINUE**)
 11-20 Years (**CONTINUE**)
 > 20 Years (**CONTINUE**)

9. We are hoping to get a diverse mix of participants for our focus groups and ask the following questions about race/ethnicity based on the U.S. Census Bureau classifications.

What is your ethnicity? (**RECORD RESPONSE. RECRUIT MIX.**)

Hispanic or Latino
 Not Hispanic or Latino

What is your race? (**RECORD RESPONSE. RECRUIT MIX.**)

American Indian or Alaska Native
 Asian
 Black or African American
 Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
 White
 Some other race

_____ (record response)

10. How many continuing education courses related to your profession have you taken in the last five years?

0 or 1 (**THANK AND END SCRIPT A**)
 2 or more (**CONTINUE**)

11. How many cultural competency continuing education courses or training courses have you attended in the last five years? **RECORD RESPONSE. GO TO INVITATION.** _____

INVITATION IF INDIVIDUAL MEETS RECRUITING CRITERIA

Thank you for answering all of my questions. You are eligible to participate in the discussion group. Are you available to attend a discussion group at _____ (**INSERT LOCATION**) _____ (**INSERT DATE and TIME**) for about two hours? As a token of appreciation for helping us in our research efforts, you will receive a gratuity of _____ (**INSERT AMOUNT**).

**RECORD INFORMATION ON THE FRONT PAGE
PROVIDE TELEPHONE NUMBER**

END SCRIPT A FOR THOSE PEOPLE WHO DO NOT MEET SELECTION CRITERIA

Thank you very much for answering my questions. As I said earlier, we are trying to recruit people who meet certain criteria. Unfortunately, you have not met these requirements. I appreciate your taking the time to speak with me and I hope you have a good day.

END SCRIPT B FOR THOSE PEOPLE WHO DO NOT MEET SELECTION CRITERIA

Thank you very much for answering my questions. As I mentioned earlier, we are trying to recruit people from different backgrounds and work experiences. It looks like you are eligible to participate but right now we already have enough people in our study with backgrounds similar to yours. Can we contact you in the future in case we have any cancellations? ***IF RESPONDENT SAYS YES RECORD RESPONDENT'S INFORMATION ON THE FRONT PAGE AND GIVE PHONE NUMBER. IF NO, THANK AND END.***

Appendix B: Academic CCC-DPCR Recruitment Screening Questionnaire

Location:
Date:
Gratuity: TBD

Name _____
Street Address _____
City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____
Home Phone: () _____ Work Phone: () _____
Cell Phone: () _____ Fax: () _____
Email: _____

How would you like to receive your confirmation letter?

Mail Email Fax

PLEASE REMEMBER TO BRING A PICTURE ID WITH BIRTHDATE FOR REGISTRATION

**GIVE PHONE NUMBER OF FACILITY _____
PARTICIPANTS WILL BE CALLED THE DAY BEFORE TO CONFIRM THEIR ATTENDANCE**

**CONFIRMATION LETTER SENT AND INCLUDES URL ADDRESS FOR TESTING AND
REMINDER TO RECORD TIME IT TOOK TO COMPLETE EACH COURSE?
DATE _____**

**REMINDER PHONE CALL MADE AND INCLUDES URL ADDRESS FOR TESTING?
DATE _____**

Assumptions for each location:

- Recruit to get 6-9 participants. Over-recruit 2 participants in anticipation of no-shows.
- Recruit individuals who are currently enrolled in a program (Master of Science, MPH, or graduate certificate) at the St Louis University School of Public Health Institute for Biosecurity. Try and recruit a gender and ethnic mix.

READ

Hello, this is _____. I am working on behalf of the Department of Health and Human Services Office of Minority Health. We are interested in talking to students and this will only take a few minutes. Please be assured that we are not selling anything—we are only interested in your opinions. No salesperson will call on you as a result of this survey.

If you are interested in participating, and you meet the requirements, we will invite you to come for a discussion group at (**INSERT LOCATION**). The group will meet for about two hours and you will be compensated for your time.

Before the group discussion, you will be asked to review an online cultural competency disaster preparedness and crisis response training program and record **how long it took you to complete each Course** (please emphasize that it is very important that each participant record this information as they are completing the curriculum). Then at the group discussion we will ask for your opinions about the online program. We will use what we learn from these group discussions to revise and improve upon the online continuing education curriculum for cultural competency in disaster preparedness and crisis response.

May I ask you a few questions? **IF YES, GO TO Q1. IF NO, THANK AND END.**

If needed, explain further: Since we need to include people who are a mix of different backgrounds and experiences, there are some requirements that I have to check on for all the people we bring in to participate in the group discussion. I need to ask you a few questions to see if you meet participant requirements.

Date _____ Time _____

11. **RECORD SEX**

Female _____ (**CONTINUE**)

Male _____ (**CONTINUE**)

(TRY AND RECRUIT APPROXIMATELY 50% MALE/50% FEMALE)

12. We would like to get a range of age groups for the focus group. Would you please state your age? **RECORD RESPONSE. (NOTE: IF UNDER 22, PLEASE THANK AND END SCRIPT)**

13. Are you currently enrolled in a graduate program in the St. Louis University School of Public Health Institute for Biosecurity? **RECORD RESPONSE.**

Yes (IF YES, GO TO Q4)

No (IF NO, PLEASE THANK AND END SCRIPT)

14. Do you have an interest in Cultural Competency and Its Relation to Emergency Preparedness and Disaster Response?

Yes (**CONTINUE AND GO TO NEXT QUESTION**)

No (**THANK AND END SCRIPT A**)

15. Have you taken any courses in Emergency Preparedness, Disaster Response, Risk Communication, etc.? (**RECORD RESPONSE AND CONTINUE TO Q6**)

Yes

No

16. Do you have access to a high-speed (DSL, cable modem, broadband) Internet connection?

YES (**CONTINUE AND GO TO Q7**)

NO (**THANK AND END SCRIPT A**)

17. We are hoping to get a diverse mix of participants for our focus groups and ask the following questions about race/ethnicity based on the U.S. Census Bureau classifications.

What is your ethnicity? (**RECORD RESPONSE. RECRUIT MIX.**)

Hispanic or Latino

Not Hispanic or Latino

What is your race? (**RECORD RESPONSE. RECRUIT MIX.**)

American Indian or Alaska Native

Asian

Black or African American

Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander

White

Some other race

_____ (record response)

18. How many cultural competency courses, either in your graduate program or outside of it, have you attended or taken in the last five years? **RECORD RESPONSE. GO TO INVITATION.**

INVITATION IF INDIVIDUAL MEETS RECRUITING CRITERIA

Thank you for answering all of my questions. You are eligible to participate in the discussion group. Are you available to attend a discussion group at **(INSERT LOCATION)** on **(INSERT DATE)** at **(INSERT TIME)**? As a token of appreciation for helping us in our research efforts, you will receive a gratuity of **(INSERT AMOUNT)**.

**RECORD INFORMATION ON THE FRONT PAGE
PROVIDE TELEPHONE NUMBER**

END SCRIPT A FOR THOSE PEOPLE WHO DO NOT MEET SELECTION CRITERIA

Thank you very much for answering my questions. As I said earlier, we are trying to recruit people who meet certain criteria. Unfortunately, you have not met these requirements. I appreciate your taking the time to speak with me and I hope you have a good day.

END SCRIPT B FOR THOSE PEOPLE WHO DO NOT MEET SELECTION CRITERIA

Thank you very much for answering my questions. As I mentioned earlier, we are trying to recruit people from different backgrounds and work experiences. It looks like you are eligible to participate but right now we already have enough people in our study with backgrounds similar to yours. Can we contact you in the future in case we have any cancellations? ***IF RESPONDENT SAYS YES RECORD RESPONDENT'S INFORMATION ON THE FRONT PAGE AND GIVE PHONE NUMBER.***

IF NO, THANK AND END.

Appendix C: CCC-DPCR Consent Form for Focus Group Discussion

Purpose

The Office of Minority Health (OMH) at the Department of Health and Human Services is working to develop an online cultural competency training program tailored to personnel involved in disaster preparedness and crisis response. As part of the curriculum development process, we are conducting focus groups with disaster personnel throughout the country. We would like to know about your opinions about the online training program, specifically with respect to its content and usability.

Estimated Time Required

This discussion group will take approximately 2 hours.

Risks of Participating in the Focus Group

There is no expected risk of participating in this focus group.

Benefits of Participating in the Focus Group

By taking part in this discussion, you have the opportunity to help shape the Office of Minority Health's cultural competency training program for disaster personnel. To thank you for your participation, we will provide you with a monetary incentive.

Confidentiality

Everything you tell us will be kept private. We will not give your name to anyone else. We will be taking notes and audiotaping the group to make sure we do not miss anything important that you may say.

More Information

For more information about this project, you may contact Ilana Dickman at (240) 514-2721, or via email at Ilana_Dickman@sra.com.

Informed Consent

I have read and understand the information regarding my participation in this discussion group about cultural competency and emergency/disaster response.

Print Your Name: _____

Signature: _____ Date: _____

APPENDIX D: CCC-DPCR MODERATOR'S GUIDE

Stage Setting

Introduction: Pre-Housekeeping Activities

Description: The purpose of this module is to prepare participants for the session ahead.

Time: 5 minutes

Theme: Upon successful completion of this module participants will:

- Sign-in/Complete Incentive Paperwork
- Complete name tags & table tents
- Be ready to discuss the Cultural Competency Curriculum for Disaster Preparedness and Crisis Response

Logistics:

Consent Forms

Name tags/Table tents

Incentive Checks (provided by MRS)

Small Table Clock for the Moderator

Pads/Paper/Flipcharts

Minimum of 12 pens/pencils

Audio-recording Equipment

Laptop with cord to take notes; seat for recorder

Handouts (CLAS Standards, Models, Self-assessment exercise)

Food/Snacks for participants as appropriate

As participants arrive, Metro Research Services/Focus Group Facility staff will show them where to get refreshments, explain the consent form, ask if they have any questions, and have participants sign the consent form. A copy of the consent form will be provided upon participant request.

**CULTURAL COMPETENCY CURRICULUM FOR DISASTER
PREPAREDNESS AND CRISIS RESPONSE (CCCDPCR)
Moderator's Guide**

Once they get their food and come into the meeting room, the Moderator will ask participants to write their name on the name tag/table tent. While they wait for everyone to get settled into their seats, the Moderator will remind them that the session will start promptly at **TBD**.

Start as close to **TBD** as possible - do not wait for late arrivals.

**CULTURAL COMPETENCY CURRICULUM FOR DISASTER
PREPAREDNESS AND CRISIS RESPONSE (CCCDPCR)
Moderator's Guide**

Introduction

Discussion Guide: Housekeeping Activities

Description: The purpose of this module is to outline the parameters of the focus group, introduce participants, and identify the themes that will be explored during the session.

Time: 10 minutes

Theme: Upon successful completion of this module participants will:

- Know the name of the moderator, the other participants, and their specialties
- The rules of conduct
- The goals of the focus group

Moderator

- Hello, thank you for being here and for making the time to participate in this group discussion. My name is: <<INSERT NAME>> and I am the Moderator for today's discussion.
- Affiliation—I work for SRA International, Inc., which is a systems and research company located in the Washington, DC area. We are currently supporting an Office of Minority Health/DHHS funded project to create continuing education materials that will be used as part of a training program in disaster preparedness and crisis response.
- Before we get started, I would like to go over a few pieces of information and some ground rules with you.
- Ground Rules: Location of bathrooms.
- Cell phone pager/off or vibrate.
- Cell phone pager/off or vibrate.
- Speak in a voice at least as loud as mine.

**CULTURAL COMPETENCY CURRICULUM FOR DISASTER
PREPAREDNESS AND CRISIS RESPONSE (CCCDPCR)
Moderator's Guide**

- Avoid side conversations. We are interested in all of your ideas, and others in the group may get ideas just from listening to yours.
- This is an open discussion and there are no wrong answers; all of your experiences are important in helping to understand the value of the curriculum.
- We want everyone to participate equally.
- If it seems that some questions are repetitive it is because we need to make certain that all the elements within the curriculum are thoroughly explored.
- Because we have a lot to discuss I may have to move quickly to a new topic. If I do, I don't mean to cut anyone off or prevent someone from voicing their opinion.
- Everything said in this room should stay in this room; please be respectful of each others' opinions.
- Take breaks if needed; however, I ask that only one person leave at a time.
- Disclosures: We are audiotaping today's session to capture all your comments. No one will be identified; no names will be used.
- We will be writing a report for our client at the Office of Minority Health, Department of Health and Human Resources. No one's name will be mentioned in the report.
- **ASK:** Ask participants to give their first names, what they do (profession), and tell how long they've been in the field of disaster preparedness and crisis response.
- State why participants are here: **"You are here today so we can get your feedback on the Cultural Competency Curriculum for Disaster Preparedness and Crisis Response."**

**CULTURAL COMPETENCY CURRICULUM FOR DISASTER
PREPAREDNESS AND CRISIS RESPONSE (CCCDPCR)
Moderator's Guide**

- Our goal is to gather as much information as possible regarding the Cultural Competency Curriculum for Disaster Preparedness and Crisis Response.
- We want to figure out which parts of the curriculum are most valuable and which may need to be changed.
- I'd like to review the Goals for our discussion with you:
 - **To explore participants' perceived relevance/applicability of cultural competency concepts including CLAS and the Five Elements of Cultural Competence.**
 - **To explore the cultural issues encountered as a part of daily interactions and the environments in which participants work.**
 - **To examine whether the DPCR makes participants want to learn more about the topics presented, and whether the curriculum provides a thorough explanation of the format of the program.**
 - **To explore participants' intentions to provide CLAS based on what is learned from the DPCR Curriculum.**
 - **To examine if the curriculum raises awareness and encourages self-reflection regarding the provision of CLAS.**
 - **To examine whether the vignettes and From the Field stories were perceived as useful for illustrating and providing culturally and linguistically appropriate services to diverse populations.**
 - **To examine participant's opinions on the usability and overall design of the DPCR curriculum.**

Cultural and Linguistic Competency

Discussion Guide: First Impressions and Overview
Part 1

Description: The purpose of this module is to gain insight to participants' first impressions of the CCC-DPCR, whether it held their attention, and their feedback regarding length and applicability of the program.

Time: 10 minutes

Theme: Upon successful completion of this module participants will talk through the following activities:

- Discuss their initial reaction to the program
- Discuss how long it took to complete and whether the length was appropriate
- Discuss their opinions regarding the applicability of the program and whether it held their attention.

GENERAL SECTION

1. **ASK:** How long did it take you to complete the Curriculum?
 - Each Course?
2. **ASK:** How did you feel about the length of the Curriculum?
 - Was the length appropriate?
 - Too long?
 - Too short?
 - Just right.
3. **ASK:** How well did the Curriculum keep your interest?
4. **ASK:** Did each section make you want to continue to the next course?
 - If not, what changes could we make to encourage you to go on to the next section?
 - If yes, was there a specific component that made you want to continue?
5. **ASK:** Was the information presented in the curriculum applicable to your role in disaster preparedness and crisis response?

**CULTURAL COMPETENCY CURRICULUM FOR DISASTER
PREPAREDNESS AND CRISIS RESPONSE (CCCDPCR)
Moderator's Guide**

- If no, was it more applicable to another role within the field? (EMS/First Responder, public health professional, mental health professional, emergency manager, etc.)
- Which sections were more/less applicable? (CC and Disaster Basics, Prepare, Respond, Recover, etc.)

**CULTURAL COMPETENCY CURRICULUM FOR DISASTER
PREPAREDNESS AND CRISIS RESPONSE (CCCDPCR)
Moderator's Guide**

Overall Usability

Discussion Guide: Overall Usability, Navigation and Ease of Use
Part 2

Description: The purpose of this module is to gain participants' opinions about the CCC-DPCR navigability and ease of use, as well as their reactions to the online CCC-DPCR experience.

Time: 15 minutes

Theme: Upon successful completion of this module participants will:

- Provide feedback on the usability and overall appearance of the online CCC-DPCR.
- Continue to discuss their reactions to the program
- Discuss their reaction to the Resource Library
- Discuss their opinions on the program and whether they would recommend it to others

Moderator

SAY: Let's talk a moment about your thoughts on the appearance and ease of use of navigating through the online training program.

1. **ASK:** Was it appealing—in what ways?
 - What did you think of the colors used? The headers? The banners? The text boxes?
2. **ASK:** Did you have any problems viewing the courses, going back to look for information, etc.?
3. **ASK:** How many of you noticed that there was a Resource Library feature?

SAY: The Resource Library provides information on:

- Cultural and Linguistic Laws, Policies and Initiatives
- Community Engagement

**CULTURAL COMPETENCY CURRICULUM FOR DISASTER
PREPAREDNESS AND CRISIS RESPONSE (CCCDPCR)
Moderator's Guide**

- Communicating Risk
 - Working with the Media
 - Preparing Response Teams
 - Collaborating with Other Agencies
 - Glossary of Terms
4. **ASK:** How many of you used the Resource Library?
- Tell me about your experience in using this feature.
 - What resources or tools did you access in the Resource Library?
 - Is there anything you hoped to find here but didn't?
5. **ASK:** How did you find the overall online experience in viewing the training program?
6. **ASK:** After completing the program, would you recommend it to your colleagues?
7. **ASK:** What would you say to your colleagues about the Curriculum?
- Probe: Provided new information, found Site easy to use, was full of information that can be used in daily practice, etc.
8. **ASK:** How much time do you think you should be provided for the training?
9. **ASK:** Would you take a longer course on cultural competency if you could get free continuing education credits for it?

CCC-DPCR Curriculum Content Review

Discussion Guide: CCC-DPCR Content Review Part 3

Description: The purpose of this module is to gain participants' reactions to the CCC-DPCR content and determine how the information presented may be used in their day-to-day preparedness and crisis response efforts.

Time: 35 minutes

Theme: Upon successful completion of this module participants will:

- Discuss their first impression and what they liked and disliked about each of the courses
- Describe what new information they learned and how it could be applied in their day-to-day preparedness and crisis response efforts
- Discuss the relevance of the material to disaster preparedness and crisis response
- Provide feedback on any recommended modifications for each of the courses

Moderator

We are now going to get into the content of the curriculum. Some of the questions may seem repetitive, but it is because we're trying to get your feedback on the specifics of each part of the Program. So to start with, let's talk about Course 1.

Activity - Go around the table.

NOTE: May want to write section headings on the flip chart prior to the group

COURSE 1

SAY: As a refresher, Course 1 provides an overview of cultural competency concepts and DPCR:

- Disaster Basics
- Awareness and Acceptance of Others
- Awareness of Own Cultural Values
- Understanding Dynamics of Difference

**CULTURAL COMPETENCY CURRICULUM FOR DISASTER
PREPAREDNESS AND CRISIS RESPONSE (CCCDPCR)
Moderator's Guide**

- Development of Cultural Knowledge
 - Ability to Adapt Activities
1. **ASK:** What was your initial reaction to the content presented in this Course?
 - Positive responses
 - Negative responses
 2. **ASK:** What two or three things did you like best about Course 1?
 - Length
 - Content
 - Diagrams
 - Statistics
 - Etc.
 3. **ASK:** What didn't you like about Course 1?
 4. **ASK:** Are there any recommendations you have for changing Course 1?
 5. **ASK:** What, if anything, is missing?
 6. **ASK:** What, if anything, should be removed?

COURSE 2

SAY: Let's move on to the Prepare section (Course 2)

SAY: As a refresher, Course 2 provides information on:

- Community Services Assessment
 - Community Outreach
 - Communication Strategies
 - Written Communication
 - Bottom-up Communication
7. **ASK:** What was your initial reaction to the content presented in this Course?
 - Positive responses
 - Negative responses

**CULTURAL COMPETENCY CURRICULUM FOR DISASTER
PREPAREDNESS AND CRISIS RESPONSE (CCCDPCR)
Moderator's Guide**

8. **ASK:** What two or three things did you like best about Course 2?
- Length
 - Content
 - Diagrams
 - Statistics
 - Etc.
9. **ASK:** What didn't you like about Course 2?
10. **ASK:** Are there any recommendations you have for changing Course 2?
11. **ASK:** What, if anything, is missing?
12. **ASK:** What, if anything, should be removed?

COURSE 3

SAY: Let's move on to the Respond section (Course 3)

SAY: As a refresher, Course 3 provides information on:

- Just-in-Time Training
 - Overcoming a Cultural Misstep
 - Meeting Basic Needs
 - Meeting Physical Health Needs
 - Meeting Mental Health Needs
13. **ASK:** What was your initial reaction to the content presented in this Course?
- Positive responses
 - Negative responses
14. **ASK:** What two or three things did you like best about Course 3?
- Length
 - Content
 - Diagrams
 - Statistics

**CULTURAL COMPETENCY CURRICULUM FOR DISASTER
PREPAREDNESS AND CRISIS RESPONSE (CCCDPCR)
Moderator's Guide**

- Etc.

15.**ASK:** What didn't you like about Course 3?

16.**ASK:** Are there any recommendations you have for changing Course 3?

17.**ASK:** What, if anything, is missing?

18.**ASK:** What, if anything, should be removed?

COURSE 4

SAY: Let's move on to the Recover section (Course 4)

SAY: As a refresher, Course 4 provides information on:

- Disparities in Recovery
- Rebuilding Neighborhoods
- Consulting the Community
- (Re)planning
- Evaluation

19.**ASK:** What was your initial reaction to the content presented in this Course?

- Positive responses
- Negative responses

20.**ASK:** What two or three things did you like best about Course 4?

- Length
- Content
- Diagrams
- Statistics
- Etc.

21.**ASK:** What didn't you like about Course 4?

22.**ASK:** Are there any recommendations you have for changing Course 4?

**CULTURAL COMPETENCY CURRICULUM FOR DISASTER
PREPAREDNESS AND CRISIS RESPONSE (CCCDPCR)
Moderator's Guide**

23.**ASK:** What, if anything, is missing?

ASK: What, if anything, should be removed?



CCC-DPCR Vignettes

Discussion Guide: CCC-DPCR Vignettes
Part 4

Description: The purpose of this module is to gain participants' opinions regarding the CCC-DPCR video vignettes.

Time: 10 minutes

Theme: Upon successful completion of this module participants will:

- Provide feedback on whether the video vignettes illustrate cultural competency concepts, whether they are relevant to their work in disaster preparedness and crisis response, and their value to the program.

Moderator

SAY: I'd like to now get your feedback on the case studies and vignettes located throughout the curriculum. Let's start by discussing the vignettes.

SAY: There were 6 vignettes presented throughout the curriculum. They were:

- Disaster Preparation – community meeting to determine outreach/message venues
- Packets for Evacuees –Mental health treatment center preparing for a hurricane by getting their patient records translated
- Tornado on the Reservation – Commissioned Corps and Just-in-Time training
- Meeting Basic Needs – Disaster responders working with the Chinese community
- But What If I'm Deported – using an interpreter, etc.
- Relocating After a Hurricane – trust and past experiences shaping current opinions for Ms. Hallie

**CULTURAL COMPETENCY CURRICULUM FOR DISASTER
PREPAREDNESS AND CRISIS RESPONSE (CCCDPCR)
Moderator's Guide**

1. **ASK:** Overall, what did you think of the vignettes?
2. **ASK:** What was your reaction to each of these video clips?
3. **ASK:** Do you believe they enhanced what you learned throughout the program? If yes, in what way(s)?
4. **ASK:** Did they help to reinforce the concepts presented in the course?
5. **ASK:** Do you feel they provided tangible examples of how to infuse cultural competency into your day-to-day work?
6. **ASK:** What did you think about the Decision-Tree format with the vignettes?
 - Did it help increase the understanding of cultural competency in these situations?
7. **ASK:** How could the vignettes be improved?
8. **ASK:** What did you think of the Taking Vitals following each vignette?
 - Did you find them useful in providing a framework for self-reflection?
 - Were they relevant? Appropriate?
 - Did they enhance your learning experience?
 - How could they be improved?

CCC-DPCR From the Field Stories

Discussion Guide: CCC-DPCR From the Field Stories
Part 5

Description: The purpose of this module is to gain participants' opinions regarding the CCC-DPCR From the Field Stories.

Time: 10 minutes

Theme: Upon successful completion of this module participants will:

- Provide feedback on whether the From the Field Stories illustrate cultural competency concepts, whether they are relevant to their work in disaster preparedness and crisis response, and their value to the program.

Moderator

SAY: In addition to the Video Vignettes, From the Field stories were interspersed throughout the curriculum to illustrate real-world application of the cultural competency concepts presented.

SAY: Some of the From the Field stories included:

- A 911 call where a young girl fell into the pool and the dispatch operator didn't use appropriate language access services
- Woman in labor whose husband doesn't want to come to the hospital for fear that the first responders will come back and rob him now that they know where he lives and that he won't be there
- Using the color red in print materials to reach out to a community with a high Hmong population following flooding, landslides, and mudslides
- New Orleans residents having difficulty with continuing medicine regime for hypertension following Katrina – difficulty meeting basic needs
- During triage, a man was misdiagnosed as a paranoid schizophrenic because no one understood what he was saying and

**CULTURAL COMPETENCY CURRICULUM FOR DISASTER
PREPAREDNESS AND CRISIS RESPONSE (CCCDPCR)
Moderator's Guide**

did not realize that he was speaking a native, indigenous dialect from a specific region of Mexico

- Research conducted following Katrina which illustrated some of the factors influencing African Americans to not evacuate and how it could be applicable to planning for the next disaster

1. **ASK:** What did you think of the From the Field stories?
2. **ASK:** Were they helpful in understanding real-world situations regarding cultural competency?
3. **ASK:** Which did you feel were most applicable to your day-to-day work?
4. **ASK:** Did they help to reinforce the concepts presented in the course?
5. **ASK:** Do you feel they provided tangible examples of how to infuse cultural competency into your day-to-day work?
6. **ASK:** How could they be improved?
7. **ASK:** What did you think of the Taking Vitals following each from the field?
 - Did you find them useful in providing a framework for self-reflection?
 - Were they relevant? Appropriate?
 - Did they enhance your learning experience?
 - How could they be improved?

**CULTURAL COMPETENCY CURRICULUM FOR DISASTER
PREPAREDNESS AND CRISIS RESPONSE (CCCDPCR)
Moderator's Guide**

Closing

Discussion Guide: Closing Remarks Part 7

Description: This module gathers some demographic information and concludes the group discussion.

Time: 5 minutes

Theme: Upon successful completion of this module participants will:

- Discuss who would benefit by taking a cultural competency training program in their organization, and identify any missing topics or questions pertaining to the curriculum that were not asked.

Moderator

1. **SAY:** We are getting ready to wrap-up our group discussion. In closing, I just have a couple more questions.
2. **ASK:** Who in your organization would benefit by taking a course on culturally competent care?
Probe: no names, titles such as emergency managers, disaster mental health professionals, Commissioned Corps, EMS personnel, social workers, etc.
3. **SAY:** I have learned a great deal from you today. Thank you for sharing your ideas and suggestions. They will help us as we continue to develop this continuing education program on cultural competency for disaster preparedness and crisis response.

Finally, is there anything you feel we should have covered but didn't?

SAY: Thank you again for your participation.

Offer business card to contact you for further comments/questions.

