

## EVALUATION RESULTS

### Response Rate

Out of the 300 attendees at the forum, 170 completed an evaluation form, for a 57% response rate. Given that this sample represents over half of the attendees, there is a great degree of confidence that these results are representative of the opinions of those attending the Trauma Forum. Biases inherent in those returning the evaluation and those who did not, however may exist.

### Perceptions and Impact

Overall, the evaluation results were very favorable. Attendees responded to a set of 10 questions about their experiences and perceptions of the forum by indicating their degree of agreement or disagreement on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Responses were averaged; the higher the score the more positive the experiences and perceptions of the forum. Table 1 below present the items and the average scores obtained. Attendees expressed positive views and in particular felt that the forum was a good use of their time, that it was helpful, that they would be more involved in promoting the need for trauma informed services, that they were more aware of the needs of those affected by trauma as well as the barriers they face in accessing services, and felt more prepared to work with other organizations and systems to better meet the needs of these survivors. The general consensus was that they would attend another forum in the future.

Table 1: Average Scores on Evaluation Questions

Item	Average Score
Attending the forum was good use of my time	4.09
The forum was helpful and useful.	3.89
The forum will likely make a difference in improving services for people affected by trauma.	3.48
The forum will make a difference in how I work.	3.55
I will be more involved in promoting the need for trauma informed services.	4.07
I am more aware of the needs of people affected by trauma.	3.88
I am more aware of the barriers people affected by trauma experience when accessing services.	3.95
I feel more prepared to work with other organizations and systems to better meeting the needs of people affected by trauma.	3.75
I am leaving the forum with concrete ideas for how my organization could improve how it responds to people affected by trauma.	3.57
I would attend another forum.	4.13

## **Changes Resulting From The Forum**

Attendees were asked to describe one or two things that had changed for them as a result of attending the forum. A total 125 of the 170 (74%) who completed evaluation forms responded to this question. A number of changes were listed and these are summarized below. Only 4% of these individuals stated that nothing changed for them as a result of attending the forum.

### **1. Increased Awareness of Service Needs**

Among the most prevalent changes reported by attendees was an increase in their knowledge and awareness of service needs for trauma survivors. These included:

- 14% reported a greater understanding of the needs of trauma survivors. The barriers they face to obtaining services, an understanding of a strength based approach and the need for a one-stop-shop with numerous services in one locations were part of this service needs awareness.
- 8% stated an increased awareness of the need to integrate services within and between agencies. The need for interagency collaboration, networking, the "no wrong door" principle were part of this awareness. Some had also learned why there was resistance to integration.
- 5% indicated that they learned the importance of working with clients where they are in their journey of healing and to involve them in the assessment and treatment process.
- 3% gained an awareness of cultural issues and needs, including the need to include more cultural information in services to trauma survivors.

### **2. Knowledge of the Nature of Existing Services**

Many attendees also reported an increase in their awareness of existing services and the nature of existing services. These included:

- 14% gained greater awareness of the available services for trauma affected individuals. For some this included networking and making contacts at the forum.
- 6% gained a greater understanding of the systems response to trauma, including the fragmentation of services and the insufficiency of existing services.
- 2% learned about the differences between urban and rural services, including the more collaborative nature of rural services.
  
- 14% reported a greater awareness of the effects of trauma and subsequently what types of services are effective and what is not effective.

### **3. Increased Awareness of Trauma Effects**

Gaining knowledge was reported by a number of individuals. This consisted of:

- 19% learned more about the issue of trauma, with most becoming more aware of the effects of trauma. Others reported greater understanding of the issue and of individuals' resilience.

#### **4. Increased Motivation**

A number of individuals stated an increase in their motivation to action. These consisted of:

- 8% reported being more focused, committed and enthusiastic about working with trauma survivors.
- 5% who wanted to begin implementing the suggestions and solutions that were generated at the forum. Some of these individuals expressed that they now had concrete steps to take.
- 3% who were more motivated to work with a holistic system.

#### **5. Personal and Professional Validation**

Some of the attendees obtained validation for their's and/or their agency's knowledge and work including:

- 10% felt validated in their knowledge and work, greater confidence in their understanding and skills, and no longer alone in their interest in this issue.
- 3% stated that it was good to know that their agency was not alone in struggling to obtain or provide quality services for survivors.

#### **6. Other Changes**

A number of other changes were mentioned. These included:

- 2% mentioned issues related to research such as recognizing the need for more research about trauma and its effects and concern that research may re-traumatize participants.
- 2% indicated greater awareness of the experience of Aboriginal people such as changes in their views of residential schools and a greater awareness of systemic racism.
- 4% became aware of the need for more information dissemination including the need to promote understanding of the needs of survivors and the barriers to service.

### **The Most Helpful Aspects of the Forum**

Attendees were asked what they felt was the most helpful part of the forum. A total of 152 out of 170 (89%) responded to this question. There was quite a bit of consensus

about the most helpful parts of the forum. The categories of responses are outlined below.

### **1. Hearing From Trauma Survivors**

The most prevalent responses given were related to the panel discussion and being able to hear directly from trauma survivors. Specifically:

- 47% stated that they liked listening to the trauma survivors. Some felt it helped to focus their discussion and gave them a sense of different types of trauma.
- 6% particularly liked hearing what worked and what did not work for trauma survivors.

### **2. Interacting With Others**

Many individuals appreciated the opportunity to interact with others about this topic. Among the responses in this category were:

- 17% like sharing ideas and learning from others.
- 16% liked meeting others and networking.

### **3. Group Work**

A number of responses referred to certain aspects of the group work done by attendees. These included:

- 24% liked the brainstorming and discussion. The questions leading the discussions, coming together for the same purpose, and beginning to plan how to reduce service barriers were part of this response.
- 3% particularly liked the group and/or Clarissa's facilitation. Some felt that the preassigned reports freed up their time to answer the questions.

### **4. Information on Trauma**

A few individuals like the information about trauma that they were given.

- 9% liked Clarissa's presentation.
- 7% liked the broad perspective of trauma services and the focus on the single theme of trauma for the entire forum.

### **5. Other Responses**

Other responses were given by 9% of the attendees. Mentioned by five individuals or less, these included:

- The diversity the crowd.
- Validation for what they were doing.
- The attendance of government representatives.

- That the conference was free.
- The lunch provided.
- The first day's events (no specific aspect was mentioned).
- The surroundings, acoustics, sound system.
- The handouts on trauma from Klinik.
- Knowing the information resulting from the forum will be processed further.
- Everything about the event.

## **Suggestions for Doing Things Differently**

Attendees were asked what could have been done differently in planning the event. A total of 122 individuals out of 170 (72%) responded to this question. Several individuals (12%) stated that nothing could have been improved and that the event was well done. The remaining people had wide a variety of recommendations that have been summarized in the categories outlined below.

### **1. Event Process Recommendations**

The largest number of recommendations (47%) were related to the process of the event and its planning and preparation. The two most common ones were:

- 16% felt that the questions in the small groups were repetitive, making the process tedious. They suggested having greater variation in activities and a shorter time for the small groups and more time for sharing among groups.
- 8% suggested having a greater diversity of occupations and/or agencies represented within the smaller groups.
- 7% wanted a variation or change of activities to maintain the energy. Among the suggestions were having certain exercises or ice breakers and having wellness breaks other than just having snacks. Some felt these were especially important after the lunch break.

A number of other suggestions were made by 1% to 5% of individuals. These included:

- Send out more information before the event to allow people to prepare. For example, sending out the questions that would be discussed.
- Have the people in the group right out the responses, not the facilitators or to train the facilitators more for their task. Some felt that the facilitators only represented their own perspective in the responses.
- Narrow the scope of the topic to community or individual trauma, doing both is too much.
- Leave more time for events, as the schedule seemed too tight.
- Have a follow-up event where ideas about how to implement the suggested ideas could be discussed and people would be able to stay involved in the process.

## **2. Recommendations for More Information**

About a quarter of the individuals (24%) made a number of recommendations related to providing them with more information. Each of the following were suggested by 1% - 6% of individuals:

- Provide more explanation of the different systems involved in trauma response.
- Provide a list of common terminology and definitions.
- To facilitate networking, provide a contact list for everyone attending (with the permission of the attendees) including the sectors/disciplines they represented, and set aside time specifically for networking.
- More information about trauma care and what services currently exist, concentrating on services for rural and remote areas.
- Have agencies display information on their services.
- Provide information about trauma services in different regions of the country and in different countries, especially services and strategies that work to facilitate treatment and address barriers.
- Let people know about presentations such as the panel talking about their trauma experiences before the event so they are prepared for the resurfacing of their own trauma and to have resources available if this occurs.
- Provide more information about traditional Aboriginal healing.
- Let people know how the information will be used to promote services for trauma survivors.
- Give participants copies of the small group discussions.

## **3. Recommendations Related to the Individuals Attending the Event**

Several people (21%) made suggestions related to the presenters and the attendees. Each of the following were recommended by 1% - 5% of respondents:

- Have more people sharing their experiences and focused more on what was and was not helpful for them.
- Have fewer panel members to allow each person more time to speak and to allow time to ask panel members questions.
- Have a moderator/facilitator for the impact narratives.
- Include greater cultural diversity in the survivors who share their experiences by including immigrants and war refugees.
- Include a greater diversity of attendees including political decision makers and politicians, police, hospital staff, more Aboriginal organizations, and spiritual leaders.
- Have a panel discussion with government and political leaders and have a national or international forum for service providers and administrators.
- It was not necessary to get a facilitator from Toronto.

#### **4. Recommendations Related to the Facility or the Environment**

A few individuals made suggestions associated with the venue, the supplies given, and the room. Each of the following was mentioned by 1% - 3%

- Have smaller separate rooms for small group discussions.
- Have a room with natural rather than florescent lighting.
- Have live cameras so everyone in the room can see the speakers.
- Have the even occur earlier in the year.
- Provide more comfortable seating.
- Have a different venue.
- Provide pens, better overhead pens, and more paper for recording notes and have only brief notes for overheads and more detailed notes on paper.

#### **5. Recommendations Regarding Food**

Some people (7%) made suggestions about the food/lunch provided. Mentioned by 1% - 2% of the people these included:

- Have fruit available.
- Have recycling bins.
- Have a shorter lunch period.
- Make lunch reservations on email prior to the event.
- Have everyone stay for lunch.