



EVALUATION REPORT ON THE 2009-10 PARTNERING FOR CHANGE PROJECT

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Partnering for Change (PfC) was a peer learning project initiated in 2007 by First 5 Alameda County (F5AC) to support the work of community agencies in delivering culturally responsive services to young children and their families. PfC was designed to provide a year-long learning environment for those working to strengthen the cultural competence¹ of their organizations. It was jointly facilitated by F5AC's Cultural Access Services Administrator, Ann Chun, MPA, and Laurin Mayeno, MPH, a consultant with experience supporting agencies to become more culturally competent. Conceptually, PfC relied on an "inside out" approach where the focus was on supporting internal organizational changes, with the intent of building a solid foundation for providing culturally competent services². PfC was first piloted in 2007-2008 with seven agencies. In 2009-10, a second cohort, comprised of six agencies, participated in PfC. This report provides a brief overview of the 2009-10 project and a summary of evaluation results.

The evaluation focused on documenting 1) project implementation challenges and successes and 2) organizational changes made, and lessons learned, by the participating agencies. Data sources included the PfC consultant's report to F5AC, pre and post agency self-assessments and work plans, evaluation forms completed by participants at the end of each cohort meeting, and results from a focus group and two individual telephone interviews conducted with PfC participants at the end of the project. The main findings were:

- Community partners valued their participation in the project, and found the agency-specific consultation especially helpful
- Community partners found the work more challenging than expected. And yet, while some agencies accomplished more than others, all made organizational changes they valued
- Four of the 6 agencies completed "pre/post" self-assessments of cultural competency and on all but 2 of 50 items, average scores increased on the "post" assessment. The items with the highest positive changes included:
 - There are guidelines or protocol to ensure that cultural responsiveness is part of all service/program planning
 - The organization has policies and procedures for fostering culturally sensitive and non-discriminatory behavior between staff, board and volunteers

¹ "Cultural competence" is defined in part as having "a defined set of values and principles, and [demonstrating]...behaviors, attitudes, policies and structures that enable [organizations]...to work effectively cross-culturally" (National Center for Cultural Competence, adapted from Cross et al., 1989).

² See "Multicultural Organizational Development in Nonprofit Organizations: Lessons from the Cultural Competence Learning Initiative. A 2008-10 Initiative of CompassPoint Nonprofit Services"

- Data collected from clients is used to improve the cultural responsiveness of services
- Factors that helped the agencies make these changes included: a) the combination of peer support and agency-specific consultation received through PfC; b) the use of a cultural competency self-assessment tool which helped the agencies identify areas of strength and need; c) support from board of directors and agency leaders; and d) the availability of additional funds (outside of PfC) for training staff on cultural competency

Lessons learned from the PfC project evaluation include:

- The combination of peer support/learning and agency-specific consultation is helpful in supporting practice changes
- When organizational changes are sought, it is desirable for participants to be organizational leaders and to have the capacity to effect change at their agency, and for the organization to be primed for change based on prior work
- It is helpful to have clear definitions of desired change (provided, for example, by a self-assessment tool)

Suggestions for future PfC projects include:

- During outreach, provide information to potential applicants about PfC's conceptual approach and be clear about potential challenges involved in the work
- Consider, where appropriate, using a more directive approach when providing agency-specific consultation
- Continue to use self-assessment tools to track practice changes; consider adding other self-assessment tools (e.g., ones with greater focus on service delivery)
- Consider ways of building more peer-to-peer support within the limited timeframe of the project and afterwards
- Consider providing limited consultation beyond the end of project to support sustainability



EVALUATION REPORT ON THE 2009-10 PARTNERING FOR CHANGE PROJECT

Partnering for Change (PfC) was a peer learning project initiated in 2007 by First 5 Alameda County (F5AC) to support the work of F5AC grantees, contractors, and other community partners in delivering culturally responsive services to young children and their families. PfC was designed to provide a learning environment for a small group of community agencies working to strengthen the cultural competence¹ of their organizations. The intent of PfC was to advance the agencies' work in this area through a combination of peer support/learning and agency-specific consultation. Conceptually, PfC relied on an "inside out" approach where the focus was on supporting internal organizational changes, with the intent of building a solid foundation for providing culturally competent services². PfC was jointly facilitated by F5AC's Cultural Access Services Administrator, Ann Chun, MPA, and Laurin Mayeno, MPH, a consultant with experience supporting agencies to become more culturally competent.

PfC was first piloted in October 2007 – October 2008. Seven agencies participated in the first cohort. For a summary of results from the pilot year, see "Evaluation Report on Partnering for Change: A Pilot Peer Learning Project Supporting the Delivery of Culturally Responsive Services" on the First 5 Alameda County website at http://www.first5ecc.org/Documents/reports_docs/Evaluation%20report%20on%20Partnering%20for%20Change%204-06-09.pdf.

A year after the pilot ended, PfC was implemented again, with a new cohort of agencies, from October 2009 to October 2010. This report provides a brief overview of the 2009-10 project and a summary of evaluation results. The evaluation was focused on documenting 1) project implementation challenges and successes, and 2) organizational changes made, and lessons learned, by the participating agencies. The main findings include:

- Community partners valued their participation in the project, and found the agency-specific consultation especially helpful
- Community partners found the work more challenging than expected. And yet, while some agencies accomplished more than others, all made organizational changes they valued
- Four of the 6 agencies completed "pre/post" self-assessments of cultural competency and on all but 2 of 50 items, average scores increased on the "post" assessment

¹ "Cultural competence" is defined in part as having "a defined set of values and principles, and [demonstrating]...behaviors, attitudes, policies and structures that enable [organizations]...to work effectively cross-culturally" (National Center for Cultural Competence, adapted from Cross et al., 1989).

² See "Multicultural Organizational Development in Nonprofit Organizations: Lessons from the Cultural Competence Learning Initiative. A 2008-10 Initiative of CompassPoint Nonprofit Services."

- Factors that helped the agencies make these changes included: a) the combination of peer support and agency-specific consultation received through PfC; b) the use of a cultural competency self-assessment tool which helped the agencies identify areas of strength and need; c) support from board of directors and agency leaders; and d) the availability of additional funds (outside of PfC) for training staff on cultural competency

DATA SOURCES

The data sources for this report were:

- The PfC consultant's report to F5AC
- Pre and post agency self-assessment results and work plans
- Meeting evaluation forms completed after each group meeting
- The consultant's notes from the final "storytelling" meeting when participants summarized their work on the project
- Results from a focus group and two individual telephone interviews conducted with PfC participants in October and November 2010 by an F5AC Evaluation Specialist. The purpose of the focus group and telephone interviews was to solicit feedback from the participants regarding their experiences with the project. (See Appendix 1 for a list of focus group/interview questions.)
- The F5AC Evaluation Specialist's notes from a March 2011 meeting attended by representatives from 6 of the 13 PfC agencies (three cohort 1 and three cohort 2 agencies), brought together by F5AC to discuss plans for sustaining their work

PARTNERING FOR CHANGE GOALS

The goals of PfC were:

1. Provide community partners serving children 0 to 5 years and their families with increased support and dedicated time and resources to enhance their ability to provide culturally responsive services
2. Support community partners to conduct a cultural competency needs assessment, articulate their agency's definition, framework and goals regarding cultural competency, and develop and implement a work plan
3. Establish a network of agencies committed to working on cultural competency and sharing lessons learned with other community agencies
4. Enhance the cultural sensitivity of services provided to young children and their families in Alameda County

COHORT 2 AGENCIES

Participation in PfC was open to F5AC contractors and grantees, and other community agencies in Alameda County serving children 0 to 5 years of age. Interested agencies submitted applications in response to a Request for Proposal. To increase the possibility that participation in PfC would lead to agency changes supporting culturally responsive service delivery, applicant agencies were required to have conducted prior work on cultural competency³. In addition, it was hoped that the individuals who participated in the cohort would be in a position to effect change. Participants were expected to be in a

³ As the consultant's report noted at the end of the pilot year, "[by selecting] organizations that were already doing cultural competency work...the project [was able] to have an impact with limited resources. The program supported existing efforts rather than trying to catalyze efforts where none existed."

high level position (e.g., Executive Director or Director of a specific program within a large institution) and be a leader in initiating change in their organization. Lastly, partner organizations were encouraged to each have a team of two staff members participate in PfC in order to strengthen their capacity to make changes.

Seven agencies were selected to participate in 2009-10; one withdrew after the first 3 months due to organizational transitions and changes in staff that affected the agency's capacity to participate. The 6 agencies that participated for the duration of the project were:

| | |
|--|------------------------|
| Alameda Family Services | City of Fremont |
| Brighter Beginnings | Kidango |
| Center for Early Intervention on Deafness | Lotus Bloom |

Each agency received a small stipend of \$3,000. Although all of the agencies served children 0-5 years and their families, they differed from one another in a number of ways including size, focus, and the kinds of services provided (e.g., early care and education, parenting education, parent-child activities, family support services, mental health services, and services for children with special needs). Agency representatives who participated in PfC included 2 executive directors, a deputy director, a finance director, a center director, a senior program manager, a program coordinator, and other staff.

In their proposals, the agencies identified 1-2 specific goals they hoped to achieve by participating in PfC. With input from the PfC consultant, the goals were modified and expanded to 2-3 goals per agency. Examples of the revised goals include:

- Establish a more inclusive environment for all: Board, staff, clients
- Clarify organizational values and reflect them in all written documents
- Establish an organizational plan for ongoing institutionalization of cultural competence
- Establish systems for hiring a culturally diverse workforce
- Increase staff capacity for reflection and leadership in cultural competency
- Adopt and integrate new diversity guiding principles into our employee and parent handbooks
- Design and implement an ongoing agency-wide survey to respond to feedback from staff about issues related to culture and difference
- Establish a system for ongoing engagement of families for improving services in general and in terms of cultural competency

OVERVIEW OF PROJECT COMPONENTS

The main components of the project were a bimonthly peer learning group and agency-specific consultation provided by the PfC consultant. Feedback received from the first PfC cohort suggested that the **combination** of peer support/learning and consultation was especially helpful to community agencies as they worked towards their goals. In addition, based on lessons learned from the pilot year, two tools were developed for use by the agencies as they worked on their projects—a cultural competency self-assessment tool and a work plan. Finally, F5AC's Cultural Access Services Administrator provided general support and oversight for the project.

Peer-learning community

Based on feedback from cohort 1 participants, a one-day retreat was added at the onset of the project to share key conceptual frameworks and resources and to build relationships among participants. After the retreat, participants met five times for 3 hours each to share challenges, lessons learned, and resources with one another; to receive support and training from project facilitators; and to report back on progress made on their work plans. Meeting topics were selected based on the needs of the group and included:

- Cultural sharing exercise
- Values and guiding principles
- The role of leaders in a multicultural change process
- Creating opportunity in challenging times
- Empowering change agents
- Agency engagement and shared responsibility

The final meeting was a “storytelling” session, during which each agency told the story of their involvement with the project, including their accomplishments, challenges, and lessons learned.

Agency-specific consultation services

Each agency could access up to 20.5 hours of individual consultation to assist in developing and implementing their work plans. Five of the agencies used all or most of their allotment. One agency, which was also participating in a cultural competency learning initiative facilitated by CompassPoint that included consultation, did not use PfC consultation. Consultation varied depending on the needs of the agencies and included:

- Assistance in self-assessment and planning processes (e.g., updating and refining work plans; helping to design needs assessment tools for staff training)
- Assistance in developing organizational values and guiding principles regarding cultural competency
- Training for staff (e.g., on guidelines and skills for multicultural communication; power, privilege, and oppression; listening and responding to communication around sensitive issues)
- Mentoring and coaching staff (e.g., on providing leadership in modeling multicultural communication; addressing conflicts or differences among staff)
- Assistance with integrating cultural competence perspectives into selected aspects of the agency’s work or procedures (e.g., a standard format for conducting case consultations, an agency’s employment/personnel policies and procedures)

Pre/Post self-assessments and work plans

An agency self-assessment tool, designed to give organizations an overview of how they are addressing cultural responsiveness from an organizational systems perspective, was developed for the PfC project (see Appendix 2). The self-assessment tool, along with the agency work plan, were developed to: 1) help agencies identify their organizational strengths and needs related to cultural competency; 2) help participants develop work plans based on their agency’s goals for the project; and 3) track agency progress and contribute to the overall evaluation of PfC.

PROCESS RESULTS

Creating a peer learning community

Successes

PfC participants valued their participation in the peer cohort meetings. They appreciated the information and support provided by the facilitators; they enjoyed sharing perspectives with, and receiving support from, colleagues at other agencies; and they liked the energy that came from being with others with similar goals.

“I loved the sessions...[I liked hearing] how [other directors]...were dealing with similar issues. It felt like an incredible luxury to have space to talk about [cultural competency].”

“I really appreciated the support of the group when we got to...[a] really difficult spot in our process [at my agency].”

One meeting, in particular, that focused on nonviolent communication, was considered especially helpful. One person explained: “[The approach involves] how to take care of yourself and how to be supported. It was liberating because it took you out of a victim frame of mind.”

The following excerpt from the consultant’s report describes some key issues and lessons learned that emerged during peer discussions:

Empowering change agents – *An essential element to successful multicultural organizational development is the empowerment of change agents. Change agents may include the formal leadership within the organization as well as the people who are active (usually in a committee or assigned role)...[in facilitating] the cultural competence process. These individuals are often focused on the organization and the tasks at hand, rather than [on] their own needs to be empowered as leaders.... [The Cultural Access Services Administrator and I] decided to make this topic a focus of one of the peer learning sessions and created a space for dialogue and coaching. We also encouraged participants to practice and model authentic communication within their organizations and shared some of the ideas and tools from Nonviolent Communication.*

Holding a space for people who are challenged by difference – *One of the themes that emerged repeatedly from the peer sharing work was the need to hold a space for people who may not be very open around issues of difference.... [Such] experiences speak to the necessity of both clarifying the agency values that all staff must abide by, regardless of their personal views, AND allowing space for people to express and discuss their views without being judged.*

Holding a space for people who “push buttons” – *A few agencies shared examples of things that staff people or program participants said that were perceived as culturally insensitive.... Project participants spoke about the importance of humanizing people and addressing [potentially offensive remarks]...with compassion, rather than judgment and censoring.*

PfC consultant’s report

Challenges

One participant, from a smaller organization, felt that it was difficult at times to share experiences openly at the cohort meetings because of the sensitive nature of the issues involved and concerns about disclosing too much about their agency.

Two participants thought the meetings would be enhanced by including a short time for more structured discussion, based on common themes the agencies were addressing and supported by reading assignments.

“We got [the PFC binder of articles]...and there are so many articles and so much information...that we didn’t necessarily review... in a...coursework kind of way. ...it would have been nice sometimes to...have a 20 minute...topic discussion or even presentation [like during the first meeting]... As we went on, there was...less of that informative [approach].... I didn’t...[take the time on my own to] read all [of the materials]... And I think it could have really informed [our work] and could inform future work as well.”

A bigger challenge for some agencies was maintaining consistent participation. PFC facilitators encouraged attendance by more than one individual from each agency at each meeting. However, two of the 6 agencies sent only one representative; another 2 agencies attended only two-thirds of the meetings; and another agency’s representatives changed mid-way during the project. One person said, “I think one of the frustrating aspects of the group was that we all weren’t there every time, so the configuration...changed each time.”

The lack of consistent participation stemmed in large part from staff and organizational transitions occurring at the agencies, which made it difficult for agencies to have more than one person in a leadership position participate. According to the consultant’s report, the unstable economic climate was a contributing factor: “A key difference from the pilot project...was the dramatic change in the economic circumstances of non-profit and public organizations.” Some of the participating agencies “were impacted by cutbacks and/or layoffs. A few also faced major transitions at senior levels in their organizations.... It appeared that people who were already overextended became even more overwhelmed with work over the past year.”

When the participants were asked if they had much contact with one another outside of the group, the majority said they had limited or no contact with one another. Having peer support outside of the meetings did not seem to be a need for the agencies during the course of the project when the agencies had support from the consultant. But peer support potentially could be helpful once the project ends. One person suggested that a yahoo group be created to facilitate communication among the participants.

Agency-specific consultation Successes

The participants highly valued the agency-specific consultation they received. One participant said: ““I found the consultation...to be certainly...one of the best aspects [of PFC].” The participants felt the consultant was able to provide strong guidance and

support for the implementation of their projects. According to participants, the consultation:

- Was strength-based
- Provided In-depth, scholarly information in a practical, relevant way
- Helped to open up communication among their staff; created “safety;” and took away “the charge” associated with discussions about race, culture, etc.
- Reframed and normalized their progress
- Provided a valuable outsider’s perspective
- Kept them focused on their goals and activities

“The combination of...individual TA plus the group learning and sharing was effective.... If I try to picture other models of doing this work, where...you’re going to training and you’re not taking it back, and you don’t have someone who can...help you with your own situation...that would not be effective at all.”

“[The consultation was] very helpful. Really, really terrific... Without [the consultant’s]...support, we would have put [cultural competency]...on the back burner because there’s too much else to deal with.”

“Her contribution to us was...the constant reframing of what we were experiencing, and...what we saw. And to some extent normalizing it, which enabled us to continue to move forward and feel good about it... That was extremely helpful.”

Some agencies requested that the consultant provide trainings for their staff, which were also well-received. One participant commented: “I wanted to do [an all-staff training like this] for a long time but I didn’t know who could do it. [The consultant] was the right person.”

Challenges

The consultant noted in her report that “an underlying assumption of the PfC project was that the process of agencies taking ownership for leading the cultural competence work is important for sustaining the work on an ongoing basis. As a result, the process was driven by the agencies, with the consultant playing a supportive role.” According to the consultant, an agency-driven approach does not work as well when agency staff have difficulty sustaining focus on cultural competency issues due to competing demands on their time, lack of exposure to diversity, or internal differences at the agency regarding how to move forward: “One agency commented that it would have been helpful to have more direction from the consultant. A question for further exploration is whether a more directive approach by the consultant would have ultimately moved their processes forward and created greater agency investment.”

Pre/Post self-assessments and work plans

Successes

All 6 of the participating agencies completed a “pre” self-assessment and an agency-specific work plan shortly after the project began (see Appendix 3 for a sample work plan). At the end of the project, 4 of the 6 agencies completed “post” self-assessments, and 5 of the 6 submitted updated work plans. Although not all of the agencies were able to complete the final self-assessment and workplan, a majority found these tools helpful in guiding their work and tracking their results.

“When we did [the self-assessment at the start of PfC]... it highlighted...areas that...we hadn’t thought about or...[hadn’t] realized we had deficiencies [in], and also strengths in areas...I wouldn’t have thought [of] if I hadn’t...[gone] through...a checklist or assessment. And...in the end it was...helpful to go back and see where some improvements had been made and...have a roadmap to where work still needs to be done.”

“The work plan was very helpful... It helped us...document what we did and where we were at. The [self-assessment] tool helped us break down the different areas we needed to work on—everything from our organization to our staff.

Challenges

Although the agencies found the self-assessment tool and workplan generally helpful, they also encountered some challenges in using them. For two of the larger agencies, deciding which staff members should complete the self-assessment was difficult. One of the agencies asked senior staff heading different programs to complete the tool, and the ratings were inconsistent. For this and other reasons, the agency decided not to complete the “post” assessment.

Two agencies were not prepared for PfC’s focus on organizational systems. One person said, “I envisioned a lot of in-service and observing our program [delivery] and making recommendations [about improving the cultural responsiveness of services]. Then I found out it was more organizational, the culture and structure of the agency. And we modified our plan a lot.” Another person said it would be helpful to have a referral to an agency or person who could assist them with organizational development in a way that would support their ongoing cultural competency work:

“I don’t think we understood that...[the project was focused on] organizational development. And so when we ran up against an issue that was less related to culture, more related to systems, processes, and communication skills—just core resolution skills—we [didn’t know what to do]. Because anyone can offer a training or communication workshop, but it may not be as relevant...or complementary to the other cultural work that we’re doing.”

More than one person said that while the work plan was useful for maintaining a clear focus and tracking their work, it did not capture the fullness and complexity of what they accomplished. One person said: “Like...we [recorded that we] did this training...but...everything that went into actually making that training happen, or the things that happen after and before...those aren’t captured.” Another person said: “I felt like we needed to have a place to put a lot of the narrative so you could understand the nuances of the change...the impetus for it, the rationale for it, and what we’re...shifting. Because it felt like the work was constantly shifting and there’s no way to really capture that.” While the work plans document the completion of activities, they do not necessarily provide a lot of information or details about the significance of the accomplishments.

AGENCY RESULTS: CHANGES IN CULTURAL COMPETENCY ***Areas of greatest strengths and needs when PfC began***

Results from the “pre” self-assessments indicated that a majority of the agencies were using the following culturally responsive practices on a consistent or frequent basis:

- Offering free or low-cost services or subsidies for people with limited economic resources
- Providing programs and services that were physically accessible to people with physical disabilities, accessible to people with different education and literacy levels, and geographically accessible (or offered transportation assistance)
- Collecting and analyzing data on the socio-cultural background of clients (race, ethnicity, gender, etc.)
- Receiving feedback from clients indicating they are highly satisfied with the services they receive and that the services are consistent with their cultural beliefs and values

The areas where culturally responsive practices were inconsistently or infrequently used included:

- Establishing explicit goals, objectives, or outcomes for developing cultural responsiveness
- Establishing guidelines or protocols to ensure that cultural responsiveness is part of all service/program planning
- Allocating funds in the annual budget to develop cultural responsiveness
- Using data collected from clients to improve the cultural responsiveness of services
- Including cultural responsiveness criteria in job performance reviews

Completion of activities on agency work plans

By the end of the project, a majority of the activities in 5 of the agency work plans had been completed. (As noted, one agency did not submit a completed work plan at the end of the project.)

“Post” self-assessment results

Results from the “post” self-assessment were positive. All 4 of the agencies that completed the “post” self-assessment had improved ratings compared to the “pre” assessment. Depending on the agency, there was improvement of 1 or more points on 46% to 81% of the items. Individual agency scores on the “post” self-assessments were generally consistent with the accomplishments recorded in the agency’s work plan. When scores were averaged across the 4 agencies, on all but 2 of the 50 scaled items the average scores improved. The items with the highest positive changes (2 points or more) were:

- There are guidelines or protocol to ensure that cultural responsiveness is part of all service/program planning
- The organization’s policy or position statement on cultural responsiveness is included in procedural manuals and/or handbooks for staff, board and volunteers
- The organization has policies and procedures for fostering culturally sensitive and non-discriminatory behavior between staff, board and volunteers
- Cultural responsiveness is included in new staff orientations

- Data collected from clients is used to improve the cultural responsiveness of services

For a case example of the organizational changes made by one agency, see Appendix 4.

Factors that helped to facilitate change

Factors that helped to facilitate change included support from the PfC project and agency-level factors that were present in varying degrees at the different agencies. These include support from board of directors and agency leaders, the availability of additional funds to support staff training costs, and internal agreement about how to move forward.

“I think [what]...helped...[to] leverage...[our] work...[was] that it was being funded by First 5, because...the reality is that I can always go back [to my agency] and say, ‘Well...this is part of the grant’ and there’s a certain weight that that holds.”

WHAT PARTICIPANTS LEARNED FROM PARTICIPATING IN PFC

When asked what they learned from participating in PFC, two people mentioned the complexity of the work.

“I didn’t know it would be so messy. And I didn’t know that it would be so complex... It was a really intense learning experience.... It’s not just [providing staff] training...[and] it’s not just [putting in place agency] policies. It has so many dimensions to the work.”

“I learned it’s very complex, complicated, difficult [work] and it’s important to continue with it, to not give up. I had tried [previously] but there were always some obstacles and there were some obstacles this time but having [the consultant] available [made the difference].”

Two participants said they discovered that their agencies were not as far along as they had initially thought in terms of their cultural competency work.

One person realized that staff trainings on cultural competency are not enough, and that it is important to have agency policies in place and to have administrator support for cultural competency work.

SUSTAINING THE WORK

Looking forward, community partners offered ideas for how F5AC could lend support to their efforts to sustain and extend their cultural competency work beyond the end of the project.

Community partners expressed a desire for:

- Information on other funding sources to support cultural competency work, organizational development, or staff training
- A lending library with videos, discussion guides, articles about cultural competency, and suggestions for speakers
- A limited number of consultation hours (e.g., two hours per quarter) for periodic check-in and support

SUMMARY

Compared to the PfC pilot, the 2009-10 PfC project encountered more challenges stemming from organizational transitions and economic instability. And yet, all of the agencies, to varying degrees, made enhancements to their cultural competency that the participants valued.

“It was critical to have the Partnering for Change support and guidance to deepen the level of work that the agency engages in related to cultural competence. The Partnering for Change project...allowed for the space and time to focus on cultural competence.... There is no question that without the...program...our agency would not have engaged in this work at this level and would not have the tangible outcomes that we now enjoy.”

LESSONS LEARNED AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE PROJECTS

Lessons learned from the PfC project evaluation include:

- The combination of peer support/learning and agency-specific consultation is helpful in supporting practice changes
- When organizational changes are sought, it is desirable for participants to be organizational leaders and to have the capacity to effect change at their agency, and for the organization to be primed for change based on prior work
- It is helpful to have clear definitions of desired change (provided, for example, by a self-assessment tool)

The following table provides suggestions for future PfC projects.

| | |
|---|---|
| <i>Outreach for PfC</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ <i>Provide information to potential applicants about PfC’s conceptual approach</i>▪ <i>Be clear about potential challenges involved in the work</i> |
| <i>Eligibility for participation</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ <i>Continue to require prior agency work regarding cultural competence</i>▪ <i>Continue to recruit organizational leaders</i> |
| <i>Peer learning</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ <i>Continue to encourage consistent participation by more than one individual per agency where possible</i>▪ <i>Provide information to potential applicants about PfC’s conceptual approach</i>▪ <i>Be clear about potential challenges involved in the work</i> |
| <i>Consultation</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ <i>Consider using a more directive approach where appropriate</i> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p><i>Self-assessments and work plans</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Continue to use self-assessment tools to track practice changes; consider adding other self-assessment tools (e.g., ones with greater focus on service delivery)</i> ▪ <i>Include more opportunities for narrative reporting of accomplishments and challenges</i> |
| <p><i>Sustainability</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Consider providing limited consultation beyond the end of project</i> ▪ <i>Consider ways of building more peer-to-peer support within the limited timeframe of the project (e.g., rotating meetings so they are held at different agency sites) and afterwards (e.g., setting up a yahoo group)</i> ▪ <i>Consider offering additional resources such as a lending library and information about potential funding sources</i> |

For more information about Partnering for Change, contact:

Ann Chun, MPA
 Cultural and Linguistic Responsiveness Coordinator
 Early Connections
 (510) 875-2421
 Ann.chun@first5ecc.org

APPENDIX 1: FOCUS GROUP QUESTIONS – 2009-10 PARTNERING FOR CHANGE

1. Why did you apply to participate in Partnering for Change? What were you hoping to get out of it?
2. Did you get what you had hoped? If yes, how so? If no, please describe what was missing for you.
3. What did you like most about participating in PfC? What worked best?
4. [If not already discussed] What did you learn from participating in PfC?
5. [If not already discussed] How helpful was it drafting a workplan and using the Assessment Tool for Organizational Cultural Responsiveness for planning your activities and tracking your progress?
 - What challenges, if any, did you encounter in using the Assessment Tool or work plan?
6. [If not already discussed] How helpful were the group meetings?
 - Which topics were most helpful for you?
 - Is there anything about the meetings (schedule, topics, structure of the meeting) that would have worked better for you?
7. [If not already discussed] How helpful was the TA?
8. What challenges did you encounter when implementing your individual projects?
9. Did you or your organization make any changes as a consequence of participating in PfC?
 - If yes, what kinds of changes did you make?
 - Is it a part of daily operations of the organization (institutionalized) now?
 - Do you think the services your agency provides to young children and their families are more culturally responsive (or have the potential to be) as a consequence of this change? If yes, how so?
10. Is there anything that PfC could have done differently that would have made it a more useful or better experience for you?
11. Would you recommend this kind of approach (group meetings, networking with other agencies, individual TA) for building capacity around diversity to another agency?

- Who, or what kind of agency, would benefit most from participating in a program like PfC?

12. How big of a factor was the availability of a stipend in your decision to participate in PfC?

- Would you have participated in PfC if the stipend were smaller, or if there were no stipend?

13. Are you still in contact with any of the other PfC agencies/individuals? How frequently and for what purpose?

14. Now that the project has ended, are you planning to continue the work on developing a culturally responsive organization? If so, how?

APPENDIX 2: ORGANIZATIONAL SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL FOR CULTURAL RESPONSIVENESS

PRE-ASSESSMENT TOOL FOR ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURAL RESPONSIVENESS

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this tool is to give organizations an overview of how they are addressing cultural responsiveness¹ from an organizational systems perspective. It is intended to provide a quick snapshot to help identify areas of strength, areas of challenge and identify next steps for planning. This tool is not a substitute for an in-depth organizational assessment, which may involve surveys of staff and clients, focus groups and other assessment methods. After completing the tool, an organization may choose to pursue a more in depth assessment. The tool is designed specifically for service delivery organizations, though it can be adapted for use by organizations that do organizing or work with communities in other ways.

The Partnering for Change Project will use this tool for two purposes:

1. It will serve as a planning tool to help partner organizations refine their goals and plans for the project.
2. It will serve as a pre-post assessment to help measure the impact of the Partnering for Change Project.

Each participating organization will be required to complete the tool at the beginning and end of the project.

HOW TO USE THIS DOCUMENT

This tool can be completed by an individual or by a management and/or diversity team. Please recognize that this is a self-assessment and will be influenced by individual perspectives. If possible, seek the perspectives of people in different parts and levels of the organization. Use the assessment process as an opportunity to learn from different perspectives and experiences.

Once you complete the assessment, review your responses and look for the following:

- Areas of strength or assets that you can build upon
- Gaps or areas that you would like to strengthen
- Areas for further assessment or investigation

Note: This document is not intended for mass distribution to staff in a large organization or for community-wide assessment. However, it may help you identify questions to include in such assessment tools.

¹ We are using the term *cultural responsiveness*. *Culture competence, cultural humility and multiculturalism* are examples of other terms that may be used. Each term refers to a different framework or approach for addressing issues of culture and difference. In developing this tool, we attempted to use indicators that are relevant to all of these frameworks.

STRUCTURE

This organizational assessment tool is organized into the following domains or major content areas. See <http://www.iffcmh.org/Assessment%20Protocols.pdf> for more information. These domains are very interconnected, so people using the tool may notice that some indicators could fit within more than one category.

1. **Organizational Values** - the explicit values related to culture and differences articulated in organizational documents. (Additional sections address how these values might be reflected in different domains of the organization.)
2. **Policies/Procedures/Governance** - Organization-wide policies and governance responsibility related to cultural responsiveness
3. **Planning/Monitoring/Evaluation** - integration of cultural responsiveness into organizational plans and processes to monitor or evaluate progress
4. **Communication** - with clients and within the organization
5. **Human Resource Development** - Includes both recruitment/retention issues and leadership/capacity building.
6. **Community and Consumer Engagement** - the two-way process of engaging with and learning from the community.
7. **Programs and Services** - the ways that services are delivered as well as feedback from clients about the services
8. **Organizational Resources** - the financial and human resources dedicated to developing cultural responsiveness

ORGANIZATIONAL VALUES

Please indicate to what extent the following statements are true:

| | Definitely | To Some Extent | | | Definitely Not | Don't know or NA |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| 1. The organization has an explicit stance (framework, values, or guiding principles) for addressing culture and difference. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. The organization's stance related to culture and difference is articulated in its mission, vision and/or values statements. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: | | | | | | |

POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND GOVERNANCE

Please indicate to what extent the following statements are true:

| | Definitely | To Some Extent | | | Definitely Not | Don't know or NA |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| 3. The organization has a written policy or position statement on cultural responsiveness. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. The organization's policy or position statement on cultural responsiveness is included in procedural manuals and/or handbooks for staff, board and volunteers. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. The organization has policies and procedures for fostering culturally sensitive and non-discriminatory behavior between staff, board and volunteers. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Cultural responsiveness oversight is included in the role of the governing body (board of directors or other governing structure). | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: | | | | | | |

PLANNING/MONITORING/EVALUATION

Please indicate to what extent the following statements are true:

| | Definitely | To Some Extent | | | Definitely Not | Don't know or NA |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| 7. Cultural responsiveness is part of the organization's strategic plan. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. The organization has explicit goals, objectives or outcomes for developing cultural responsiveness | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. The organization collects and analyzes data on the socio-cultural background of clients (race, ethnicity, gender, etc.). List categories: | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 10. The organization analyzes outcomes data by sociocultural background. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 11. The organization analyzes client satisfaction data by sociocultural background. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 12. The organization collects and analyzes input from clients to assess cultural responsiveness of services. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | Definitely | To Some Extent | | | Definitely Not | Don't know or NA |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| 13. Data collected from clients is used to improve the cultural responsiveness of services. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 14. There are guidelines or protocol to ensure that cultural responsiveness is part of all service/program planning. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: | | | | | | |

COMMUNICATION

A. Communication with clients

Please indicate how routinely the following occur:

| In coming into contact with your organization, people from diverse social and cultural backgrounds : | Routinely | Sometimes | | | Never | Don't know or NA |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| 15. Are informed of what they should expect from the organization (e.g., knowing their rights and responsibilities) | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 16. Are informed about what to do if they have complaints about discrimination or cultural insensitivity. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 17. Receive timely responses to complaints about discrimination or cultural insensitivity. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: | | | | | | |

B. Communication inside the organization

Please indicate how routinely the following occur:

| | Routinely | Sometimes | | | Never | Don't know or NA |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| 18. Cultural responsiveness is a topic in staff and/or team meetings. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 19. Managers/supervisors encourage and value full expression of different viewpoints. | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | Routinely | Sometimes | | | Never | Don't know or NA |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| 20. Managers/supervisors listen openly and respond to feedback from staff about issues related to culture and difference. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 21. The community expertise and/or cultural knowledge of people inside the organization is valued and shared. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 22. Staff is informed about what to do if they experience or witness discriminatory or culturally insensitive behavior by staff, board or volunteers. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: | | | | | | |

HUMAN RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT

A. Recruitment and Retention

Please indicate to what extent the following statements are true:

| | Definitely | To some extent | | | Definitely not | Don't know or NA |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| 23. Staff is reflective of the sociocultural diversity of the community served. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 24. Management is reflective of the sociocultural diversity of the community served. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 25. The Board of Directors is reflective of the sociocultural diversity of the community served. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 26. Hiring processes (job descriptions, interview questions, advertising) are designed to recruit culturally responsive staff. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 27. Board recruitment processes are designed to recruit culturally responsive board members. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 28. Cultural responsiveness criteria are included in performance reviews. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: | | | | | | |

B. Leadership and Capacity Building

Please indicate how routinely the following occur:

| | Routinely | Sometimes | | | Never | Don't know or NA |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| 29. Directors and managers actively develop their capacity to provide leadership in a cultural responsiveness initiative. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 30. Directors and managers actively engage in developing organizational cultural responsiveness. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 31. Staff receives regular training to strengthen capacity to work with diverse communities. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 32. Cultural responsiveness is included in new staff orientations. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: | | | | | | |

COMMUNITY AND CONSUMER ENGAGEMENT

Please indicate how routinely the following occur:

| | Routinely | Sometimes | | | Never | Don't know or NA |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| 33. The organization reaches out to learn about different socio cultural groups in the community and their experiences. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 34. The organization reaches out to establish relationships with individuals and organizations from diverse communities. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 35. The organization engages people from different socio cultural groups in the community in planning its work. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 36. Input from community members is used to make concrete changes in programs, services, policies or operations. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 37. The organization reports to the community on what changes have been made in response to community input. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 38. The organization involves community residents and/or clients in decision-making roles. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: | | | | | | |

PROGRAMS AND SERVICES

A. Service Delivery

Please indicate to what extent the following statements are true:

| | Definitely | To Some Extent | | | Definitely Not | Don't know or NA |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| 39. There are systems in place to provide linguistically accessible services to all major language groups in the community. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 40. Programs and services are geographically accessible to people in the community and/or transportation assistance is provided. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 41. Programs and services are physically accessible to people with physical disabilities. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 42. Culture and difference are taken into account in discussing /planning work with individuals and families. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 43. Programs and services are tailored to respond to different learning styles and communication styles. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 44. There are free or low-cost services or subsidies for people with limited economic resources. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 45. Programs and services are accessible to people with different education and literacy levels. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: | | | | | | |

B. Client Feedback on Services

These questions pertain to feedback from clients. Please check the most accurate response based on data (formal data collection or anecdotal feedback) you have received from people who use your services. If you do not have this data or have not analyzed it, please check "don't know".

| | Consistently | Sometimes | | | Never | Don't know or NA |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| 46. Clients from diverse sociocultural groups report that they are highly satisfied with the services they receive. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 47. Clients from diverse sociocultural groups report that they are treated with respect. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 48. Clients from diverse sociocultural groups report that the services are consistent with their cultural beliefs and values. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: | | | | | | |

Please list out the major sociocultural groups you serve in terms of how they evaluate the services (if known):

| MOST SATISFIED | LEAST SATISFIED |
|-----------------------|------------------------|
| | |

ORGANIZATIONAL RESOURCES

Please rate to what extent the following statements are true:

| | Definitely | To Some Extent | | | Definitely Not | Don't know or NA |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | 5 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 1 | |
| 49. There are funds allocated in the annual budget to develop cultural responsiveness. | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 50. There is staff time allocated to develop cultural responsiveness | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Comments: | | | | | | |

REVIEW

Now that you have completed the tool, review your answers.

51. What are the organization's core strengths to build on?

52. What are the gaps/areas to be strengthened?

53. What are areas for further assessment?

APPENDIX 3: SAMPLE WORK PLAN

| Initial Goals (per proposal) | Revised Goals (include date of revision) | Planned Activities to Achieve Goals | Target Date for Completion | Activities Accomplished, with Challenges Noted |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| Increase involvement of staff at all levels in cultural competency efforts | Establish a written values statement and guiding principles related to cultural responsiveness (11/10/09) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Create workgroup b. Discuss current values and principles in workgroup c. Use survey or focus groups with families, staff and board to inform workgroup d. Create and articulate values and principles in writing e. Create means to communicate values and principles to families and all staff | <p>December 2010</p> <p>December 2010</p> <p>January 2010-February 2010</p> <p>March 2010</p> <p>April 2010</p> | |
| Revise parent surveys to include questions relating to cultural competency issues | Increase staff capacity to implement guiding principles (11/10/09) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Develop 2-4 staff trainings focused on principles and practical implementation strategies b. Provide trainings | <p>August 2010</p> <p>Ongoing and May 2010-August 2010</p> | |
| | Establish system for ongoing engagement of families for improving services in general and in terms of cultural competency (12/2/09) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Brainstorm engagement methods b. Pilot engagement method to get input on values c. Create plan for ongoing engagement activities d. Institutionalize system in policy and practice | <p>January 2010</p> <p>February 2010</p> <p>April 2010</p> <p>May 2010</p> | |

APPENDIX 4: CASE EXAMPLE

One of the Partnering for Change (PfC) agencies applied to participate in PfC to get “some fresh ideas [and]...perspectives” for the staff diversity trainings the agency held every couple of months. “We plan [diversity] trainings for the whole staff,” explained one of the participants. “When we applied [for PfC]...we were feeling kind of frustrated and stuck a little bit with some of those trainings.” One source of frustration was the lack of active participation by some staff members in the training discussions. As the agency noted in its application, one goal the agency planned to work on was to “increase awareness of diversity issues in staff and improve staff self-disclosure in diversity training.”

When the PfC consultant started working with the agency, she helped the agency shift to a more “strength based” approach. For example, using more strength based language, the agency’s goal was revised to read: “Strengthening multicultural interactions and valuing what each person brings within the work team and with clients.” To support this shift in approach, the PfC consultant provided a training on communication for agency staff, and coached the PfC participants on the importance of modeling “authentic communication” by sharing their own perceptions and experiences during staff diversity trainings. According to one of the participants, the new approach involved “honoring each [staff] person’s diversity and respecting who people are.” The agency feels it was successful in communicating to staff that “all opinions and perceptions are valued in our diversity trainings.” As a consequence, “staff members who in the past have been largely silent have been more willing to participate.” During the trainings, “people have an opportunity to talk about their experiences and what they’ve done differently [as their awareness of cultural issues increases].”

A second goal of the agency was to “create an environment in the agency that is welcoming to people.” This goal was revised to read: “Increase cultural responsiveness of agency to different ethnic groups.” One of the activities designed to address this goal was the inclusion of cultural issues in the agency’s case consultation format. With assistance from the PfC consultant, agency staff drafted guidelines for discussing cultural issues during case consultation. By the end of the PfC project, plans were in place to obtain final approval of the guidelines and begin implementing them.

A third goal was identified after the agency completed its organizational self-assessment using the cultural competency tool. One of the participants explains: “As we did our...initial assessment...[we] realized we were very low in workforce diversity. We serve a diverse community but...our administrative positions...were not reflective of the population... Although we had a mission statement that...stated that...we...value diversity...it...[wasn’t reflected] in some of our practices.” Working with the PfC consultant, the participants created agency guidelines for hiring culturally responsive and diverse staff. When there was a job opening for a supervisor, the participants rewrote the job description “with a more cultural lens.... And it worked because...we had the most diverse candidate pool that we’ve ever had for...that position.” In the end, the agency was able to hire an Asian American supervisor with a background in cultural competency.