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Background

The Language Services Toolkit (Toolkit) was an outcome of the project ‘Quality Language Services in Rural Primary Care Settings’, which was a joint project between the Goulburn Valley Primary Care Partnership and the now defunct Central Health Interpreter Service Inc. The Toolkit is designed to assist health care providers with the implementation of policies and procedures ensuring best practice in the provision of language service delivery and cross-cultural communication. The Toolkit contains information on risk management, policies, interpreting and translation issues. Following the state-wide release of the document, the Home and Community Care (HACC) Unit of the Department of Human Services approved funding to deliver a series of training sessions. Initially funding was received to conduct three training sessions within Hume Region and thereafter more funding was received to provide six training seminars/workshops for HACC funded and other health care providers in rural and regional areas of Victoria and one workshop for HACC Access and Equity Workers.

The trainers recruited for the workshops were Mr. Ari Pappas, Victorian Health Interpreter Service, who was also involved in writing the document and Ms Sigrid van Fondern, accredited trainer and staff of the Regional Information and Advocacy Council Inc. (RIAC).

The first training was held on 4 November 2004 in Shepparton to pilot not only the training content, but also the Toolkit. Following the training delivered on 4 November 2004 in Shepparton, the layout of the Toolkit was finalised and subsequently printed by DHS. Following the initial three training workshops in West Hume, six more seminars/workshops were to be conducted in geographical areas as outlined in the funding proposals dated 15 September 2005, with up to 25 places to be offered per seminar. Each seminar was split into morning and afternoon sessions, and was to be of three hours duration each. The session for the Access and Equity Workers was conducted during their normal quarterly meeting in April 2006. Due to demand for training in Geelong, Wodonga and Orbost additional funding was requested to conduct these session. The training in Shepparton conducted on 15 August 2006 was made possible because of combining funding received from the HACC program and funding received from the Department of Health and Ageing under the Community Partners Program. This workshop was attended by a total of 35 aged care workers, however only 15 stayed for the afternoon session which focused on the Toolkit. Due to being able to utilise some additional funding, a total of 15 workshops were delivered state-wide.

The content of the seminars was to be structured to provide knowledge regarding cross-cultural communication and issues faced when dealing with consumers from a culturally and linguistically diverse background and to facilitate an understanding of the skills health professionals should have when interacting through health specialist interpreters with their non-English speaking background patients/clients. The needs of linguistically and culturally diverse clients (CALD) were to be addressed during the seminars/workshops. Also
addressed where the strategies that should be developed in order to deliver culturally competent services to CALD.

RIAC was required to evaluate the effectiveness of the seminar/workshops conducted and report such evaluation to the HACC Unit. The report was to identify seminars conducted, data collected, number of attendances, positions held by participants, feedback from the participants and any other relevant information.

All workshops were promoted through regional Primary Care Partnerships, HACC Equity and Access workers, the regional HACC Training Coordinators and regional DHS offices.

Due to the great demand in some regional centres, numbers of attendees had to be restricted, as was the case in Mildura were almost 50 health care professionals wanted to attend. A similar demand was experienced in Geelong, where a second training was offered, both workshops were well attended.

The training held in Traralgon generated interest into areas such as Lakes Entrance and Orbost. Subsequently funding was requested to hold a workshop in Orbost.

The initial training in Ballarat had to be cancelled due to low numbers at the close off date. This training was re-scheduled for the end of September and again only five people attended the seminar. However, considering that the majority of attendees came from as far as Hamilton, the seminar was offered for the benefit of those workers who do not have the opportunity to attend trainings locally very often.

Since the conclusion of the funded seminars further requests for trainings, particularly in more isolated areas have been received. However, due to cost involved, no further seminars have been organised.

### Aim

To provide a detailed report on and evaluation of the workshops conducted.

### Workshops Conducted

The 15 workshops were conducted according to the following schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Venue</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Registered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>04/11/04</td>
<td>Ave Maria Com. Village</td>
<td>Shepparton</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12/07/05</td>
<td>Ave Maria Com. Village</td>
<td>Shepparton</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06/12/05</td>
<td>Ave Maria Com. Village</td>
<td>Shepparton</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02/03/06</td>
<td>Benalla Bowls Club</td>
<td>Benalla</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09/03/06</td>
<td>Grace Bennet Centre</td>
<td>Yea</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Venue</td>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Registered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/04/06</td>
<td>Town Hall</td>
<td>Bendigo</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27/04/06</td>
<td>La Trobe Regional Hospital</td>
<td>Traralgon</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10/05/06</td>
<td>Barwon Community Health</td>
<td>Geelong - Newcombe</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11/05/06</td>
<td>Portland Library</td>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/05/06</td>
<td>Mildura Base Hospital</td>
<td>Mildura</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21/06/06</td>
<td>Barwon Community Health</td>
<td>Geelong - Newcombe</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15/8/06</td>
<td>Ave Maria Com. Village</td>
<td>Shepparton</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08/09/06</td>
<td>Orbost Regional Health</td>
<td>Orbost</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/09/06</td>
<td>Lutheran Aged Care</td>
<td>Albury-Wodonga</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28/09/06</td>
<td>Ballarat Learning Exchange</td>
<td>Ballarat</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Attendees 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Evaluation Forms 179</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Collected**

Data collected in association with the conduct of the workshops included:

- Numbers of attendees at each workshop,
- Positions held by participants, and
- Participant Feedback Evaluation Form of Workshop Experience.

**Number of Attendees**

A number of people attended the workshop sessions that did not register prior to the workshop but were recorded on the attendance sheet. One Toolkit (Toolkit) was issued to each participant on arrival at the workshop. The Toolkit also included a copy of the DHS Language Services Policy and during later trainings also the information on the Interpreter Card. In total 235 people actually participated across the 15 workshops. The training workshop conducted on 15 August 2006 was actually attended by a total of 37 participants. However, since this workshop was funded jointly by funds from the HACC programme and funding received from the Department of Health and Ageing, participants were given a choice to either attend only morning or afternoon sessions or both. Fifteen participants attended the afternoon session to receive information on how to effectively work with interpreters and translators. Therefore only this number was considered for evaluation purposes.
Positions Held by Participants

Those participating in the workshops held a representative cross section of positions within the health service provider system. They included the full spectrum of health care providers, specialty nurses, senior manager, assessment officers, allied health professional, personal carers and planned activity group workers, pharmacists, clerical staff, speech pathologists, physiotherapists.

Feedback Provided by Participants

Feedback was provided via a workshop evaluation form completed by participants. A copy of this form is provided as Attachment 1 to this report. As there was no compulsion for attendees to complete these forms, not all participants completed these forms. However the feedback received was most supportive of the workshop and appreciative of both the information provided and the way in which it was delivered.

Feedback 1: Relevancy of the content

Here the participants rated the workshop as Strongly Agree [5], Agree [4], Neither agree or Disagree [3] or Disagree [2] and Strongly Disagree (1). A maximum rating possible was therefore a rating of 5. The average of all ratings was 4.20 or 84%.

Feedback 2: Level of content

Here the participants rated the extent to which the workshop met participant expectations by selecting a rating from Strongly Agree [5], Agree [4], Neither agree or Disagree [3] or Disagree [2] and Strongly Disagree (1). A maximum rating possible was therefore a rating of 5. The average of all ratings was 4.23 or 84.5%.

Feedback 3: Rating of Presenters

Here the participants rated five [5] aspects of presenter performance with a rating from Strongly Agree [5], Agree [4], Neither agree or Disagree [3] or Disagree [2] and Strongly Disagree (1). A maximum rating possible was therefore a rating of 5 for each aspect.

The four aspects rated were:

- Knowledge of subject: The average of all ratings was 4.8 or 96%
- Balance between theory and practice: The average of all ratings was 4.3 or 86%
- Clear Presentation: The average of all ratings was 4.5 or 90.5%
• Encouragement of participation:

  The average of all ratings was 4.6 or 92%

Feedback 4: Knowledge can be transferred into practice

Here the participants were asked how they could transfer the knowledge gained into their work environment by selecting from the ratings from Strongly Agree [5], Agree [4], Neither agree or Disagree [3] or Disagree [2] and Strongly Disagree (1). The average of all ratings was 4.13 or 86.5%.

Feedback 5: Recommendation of training to colleagues

Here the participants were asked whether they would recommend the training to colleagues by selecting again from the rating Strongly Agree [5], Agree [4], Neither agree or Disagree [3] or Disagree [2] and Strongly Disagree (1). The average of all ratings was 4.4 or 88%.

Feedback 6: Most Useful Aspect of Workshop

Here the participant was asked to identify what they perceived to be the most useful aspect of the workshop in open text format. Although there were different styles of response, almost all respondents answered this one with the top five responses being:

- Awareness raising regarding cultural issues and languages services: 52 responses
- Interaction: 35 responses
- Presenters: 34 responses
- Resources (Toolkit): 29 responses
- Practical information and examples: 28 responses

The top five responses accounted for 178 of the 179 responses provided or equivalent to almost 100% of all responses.

Here two comments received from participants:

'A very helpful day – has challenged my practice and made me feel a lot more confident about accessing interpreter services.'

Another: 'As I am a migrant myself coming from a non-English speaking background I was already acutely aware of the cultural differences. However, it was wonderful to see and hear these discussed in the workshop.'
Feedback 7: Least Useful Aspect of Workshop

Here the participants were asked to identify what they perceived to be the least useful aspect of the workshop in open text format.

The response ‘Nil’ or its equivalent: 170 responses out of 179 received

Of the remainder individual comments centred on 'not enough time', 'translation exercise', the 'encouragement to discuss common practice within the agencies represented', 'no agency specific information', 'lack of professionals who should have attended'.

Feedback 6: Identify Opportunities for Improving Workshop

Here the participant was asked to identify opportunities for improving the workshop. Responses were provided in open text format.

The response ‘Nil’ or its equivalent: 172 responses out of 179 received

The few comments received centred on:
- Promoting the training workshops to management,
- Allowing more time,
- More role play,
- More practical tasks
- Ongoing training updates.

Detailed Analysis of Completed Evaluation Forms

A detailed analysis was conducted of all completed evaluation forms giving breakdowns by each of the 15 workshop sessions. The above result summaries (see attachment 2) are drawn from that analysis. The results of the detailed analysis have not been presented in this report as all prescribed requirements are embraced by the summaries provided above.

Conclusion

The service aim of the project 'to provide policy makers, senior managers, and health care providers in the rural public health sector with the knowledge and communication skills necessary to operate in a culturally and linguistically diverse environment by implementing the Language Services Toolkit' has been addressed by the workshop with some significant success.

Each of the required performance measures was complied with. Fifteen training sessions were conducted for health care providers across all major rural Victorian locations with content addressing the needs of linguistically and culturally diverse clients and the skills required of health professionals to interact effectively with them through health specialist interpreters, also taking into account cross-cultural issues that may be encountered when working with CALD. Workshop participants evaluated each workshop for effectiveness.
Recommendation

There was significant evidence in the participant evaluation forms, that participants appreciated the value of the workshops presented to them. For most participants it was a first exposure to formal training of this kind. There was positive feedback that the workshops should be re-run for those who could not attend the one workshop offered to each major rural region. There was also evidence that service providers would appreciate more frequent trainings and updates. There was evidence that many services providers were not aware of recent changes in the state-funded language service provision and also the implementation of the interpreter card.

It is therefore recommended that more cross cultural and communication awareness training be included in training programs offered to rural and regional Victoria.
**Evaluation Form**

Training Topic: Language Services Toolkit Training  
Trainers’ Name: Sigrid van Fondern / Ari Pappas  
Location:  
Date:  

We are eager to receive feedback from you so we can improve our session and/or provide further training session.  
Please circle as appropriate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Most of the content was relevant to my needs  
2. The content was at the right level for me  
3. The facilitators had sound knowledge of Subject matter  
4. The presentation was clear  
5. Participants were encouraged to contribute their own ideas  
6. The balance between theory and practice was appropriate  
7. I have acquired knowledge that I can transfer to my practice  
8. Advance information about the training was accurate  
9. The venue was appropriate  
10. I would recommend this training to colleagues

© Regional Information and Advocacy Council Inc.  
Author: Sigrid van Fondern,  
Date: 19 December 2006
Your reactions

The best things about the training were:
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

The worst things about the training were:
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

Any other comments or suggestions to improve?
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for your assistance.