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# 1.0 Introduction

Disasters and emergencies[[2]](#footnote-2) can strike at anytime and anywhere. But how many of us are actually prepared to respond to an emergency? About 85% of Canadians agree that preparing an emergency plan and emergency kit are important in ensuring their family’s safety, yet on only 40% have prepared them (Alberta Emergency Management Agency [AEMA], n.d.a). These findings are concerning since many citizens are relying on first responders to assist them; however, provincial and municipal governments have communicated that households and communities must be prepared to be on their own for the first 72 hours of an emergency (AEMA, n.d.b). The lack of household and community or neighbourhood level preparation is also concerning because municipalities may not have the capacity to respond; greater responsibility has been placed on them by federal and provincial governments to provide emergency (and other) services without necessarily receiving adequate resources to do so (Shrubsole, 2013). Municipalities being overstretched and underfunded has serious implications, especially since they respond to more than 90% of emergencies (Juillet & Koji, 2013).

Relationships are the most important levers of emergency preparedness (Donahue & Tuohy, 2006). Studies have found that communities with strong social ties are more resilient, since “resilience isn’t personal grit; it’s the capacity of a neighbourhood or community to respond, mitigate, and adapt to crisis” (Aldrich, 2015). Examining Cuba’s disaster management reveals that “strengthening community capacity, strong coordination of local actors and investing in social capital are determining factors for success[…]” (Grogg, 2015). Disaster preparedness and response programs are more successful when they are community-driven (Ibid.) and if community members had participated in planning and training for response prior to the event (Pollon, 2014). Also, organized grassroots efforts may be more successful if they are integrated into the community through neighbourhood associations, schools, workplaces, and other existing organizations (Ibid.).

There is a gap at the scholarly and practitioner level in community-level disaster preparedness and response for neighbourhoods (see next section) and even more so for ethnic communities. The term community describes both social (e.g. ethnic community) and geographical (e.g. neighbourhood) communities. A community may include citizens, various organizations, subject matter experts (SMEs), and professionals, among others, residing either in a specific geographical location or bound together by common objective but not a common location.

Research by Cherry and Allred (2012) on Hurricane Katrina found that immigrant populations are largely ignored in disaster strategic plans. Subsequently, culturally appropriate disaster preparedness programs need to be developed and tested (Eisenman et al., 2009b). Social networks are critically important to ethnic communities since they often do not have extended family members, have limited language proficiencies, and may not be familiar with available resources. Eisenman et al. (2009a) found that interventions delivered through a culturally targeted program using informal social networks and community engagement had increased disaster preparedness for a difficult-to-reach Latino population. Cherry and Allred (2012) found that the Filipino community during Hurricane Katrina “mobilized quickly because of pre-existing networks, social capital and effective leadership structures” (p. 400) and because of their “unified sense of urgency for their fellow Filipinos…and…a sense of obligation toward them, what many Filipinos would call the *bayanihan* (Tagalog) spirit” (p. 397). The Filipino community comprises the largest ethnic group in High River (about 600 members) and is one of the community partners of the We’re Ready! Pilot Project. The Filipino population has a unique experience with disasters since it is one of the most disaster prone countries in the world, such as volcanic eruptions, earthquakes, tsunamis, floods, etc.

The We’re Ready! Pilot Projectwas developed to address the gap in emergency preparation and response at the community-level (ethnic and geographical) as well as the shortage of resources at the municipal level. Being prepared for emergencies and having the knowledge and resources to respond adequately is important because it can reduce confusion and distress, prevent injury and save lives, and minimize or avoid damages. *The purpose of the We’re Ready! Pilot Project is to facilitate communities in designing and implementing their own disaster preparedness program through engaging and effective approaches.* Deliverables of the project include hazard and evacuation maps; communication plans; and a community capacity inventory.

The We’re Ready! Pilot Project differs from other emergency preparedness programs in Canada by combining the following: 1. Community-based rather than household-based; 2. Workshop is designed to encourage building of social networks, social capital, and social capacity; 3. Participants design their own customized disaster community plan and communications plan; 4. The project is designed based on principles of program planning and adult education with an emphasis on learning transfer; 5. Community partners contributed to the development and implementation of the pilot project; 6. The process is facilitated rather than led; and 7. Results from two different communities (ethnic and geographic) are compared and contrasted. The We’re Ready! Pilot Projectis intended to complement existing emergency preparedness programs, to build on effective strategies, and to promote collaboration which is considered key for the short- and long-term success of such projects.

# 2.0 Context and Rationale

## *2.1 The 2013 Alberta floods & High River*

The 2013 Alberta 2013 flood is considered one of the most expensive natural disasters in Canada’s history, estimated at $6 billion. The 2013 storm impacted thirty communities in southern Alberta, but the most severely hit was the Town of High River (THR). Over 13,000 residents were evacuated, 59% of the land was inundated by water, 70% of homes were moderately to severely damaged, and 79 out of 83 town buildings experienced significant damage (Flootman, 2014). Flowing through the town is the Highwood River, which has a history of flooding: 1897, 1902, 1906, 1912, 1913, 1932, 1942, 1995, 2005, and 2013. Yet despite its location and history, High River was not prepared for a flood of such magnitude.

The Town has gone to extensive efforts to improve their overall emergency preparedness using both structural and non-structural approaches.[[3]](#footnote-3) At the municipal level, the Town has hired a full-time director of emergency management, updated its Municipal Emergency Management Plan (THR, 2014b), and completed a Hazard Risk and Vulnerability Assessment identifying 29 potential risks that could create emergency situations including environmental, technological and human-caused events, such tornadoes and severe winds, hazardous material spills, and potential contamination of the water supply (THR, 2015). In February 2015, the Town hosted a mock ice storm emergency for those working in the Emergency Operations Centre (EOC) (Rushworth, 2015). A website (hrready.ca) was created to provide alerts, notifications and resources to help stay informed and prepared for future emergencies. May has been declared as the Emergency Preparedness Month in High River – in conjunction with the national Emergency Preparedness Week (first week of May) – and the first Emergency Preparedness Expo was held on May 9, 2015. In October 2015, the Town hosted a two-day mock meteorite strike to engage their community with a focus on spontaneous volunteer management and had 68 participants (Graveland, 2015).

At the household level, residents have access to the hrready.ca website and were invited to the Emergency Preparedness Expo. The Town has created the Household Emergency Guide (THR, 2014a). There is no data available on what percentage of households in High River have prepared emergency plans and emergency kits (personal communication, 2015), but the percentage is expected to be on par with Canada-wide statistics. Several workshops on emergency kits, coping, etc. were offered shortly after the 2013 flood but participation rate was low. Timing is of critical importance: workshops on preparation held too close to a disaster event will likely have low turnout rate because of disaster fatigue, but the window of opportunity for change after a disaster is only about 18-24 months (Auditor General, 2015); thus, action is needed before the onset of “disaster amnesia” (Tierney, 2007, p. 508).

Given that a large disaster occurred within a few years, the Town’s extensive efforts in emergency preparedness, expected low uptake of emergency preparedness by residents, and neighbourhood-based strategy being identified as an emerging priority for action in High River (Weaver & Cheuy, 2014), we anticipated that this proposed We’re Ready! Pilot Project will address a need and that piloting it in High River will be successful.

## *2.2 Community-based approach to disasters*

Historically, emergency preparedness programs and resources in Canada have tended to target individuals and households, institutions such as workplaces and schools, and municipal, provincial, and federal government administration, creating a gap at the neighbourhood level. Recently, British Columbia (B.C.) developed a Neighbourhood Preparedness Guide (PreparedBC, n.d.) and an award-winning Rural Disaster Resiliency Planning Community Toolkit (JIBC, 2013). Also, the City of Calgary developed ReadyCalgary: Building Community Resilience Participant Manual (CEMA, 2015). This pilot builds on numerous programs as to not “reinvent the wheel.”

Some countries have a neighbourhood-based approach to disaster preparation and response. Cuba’s low disaster casualty rate is attributed to its success in instilling a culture of preparedness that is annually reinforced in countrywide training weekends and community drills before hurricane season as well as lessons in emergency preparedness being built into the school curriculum (Newhouse, 2013; Grogg, 2015). Dutch “flood brigades” are made up of community members (OECD, 2015, p. 134). In the United States (U.S.), the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (FEMA) has several community-based emergency programs such as America’s PrepareAthon!, Citizen Corps, and Community Emergency Response Team (CERT) (see Appendix A).

The first Canadian CERT training was held in 2014 by Bridges of Love Ministry in Calgary, Alberta. The instructional design included lecture-style presentations from experts on topics such as search and rescue, disaster psychology, and medical operations. A one-hour triage exercise was held. This pilot differs because residents of a neighbourhood work together to build their own disaster plan in engaging activities. Since social connections are critical during disasters, a community capacity list will be compiled through activities that facilitate social connections.

## *2.3 Applying the Interactive Model of Program Planning*

The We’re Ready! Pilot Project incorporates the Interactive Model of Program Planning (see Appendix B) with its emphasis on learning transfer to ensure effectiveness. The “lessons learned” process of post-event reviewing and reporting are widely used in emergency management. However, studies have shown that lessons are not necessarily learned since the problems and mistakes are repeated in subsequent events (Donahue & Touhy, 2006). Rather, they are “lessons observed” (Birkland, 2009, p. 13) or “lessons learned not remembered” (Government of Canada, 2008, p.51). Factors identified in failure to learn include lack of dissemination of lessons, lessons not being consolidated into training regimens, and lack of practice (Donahue & Touhy, 2006). Practice is required to engrave new behaviour until old behaviours are not automatically enacted during emergencies. In addition, response agencies need to have a deeper understanding of the learning process, which is not taught in emergency response educational institutions. Learning activities need to be targeted at improving performance rather than being punitive (Ibid.). The pilot program will consist of numerous engaging, experiential, and hands-on activities to maximize learning transfer (see Appendix C) in order to ensure learners actually learned what was intended and they are able to apply the new information (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013). This pilot uses pragmatic or practical approach to program planning which recognizes that changes will be made throughout the process and acknowledges that practitioners need to be willing to confront tough issues, facilitate difficult meetings, and be flexible (Ibid., p. 11).

# 3.0 Partnerships and support for program

The Pilot Project was intended to be small-scale with a few partners and limited number of participants. An ad-hoc committee was formed and included representatives from Emergency Management of THR: Carly Benson, Director of Emergency Management; Lisa Degenstein, Settlement Worker, Foothills Community Immigrant Services (FCIS); Mary-Joy Lamprea, Vice President, Filipino Community Association; Eva Bogdan, University of Alberta; Stephanie Sodero, Memorial University. In addition, the ad-hoc committee included three community volunteers: Judy McMillan-Evans, McMillan-Evans Consulting; John Robson; and Gayelle Geres. Table 1 below outlines the various types of support provided by project partners:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Members & Organizations**  | **Type of support** |
| Endors-ement  | SME & local knowledge | Funding source  | In-kind participation or supports | Materials & Resources |
| THR – Emergency Management (n=1) | X | X |  | X | X |
| THR – Town Office | X |  |  | X | X |
| THR – Foothills Community Immigrant Services (FCIS) (n=1) | X | X |  | X | X |
| Centre for Community Disaster Research (CCDR), Mount Royal University | X |  | X |  |  |
| Town of High River community volunteers (n=3) | X | X |  | X | X |
| Filipino Community Association (n=1) | X | X |  | X | X |
| Academics – University of Alberta and Memorial University (n=2)  | X | X |  | X | X |

Potential future funders and partners for expanding the Pilot Project into a Program that provides resources and supports to communities in Alberta and elsewhere: Community Futures, AEMA, St. John’s Ambulance, Public Safety Canada, United Way, Hollyhock Social Venture Institute, Center for Disaster and Risk Analysis at Colorado State University, Canadian Risk and Hazards Network (CRHNet), Federation of Canadian Municipalities, Federation of Community Leagues, Alberta Urban Municipalities Association, Aviva Insurance, Red Cross, Samaritan’s Purse, TD Canada Trust, Institute for Environmental Sustainability at Mount Royal University, etc.

# 4.0 Developing the We’re Ready! Project and the workshops

## *4.1 Purpose, deliverables, and goals of the four phases*

The purpose of the We’re Ready! Pilot Project is to facilitate communities in designing and implementing their own disaster preparedness program through fun and engaging community-building activities.

Deliverables of the project include hazard and evacuation maps; communication plans; and a community capacity inventory. A difficult to measure but significant outcome of this project will be strengthened social connections which enhance community resilience pre- and post-disaster.

The pilot project consists of four phases. The first phase involved designing the pilot project. The second phase involved implementing the pilot project. The third phase involves evaluation and revision. Phase four involves expanding the pilot project into a program which includes the We’re Ready! Website (<http://www.wereready.org/>) with resources and supports available for communities in Alberta and elsewhere. Each of these phases has a set of goals and objectives, some of which are focused on operational outcomes while others are focused on participant outcomes (learning objectives or LOs).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Jul. 2015 – May. 2016 | *Phase 1: Designing the We’re Ready! Community Disaster Preparedness Pilot Project* |
|  | **Goal 1: Design the We’re Ready! Community Disaster Preparedness Pilot Project and build support for the project.**  |
| Jul. 2015 | Objective 1.1: Develop a draft proposal and project plan for the Pilot Project. |
| Aug. – Oct. 2015 | Objective 1.2 Receive feedback on the draft and make revisions. |
|  |  |
| Nov. – Dec. 2015 | Objective 1.3: Identify potential ad hoc committee members and recruit 4-6 members. |
| Jan. - May. 2016 | Objective 1.4: Further develop the pilot project with the Pilot Project committee members. (Meet every 2-3 weeks in-person or via phone call) |
| Feb. – Mar. 2016 | Objective 1.5: Secure financial resources and other types of support for the pilot project. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| May, 2016 | *Phase 2: Implementing the* *We’re Ready! Community Disaster Preparedness Pilot Project* | *Learning Objectives (LO’s)*  |
|  | **Goal 2: Through the We’re Ready! Community Disaster Preparedness Pilot Project, residents are collectively prepared for emergencies and respond in ways that reduce confusion and distress, prevent injury and save lives, and minimize or avoid damages.** |
| May 28 & 29, 2016 | Objective 2.1: Facilitate two one-day workshops for participants to work together to develop their community disaster plan.  |  |
|  | Objective 2.2: Provide opportunities for participants to begin building a network of support.  | A. Participants identify their community members in terms of their name, skills, needs, resources, etc.  |
|  | Objective 2.3: Engage participants to share their experiences with disasters and strategies to reduce vulnerability to them.  | B. Participants reflect on past disaster experiences and identify what worked and what could have been improved in order to develop strategies to reduce vulnerability to future disasters.  |
|  | Objective 2.4: Engage participants to identify information and resources on responding to a disaster that could potentially impact their community. | C. Participants identify plausible responses to a potential disaster in their neighbourhood and incorporate this information into their community disaster plan. |
|  | Objective 2.5: Practice hands-on disaster-related activities to increase learning transfer. Objective 2.6: Integrate learnings from the workshop to revise the disaster plan. | D. Participants demonstrate the skills and knowledge needed to prepare and respond to a disaster.E. Participants integrate learnings from the workshop activities and discuss improvement to the various disaster component plans.F. Participants translate what they have learned during the workshop into their own community disaster plan. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Jun. 2016 – Aug. 2016 | *Phase 3: Evaluating and revising the We’re Ready! Community Disaster Preparedness Pilot Project* |
|  | **Goal 3: Improve the We’re Ready! Community Disaster Preparedness Project.**  |
| May. 2016 | Objective 3.1: Analyze the pre- and post-workshops survey results.  |
| Jun. 2016Jul. – Aug. 2016Summer and/or Fall 2016 | Objective 3.2: Conduct debriefing of the workshops to identify what worked and what can be improved as well as lessons learned.Objective 3.3: Revise the We’re Ready! Community Disaster Preparedness Project.Objective 3.4: Provide supports and resources to Team Leaders who have self-identified and volunteered to lead the development of their community’s Disaster Preparedness Plan. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Sep. 2016 – Dec. 2016 | *Phase 4: Expanding the We’re Ready! Community Disaster Preparedness Project into a program.* |
|  | **Goal 4: The We’re Ready! Community Disaster Preparedness Program is available for public access (in Alberta and elsewhere).** |
| Sep. – Oct.2016 | Objective 4.1: Design and develop the We’re Ready! Website (<http://www.wereready.org/>) with links to resources and supports.  |
| Nov. 2016 | Objective 4.2: Implement We’re Ready! workshops for geographic, ethnic, and/or other types of social communities e.g. senior’s facility in High River and/or other municipalities. |

Other phases, goals, and objectives to be determined

## *4.2 Workshop*

The workshop schedule provides a breakdown of activities and their corresponding learning objectives.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Time** | **Activities** | **LOs** |
| 9:00 AM – 9:15 AM | *Registration:*Ask participants to initial next to their name on the attendance list, verify correct contact information, and also double check for those who were registered by someone else about food allergies. Provide name tags. |  |
| 9:15 AM – 9:20 AM | *Welcome:* Introduce the We’re Ready! project (e.g. purpose and deliverables) and the organizing committee. Outline workshop schedule.  |  |
| 9:20 AM – 9:40 AM | *Activity 1: Pre-workshop survey* | B |
| 9:40 AM – 10:00 AM | *Activity 2: Community Bingo*Identify community members in terms of their name, skills, needs, resources (see details in Appendix D). | A |
| 10:00 AM – 10:15 AM | *Break and refreshments* |  |
| 10:15 AM – 11:00 AM  | *Activity 3: Sharing Previous Disaster Lessons/Experiences*Participants share their experiences of previous disasters and reflect on What worked well during the 2013 flood? What could be improved? | B |
| 11:00 AM – 11:45 AM | *Activity 4: Map Evacuation* Participants map out different sections of the Town of High River and discuss plausible responses to a potential disaster by identifying hazards, safe places and evacuation routes. | C |
| 11:45 AM – 12:15 PM | *Lunch* |  |
| 12:15 PM – 1:00 PM | *Activity 5: Community Plan*Participants are grouped into teams and each team is tasked with a different disaster event and asked a series of questions about communication and response strategies in order to create a disaster response plan.  | A, B, C, D |
| 1:00 PM – 1:45 PM | *Activity 6: Off-site Mock Disaster Game*Participants demonstrate the skills and knowledge needed to prepare and respond to a disaster. | A, C, D,  |
| 1:45 PM – 2:00 PM | *Break and refreshments* |  |
| 2:00 PM – 2:15 PM | *Activity 7: Debrief and Revision*Participants discuss what worked and what are areas for improvement of their plan based on their experience of the mock disaster scenario.  | E |
| 2:15 PM – 2:30 PM | *Activity 8: Our Team*Discuss next steps for the community disaster plan. Volunteers self-identify to be a lead for their community.  | F |
| 2:30 PM – 2:45 PM | *Activity 9: Post-workshop Survey*  |  |
| 2:45 PM – 3:00 PM | *Wrap up*Thank participants for attending and hand out certificates of completion. |  |

For an example of an activity instructional plan, see Appendix D. Detailed instructional plans for each activity will be available on the We’re Ready! Website.

Two workshops were held, one on Saturday, May 28, 2016 for the Filipino community and one on Sunday, May 29, 2016 for the general public in High River. Initially the Sunday workshop targeted residents of south-west neighbourhood in High River but not enough participants signed up so the workshop was opened up to all residents of High River.

* Saturday – 22 participants in the beginning, 23 participants at the end
* Sunday – 11 participants of the general public but 1 person was from Airdrie and so their survey response was not included for analysis

# 5.0 Evaluation

Evaluation is an important component of program planning because it allows for assessing the success of program. Program goals and objectives as well as participants’ learning objectives will be critiqued based on the SMART criteria (Specific, Measurable, Assignable, Realistic, and Timely). At the end of the workshop, whether the program’s goals and objectives and participants’ learning objectives were achieved were evaluated based on the assessment plan for each instructional activity (see Appendix D). The learning objectives are based on assessment of whether learning transfer occurred. Transfer of learning is not a new component in the planning process but it is receiving more attention as participants and sponsors of programs demand more concrete results (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013). Ensuring learning transfer is critical for emergency preparedness because it can make the difference between life and death. Participants filled out a pre- and post-workshop survey evaluation based on questions from *Statistic Canada’s 2014 Survey of Emergency Preparedness and Resilience*[[4]](#footnote-4) (SEPR). The ad hoc committee met shortly after the workshop to debrief and discuss what worked and what can be improved upon.

A detailed review of the workshop survey results and the debrief is out of scope for this report;

however, highlights are described below.

## *5.1 Debrief by organizing committee*

The Committee debriefed each step of the Pilot Project, including timing, promotions, registration, participant attendance and dynamics, facility, food, set-up, and each activity. Overall, the workshops were a success. A quote from one of the participants captured the spirit and purpose of the We’re Ready! Project: **“It’s better to be together, than alone!”** Plans are underway to implement more workshops in High River and other municipalities, including Airdrie and Edmonton.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| What worked well? | What could have worked better? |
| * Great collaboration by the members of the Organizing Committee!
* Well prepared and organized
* Activities and workshop rated high
* Debrief after each activity to ensure learning transfer
* Post outcomes of each activity on wall to build disaster plan
* Build on existing social ties
* Demand for more of these workshops
 | Saturday – Filipino community* Unexpected double night shift for workers resulting in lower attendance
* Survey too long with translation

Sunday – General community* Church community resulting in lower attendance so do not book Sundays
* Group did not “gel” because most of them did not have existing social ties
 |

## *5.2 Survey results*

1. When asked if participants understood the purpose of the We’re Ready! Workshop, 90-100% agreed or strongly agreed.
2. In general, when asked about the effectiveness of each activity in achieving its goal, 80-100% participants agreed or strongly agreed. The only exception was Our Team (Activity 8) in which 20% responded neutral, 40% left the question blank, leaving only 40% to agree or strongly agree to the question on effectiveness of the activity for discussing next steps for the community disaster plan. A possible explanation for the lower favourable responses for this question is that the Sunday group did not “gel” since they did not know each other. In contrast, the Filipino participants on Saturday have stronger social bonds with each other. Community team leads emerged to continue working on emergency plans either with community members there or a leader’s own social group.
3. Over 90% of participants absolutely or partially agreed that enough time was given during the workshop to make social connections.
4. With the exception of one respondent who left the question blank, all participants absolutely or partially agreed that the workshop fulfilled their reason for attending. Challenges with English as a Second Language may have been a barrier to completing this question.
5. Over 90-100% of participants absolutely or partially agreed that they would recommend this workshop to others.
6. Other comments (select):
* Well done nothing to be suggested all good. Awesome thanks.
* Good job!
* More training and workshop! Congratulations everybody!
* A group should be formed and members be identified for training on disaster preparedness. MUST.
* Learned a lot, you guys did a good job. Thank you!
* Hoping more people will attend this kind of workshop
* Thank you so much for sharing to us your knowledge. More people to educate for this workshop. God bless.
* Want more trainings, need equipment for the time of disaster.
* More training to help in the community in times of disaster.
* Great program and presentation! Thanks to all.
* Was surprised more people did not attend - Excellent workshop. Thanks for Carly and all staff and volunteers.
* Good follow-up workshop would be people developing their specific individual or community emergency plans and physically following through work them in response to a stage 2 (mock) emergency in town (to test their plans).

# 6.0 Budget

**Budgets**

The estimated expenses and income sources in this proposal pertain to the pilot project only.

*Expenses*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Items** | **Expenses** |  | **Items** | **Expenses** |
| *Personnel* |  |  | *Travel* |  |
| Instructors/facilitators | In-kind |  | Airfare (NB to AB)  | **$** 0 |
| Ad-hoc committee | In-kind |  | Mileage | $ 360 |
| Other contractors | 0 |  | Parking fees | 0 |
| *Materials* |  |  | *Facilities*  |  |
| Copying, printing, stationary | $ 658.70 |  | Hotel accommodations | $ 0 |
| Design  | In-kind |  | Rental | $ 0 |
| Large area map | See print |  | *Food*  | 1194.94 |
| *Technical support* |  |  |  AM Snacks & refreshments |  |
| Internet fees | 0 |  |  Lunch (canned food) |  |
| *Equipment* |  |  |  PM Coffee & drinks |  |
| Computers | In-kind |  |   |  |
| Projectors | In-kind |  | *Supplies for activities*  |  |
| Screen | In-kind |  |  |  |
| *Marketing* |  |  | ~~Emergency kit supplies ($100/ person x 40)~~ | ~~$0~~ |
| Design, printing, distribution, translation | $ 696.30 |  | *Miscellaneous* | $0 |
|  |  |  | **Total direct expenses** | **$2909.94** |
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# 8.0 Appendices

**Appendix A: Emergency Preparedness Programs**

America’s PrepareAthon! is a grassroots campaign for action to increase community preparedness and resilience for disasters (FEMA, 2015a). It provides opportunities for individuals, organizations, and communities to prepare for specific hazards through drills, group discussions, and exercises, including planning with neighbours and doing activities. Materials are available including videos and Playbooks on specific disasters that guide discussions, tabletop exercises, and maintaining year-round momentum.

Citizen Corps’ mission is to harness the power of the individual to make communities safer. Its focus is on outreach, engaging voluntary organizations, as well as “integrating whole community representatives with emergency managers to ensure disaster preparedness and response planning represents the whole community and integrates nontraditional resources” (FEMA, 2014).

CERT basic emergency training is a grassroots strategy to strengthen community safety and preparedness through increased civic participation. The success of the CERT program over the past 20 years has been captured through numerous stories (FEMA, 2015b).

**Appendix B: Interactive Model of Program Planning**



This Interactive Model of Program Planning by Caffarella and Daffron (2013) was used for designing the various phases of the We’re Ready! Disaster Preparedness Project.

Figure 1. Interactive Model of Program Planning (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013, p. 29).

**Appendix C: Successful Transfer of Learning Model**



Figure 2. Successful Transfer of Learning Model (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013, p. 217).

Transfer of learning has often been thought of in terms of observable changes in knowledge, skills, and attitudes. This has led to the assumption that as long as it is clear what learning is to be transferred and how, the transfer will occur without any additional interventions. While true in some cases, “learning transfer is often more complex and multifaceted than just simply being clear about what learning needs to be applied and having a plan to do that” (see references in Caffarella & Daffron, 2013, p. 211). However, application is a complex and multidimensional process that takes knowledge, skill, endurance and artistry (Ottoson, 1995 in Ibid).

There are links between transfer of learning and program planning components. For example, learning transfer can be enhanced or blocked by a number of influencing factors, which may interact, such as the following: participants, design and execution, content, changes required to apply learning, organization content, and community and societal forces (Caffarella & Daffron, 2013, p. 219). Three key elements need to be addressed when planning the learning transfer: 1. Timing of when the transfer strategies will be used; 2. Variety of strategies used; and 3. Key people involved. (Ibid., p. 220).

**Appendix D: Instructional Plan**

A detailed instructional plan is provided below for one of the activities.

|  |
| --- |
| **Session title:** *Activity 2: Community Bingo*  |
| **Date & time:** 9:40 AM – 10:00 AM |
| **Presenter:** Lisa provides instructions for the activity and Carly leads the de-briefing discussion. |
| **Description of learning activity:**This activity is based on the game “Find someone who.” Participants use a checklist to find a person who has a certain characteristic. When the participants find “someone who is an electrician” or “someone who has mobility challenges” or “someone who has two cats and a dog,” they write that person’s name on their checklist and move on to the next person until the allotted time is up. The goal is to meet and talk to as many people as possible within the time limit in order to put a name by each of the characteristics or resources.  |
| **Learning objectives:** AThe participants will identify residents of their neighbourhood in terms of their name, skills, needs, resources, etc. |
| **Instructional techniques:**Read instructions and demonstrate the activity.  |
| **Discussion/debrief:**Select a few participants to speak to whether they were surprised by someone new they met or learning something new about someone they already knew. Create a master list on a flip chart page and post on wall |
| **Assessment plan:** After the activity, ask how many filled out 5, 10, 15, etc. of the checklist items and award prizes (emergency kit supply items). Pre- and post-workshop survey sections on social networks as well as social cohesion and community belonging.  |
| **Estimated duration of activity:** 20 minutes: 10 minutes for activity and 10 minutes for pre-activity instructions and post-activity discussions.  |
| **Instructor (I) and participant (P) resources:**Checklist of various characteristics of people related to skills, needs, resources. # copies: 80. Prizes that consist of emergency supply kit components.  |
| **Facilities required:**Community league or equivalent. |

1. The need for such a pilot project arose from literature review and findings from Eva Bogdan’s PhD research on flood management in High River and Stephanie Sodero’s PhD research on hurricanes in eastern Canada. Both researchers are funded by Social Science and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC). This pilot project received seed funding of $7,500 from the Centre for Community Disaster Research at Mount Royal University. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. An emergency is “an event that requires prompt co-ordination of action or special regulation of persons or property to protect the safety, health or welfare of people or to limit damage to property” (Alberta Municipal Affairs, 2010). A disaster is “a more serious event[..] that threaten[s] or cause[s] widespread losses and damage, and disrupt[s] social structure and essential functions” (Ibid.). The terms emergency and disaster are used synonymously since the emergencies of interest in this pilot program are those that occur at the community scale. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Flood management practices are categorized into structural and non-structural adjustments. Structural-adjustment approaches include dams, diversions, berms, building construction, etc. Nonstructural adjustments include education and awareness, prediction and warning systems, relocation, river modelling, and individual and institutional capacity building. This proposal does not provide an exhaustive list of the THR’s emergency preparedness efforts. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. For more information, visit http://www.statcan.gc.ca/daily-quotidien/151028/dq151028a-eng.htm [↑](#footnote-ref-4)