



Transforming the Field Education Landscape



We're Ready! Plus Report

A Practicum on Community Disaster Preparedness Workshop in
Inglewood community, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

Dr. Evalyna Bogdan, Tegan Nelson, and Winkie Lau




Table of Contents

Acknowledgments	3
Description of We're Ready! Plus Training	4
We're Ready! Plus Workshop 2022	5
Inglewood Community Demographics	6
Welcome and registration	6
Pre-workshop survey (Activity 1).....	6
Community Capacity Inventory Bingo (Activity 2).....	6
Sharing Previous Disaster Lessons/Experiences (Activity 3)	7
Map Evacuation Routes and Muster Points (Activity 4).....	8
Building the Community Plan (Activity 5).....	10
On-Site Mock Disaster Simulation (Activity 6).....	12
Debrief & Identify Community Plan Revisions (Activity 7)	12
Building Momentum (Activity 8).....	14
Post-Workshop Survey (Activity 9)	15
Wrap-Up & Certificates.....	15
Effectiveness of WR!+ Workshop 2022	16
Awareness.....	16
1. Personal Preparedness	16
2. Community Preparedness	17
3. Motivation & Action	18
4. Information & Messaging	19
Social Connections	20
Self-Efficacy & Sense of Agency	22
Rating Effectiveness of Workshop Activities	24
Rating of activities.....	24
Visioning.....	25
Conclusion	26
Next Steps	26
Appendix 1. Pre-Workshop Survey	27
Appendix 2. Post-Workshop Survey	32

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Transforming the Field Education Landscape (TFEL) project is supported in part by the funding from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC).

Dr. Bogdan's research on We're Ready! Plus is supported by the Eyes High Postdoctoral Match-Funding Fellowship from the University of Calgary.

We thank the TFEL Project for providing funding to hire BSW practicum student (Tegan Nelson) and Global Mitacs for the financial support for research assistant (Winkie Lau). We are also grateful to the Inglewood Community League for the funding that provided lunch and snacks for all participants and facilitators – this was made possible by Lauren McConnell, associated with the League and resident of Inglewood. We extend our gratitude to her for her time, effort, and participation. The funder did not play any role in the conduct of the research or preparation of this report.

We would like to thank the MAC Islamic School for providing the venue to run the workshop. We have also received support from Amina Shaikh, the EnrichIt Coordinator of the MAC Islamic School, for recruiting participants and venue preparation, as well as informing facilitators on specific cultural competency components.

We would also like to thank Adam Conway, the Emergency Manager from the University of Alberta, for demonstrating and explaining the emergency preparedness kit and for obtaining prizes for the Community Bingo (Activity 2) from the City of Edmonton.

Finally, we would like to thank the participants who gave permission to share their names, Brad Marshall and Taramay Curtis, as well as participants who did not wish to be named, who have taken their time to contribute to this research.

REPORT AUTHORS (listed alphabetically by last name)

Dr. Evalyna Bogdan (Postdoctoral Scholar)
Tegan Nelson (BSW Practicum Student)
Winkie Lau (TFEL Research Assistant- Mitacs Intern)

MEMBERS OF THE WE'RE READY! PLUS REPORT TEAM (listed alphabetically by last name)

Dr. Evalyna Bogdan (Postdoctoral Scholar)
Dr. Julie Drolet (Postdoctoral Supervisor and TFEL Director)
Tegan Nelson (BSW Practicum Student)
Winkie Lau (TFEL Research Assistant- Mitacs Intern)
Liz Tettman (TFEL Research Assistant)

SUGGESTED CITATION

Transforming the Field Education Landscape (TFEL). (2022). *We're Ready! Plus Report. A Practicum on Community Disaster Preparedness Workshop in Inglewood community, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada*. University of Calgary, AB: Authors.

CONTACT:

Dr. Julie Drolet, Professor & TFEL Project Director, Faculty of Social Work, University of Calgary, 3-250, 10230 Jasper Avenue, Edmonton, Alberta, T5J 4P6, Canada. jdrolet@ucalgary.ca

Description of We're Ready! Plus Training

The We're Ready! (WR!) Community Disaster Preparedness© approach¹ was co-developed with community members from High River following the 2013 Alberta flood. Three in-person workshops and one online workshop have been successfully implemented between 2016-2019 (described further below).

In 2022, as part of her postdoctoral research, Dr. Evalyna Bogdan and her supervisor Dr. Julie Drolet (both field instructors for this practicum), transformed WR! to We're Ready! Plus (WR!+) as a practicum and research assistantship (RA) opportunity for students. WR!+ is part of the Transforming the Field Education Landscape (TFEL) Project 2 (2019-2025) at the Faculty of Social Work, University of Calgary (UC). A major aspect of TFEL is to identify sustainable field education models, especially those that address practicum shortages, interprofessional practice, research-based practice, use of technology and simulation, and anti-racist and decolonizing perspectives. New models of social work (SW) practicums are needed because SW field education is in crisis, in part due to a shortage of quality practicum placements and insufficient integration of research and practice. Additionally, even though SW practitioners in Alberta are increasingly involved in all phases of disaster management, Dr. Drolet and colleagues found that SW practitioners lack the necessary education and training to reflect the complexities of community disaster management and lack field education in disaster contexts. The WR!+ practicum training aims to address these challenges in SW education.

In the WR!+ model, students from social work programs and emergency management (EM) programs work with community members to adapt and implement the WR! activities under the guidance and close supervision of Dr. Bogdan and other field instructors or practicum coordinators. During the 2022 iteration of the newly adapted model, only SW students took part in the WR!+ training and workshop facilitation.

The WR!+ Student Training has five unique components that constitute the Plus element:

1. Gender Based Analysis Plus³ (GBA+), and the Social Vulnerability and Disasters⁴, and Cultural Competence in Hazards and Disaster Research⁵ modules (CONVERGE, Natural Hazards Center, University of Colorado Boulder) training for students to examine intersectional identity factors and to promote Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion (EDI) in the workshops – this is critical, because students work with vulnerable and diverse populations to ensure inclusive disaster resilience (anti-racism).
2. As part of Green Social Work focusing on environmental and social justice, students watched the webinar by Dr. Haorui Wu from Dalhousie University on Building a Culture of Resilience: Community-Based Disaster Specific Initiatives⁶. This webinar describes the link between disasters and environmental sustainability to understand causes of risk and vulnerability, thereby building students' capacity to work in disaster prevention and policy advocacy (advocacy-based). Students then facilitate participants identifying the link between disasters and sustainability specific to their communities (e.g., increased demand for oil increases greenhouse gas emissions contributing to climate change as well as increases the risk of another Lac Megantic train derailment incidence).
3. Training and mentoring on community engagement in three ways: How students can a) work with community champions (community members who take the lead on collaborating with students) to adapt the workshop to their community contexts and needs; b) co-organize the workshop (decolonizing

¹ For more information about the WR! Approach, visit www.wereready.org

² For more information about TFEL, visit <https://tfelproject.com/>

³ <https://women-gender-equality.canada.ca/en/gender-based-analysis-plus.html>

⁴ <https://converge-training.colorado.edu/courses/vulnerable-populations/>

⁵ <https://converge-training.colorado.edu/courses/cultural-competence/>

⁶ <https://tfelproject.com/2021/10/28/webinar-building-a-culture-of-resilience-community-based-disaster-specific-initiatives/>

approach); and c) how students can work with community members to identify resources and empower them to advocate for reducing risks and vulnerabilities (participatory capacity building, action-oriented). Students also complete the Reciprocity in Hazards and Disaster Research CONVERGE module from the Natural Hazards Center, University of Colorado Boulder which provides information about community engagement and participation in research-related activities. The students and field instructor met with community champions five times to discuss recruitment of workshop participants, cultural considerations, venues, supplies, and food.

4. Train students in the Community Resilience Model⁷ (CRM) so that they can utilize the associated skills during the WR!+ Workshop. The goal of CRM is to create trauma-informed and resiliency-informed communities that share a common understanding of the impact of trauma and stress on the nervous system and how resiliency can be restored or increased. Students will learn about the first four of the six wellness skills that comprise the CRM model: tracking, resourcing, grounding, help now, gesturing, and shift and stay. Students share the CRM skills with workshop participants. The key developer of the CRM model is Elaine Miller-Karas, LCSW, co-founder of the Trauma Resource Institute.
5. To provide collaboration (and interprofessional) opportunities for SW students and EM students to work together (where possible) with students in delivering the WR!+ Workshops and evaluating the effectiveness of the workshops they lead (research-based practice). Only SW students participated in the WR!+ training in 2022. In the future both SW and EM students will work together in this unique practicum training across Canada.

WR!+ training took place online from May 16, 2022 – June 25, 2022, Monday through Friday 1-4pm (3 hours). The students being trained to become facilitators of the workshop engaged in continual reflection by completing ‘How I Will Apply’ documents every day of training followed by discussions with peers and the field instructor.

We’re Ready! Plus Workshop 2022

The WR!+ approach is unique: Its purpose is to facilitate (rather than lead) community members to design and implement their own neighbourhood-level, locally relevant disaster plans, and build their social networks and community capacity, through interactive and engaging activities.

WR!+ is based on the principles of adult education (Knowles, 1973) and incorporates experiential learning (Kolb, 1984) including disaster simulation (e.g., ice storm). Knowles (1973) proposed that adults are self-directed, learn best with hands-on teaching methods, and are motivated to apply learning to practical situations. Kolb’s (1984) model of experiential learning includes direct experience (concrete learning); reflection (reflective observation); development of abstract concepts (abstract conceptualization); and their application to new situations (active experimentation), such as the simulation exercise.

WR!+ consists of eight main activities to create the following deliverables: hazard and evacuation maps; communication plans; and a community capacity inventory. WR! is intended to complement existing emergency preparedness programs, and emergency managers (and community members) were involved in designing and implementing each workshop. WR! has been implemented in person in 2016 and 2019 as three successful pilots of WR!+ workshops for ethnic, geographical, and workplace communities (Bogdan et al., 2021). WR!+ was also adapted as an online pilot train-the-trainer workshop in 2021. Participants included faculty, staff, students, and community members across Canada, including from emergency management and fields related to social support.

The date of facilitation of the in-person workshop with Edmonton’s Inglewood community members (six in total) occurred on June 18, 2022, from 9 AM – 4 PM at the MAC Islamic School (located in the Inglewood neighbourhood).

⁷ <https://tfelproject.com/2021/12/03/webinar-returning-to-the-resilience-zone-via-the-community-resiliency-model-wellness-skills/>

Community champions collaborated with Dr. Bogdan and the social work practicum students to successfully organize the workshop. These champions included the MAC Islamic School's EnrichIt Coordinator, the Emergency Manager from the University of Alberta (resident of Inglewood), and a representative for the Inglewood Community League (resident of Inglewood).

During the workshop, participants worked in small groups and answered a series of questions for each activity (see the following activity descriptions). Due to poor weather conditions, the entire workshop was held inside the MAC Islamic School. Majority of the activities took place in the gymnasium, with the Mock Disaster Simulation taking place in the prayer room of the school.

Inglewood Community Demographics

Inglewood is home to approximately 7,000 of Edmonton's residents, the majority (50.2%) of whom are of working age (25 – 54 years). More of the population in this neighbourhood have never married (36.7%) and couples who are married (30.8%). The primary family structure is composed of two (55.9%) or three (24.4%) individuals per household. The community has a large amount (64.2%) of high-density residential housing (apartment complexes) and some low-density housing units (22.2%) that are close in proximity to each other. This means that disaster preparedness is especially critical as more people will be impacted in case of a disaster event and may have challenges evacuating the high-rises. The primary language spoken in this area is English (65.8%); however, a sizeable number of the population speak other languages at home, due to there being a prominent immigrant population (18.8%), such as Indo-European (8.5%), Austronesian (6.4%), Afro-Asiatic (7.2%), and French (2.6%). Inglewood is home to a large portion of low-income households (18.8%) which increases vulnerability to disasters. Approximately 43% of households in Inglewood earn less than \$30, 0000 per year.

Welcome and registration

The workshop began with welcoming participants, signing them in, and providing them with name tags. Invite them to find a seat, have tea/coffee and snacks, and get to know each other. After a short period of time (approximately 10-15 minutes), provide a land acknowledgement, introduce facilitators, explain to them the schedule and brief overview of the activities for the day.

Pre-workshop survey (Activity 1)

(See Effectiveness of WR!+ Workshop 2022 section and Appendix 1 below)

Community Capacity Inventory Bingo (Activity 2)

This is an interactive ice-breaker activity in which participants circulate around the room with a 'bingo' type card with images and descriptions of skills, resources, or connections related to emergencies such as the following: The participants greet each other and ask whether they meet the requirements of the bingo card queries. Examples of these queries include: "Who owns a van?", "Who has experienced a flood?", "Who does not have a cell phone?", and "Who can turn off the water and gas in their home?" When they successfully identify the individual who fits the parameter, they note their name in the space provided. All participants are awarded prizes throughout the duration of the activity that consist of items that would be useful for putting together an emergency kit (e.g.: flashlights, whistles, pens, etc.).

The following is a list of responses participants provided in Activity 2:

What skills did you find among your community members?

- First-Aid

- Volunteer Management
- Hazard Training & Management
- Multi-lingual

What needs did you discover among your community members?

- No one present at the workshop had a generator

What resources did you find among your community and community members?

- Construction sites
- Large spaces for children
- Shops that provide food
- Access to vans & spacious vehicles

Part of Activity 2 is a demonstration (by Adam Conway, EM at the University of Alberta), what to pack for a to-go kit in case of an emergency.





Sharing Previous Disaster Lessons/Experiences (Activity 3)

Presentation on the CRM wellness skills. CRM skills are useful in helping build resilience (individually and collectively) through regulating the nervous system especially after stressful and traumatic events. Sharing previous disaster experiences may be difficult and distressing for some individuals, causing them to get bumped from their 'resilient zone.' Conducting a brief presentation on CRM skills beforehand gives individuals the opportunity to exercise self-care and come back to a place of balance (their 'resilient zone'). Participants then engage in a discussion in their groups answering questions about previous disaster experience, what went well, and what could be done better. Having this in the forefront of their minds helps to develop the community disaster plan.

The following is a list of the responses the groups gave regarding Activity 3:

	What worked well in terms of disaster preparation and responsiveness?	What needed to be improved in terms of disaster preparation and responsiveness?
GROUP 1		
Windstorm	Safe space/shelter and water were provided, and peers were reliable for support	Limited communication, no one could tell who was in charge, cell phone networks were down, and due to the large crowd, it was difficult to find help from first responders.
Earthquake	Peers were reliable and supportive, and teachers knew what to do during this event.	Limited knowledge about what to do in emergencies.
Flooding	Able to rely on radio for warnings, alerts, and updates.	
GROUP 2		
BBQ Fire	Able to think quickly and smother the fire.	A proper fire extinguisher was not present.
Flood	There was effective responsiveness.	
Tornado	Individuals took initiative and the neighbourhood responded effectively.	Vulnerabilities high
Power Outage	The outage was anticipated, resources were prepositioned, and there was a proactive response.	Information flow was poor, and there was a lack of emergency planning and awareness.
Carbon Monoxide Release	Release Experience: Early response; tracking [sensations in the body and observing that something is not right].	



Map Evacuation Routes and Muster Points (Activity 4)

Participants develop evacuation maps and safe-meeting points to be used for people affected by a possible future event. Each group builds an interactive map of their community using arts and crafts supplies. The objective is to

create a visual representation of the community of key access routes to take in case evacuation is necessary, safe places to go, places that are not safe, and where to meet (muster point) in the event of a disaster.

For this activity, as well as activities 5-7, the scenario of a train derailment was used for Inglewood community participants to consider and build their maps.

Guiding questions were provided to help inform participant how to create their maps. The questions provided are as follows:

1. Consider mapping out what to do if at school or workplace, not just at home.

2. What are the safe places to meet?

- First, find a safe place to meet inside of the community.
- Second, find a safe space outside of the community (within a 10-block radius)
- What if the facility isn't available?
- What if you can't get there? What's an alternative?

3. What are the unsafe places to meet?

- Consider isolated places that might be difficult for emergency personnel to access.
- Consider places close to disaster zones.
- Consider places that might normally be safe, but not during disasters. For example, crowding can be an issue at firehalls- large equipment such as fire trucks can be dangerous, and it is a fast-paced environment during emergencies/disasters.

4. What routes would be best for evacuation?

- What routes should you avoid?
- What if certain routes aren't available?

5. Who is most vulnerable in the community?

- Consider children, elderly, people with disabilities, etc.

6. What are the hazards?

- Are there blockages, exposed power lines, debris, etc?

7. What resources are available?


- Example: Hospitals; St. John's Ambulance

Maps:

Group 1



Group 2



Building the Community Plan (Activity 5)

Based on a specific incident, participants develop a community plan for how to make sure they and their community members are safe. This activity builds on the skills and knowledge of the previous activities and considers specific details when preparing and responding to a disaster as a community. Participants identify safe places to go and alternate strategies to contact people in the event there is damage to the communication system. This activity is based around three main learning objectives: 1. To create a community disaster plan that is applicable to train derailment, including the identification of safe places to evacuate; 2. To identify multiple types of communication strategies for checking in with family, neighbours, and friends in the event of an incident; 3. To identify capabilities within the community to promote self-sufficiency.

Participants chose questions from the following list to help inform their community plans:

1. How did you learn about the emergency/where would you get your information?
2. What do you do with this information? Where do you go for more information? Can you verify that the information is accurate?
3. If you need help, where do you go? Who do you ask? If official help is not available, what are some other options? (e.g., security, colleagues)
4. What are your primary concerns? Secondary concerns?
5. What do you want to make sure you have access to during an emergency? (food/water/shelter/blankets/first-aid supplies)
6. If you can't go home for a while, where is a safe place for you to go?
7. Who might need your help in the community? Who might help you? (e.g., buddy system)
8. Who do you need to contact? (For example, if kids are in daycare - are they safe? Who can pick them up?)
9. Who can count the number of people (children in particular) and ensure everyone is accounted for?
10. What are the different hazards? (Power outage, fires, contamination from crude oil, possible floods from breaking water lines, blocked routes, dangerous air pollution from oil burning)
11. What are the potential safety risks?
12. How to assess the size of area impacted?
13. How will you determine if the situation could worsen suddenly and how it could worsen?
14. What transportations may be available? Unavailable? (e.g., cars, scooters, bikes, buses, etc.)
15. What are the different routes that might be available? Unavailable? Where will traffic be directed?

16. Where are the community muster points?
17. Are there other considerations to include in this plan for other types of disasters or emergencies?


Each group's responses to Activity 5 are listed as the following:

Group 1:

1. See smoke or smell fumes; social media
2. Emergency alert app; news/radio
3. Neighbours
4. Make sure neighbours and family have what they need to be safe; close windows and shut off air exchange/HVAC
5. Safety/emergency plan; emergency kit; power for charging devices; landline
7. People in need of urgent care
8. Make social media announcement and update important websites (trigger existing volunteer lists)
10. Explosion, toxic fumes, secondary fires, debris, contamination; stress of being separated from family and inability to contact them quickly
13. Weather forecast; have someone keeping an eye on the news/media; have someone cataloguing/ documenting the number of people and resources that are accessible, and instructions for safely evacuating
15. Evacuation to sites on emergency map
16. School gyms/churches; parks if safe

Group 2:

1. AB Alerts/mobile app; social media
2. Inform neighbours and family of the situation; let them know to stay away
3. Friends/family/neighbours; 311; nearby community center
4. Self needs; immediate family and extended folks; pets
5. Transport
6. Shelters- halls and churches
7. People with disabilities; seniors; individuals experiencing homelessness; dense residences (e.g., apartment buildings)
11. Air quality; explosion; visibility
16. Community hall; St Andrews; Westmount mall; Dutch church
17. Pets (food, water, carriers, vets and others to help care for them)



On-Site Mock Disaster Simulation (Activity 6)

This exercise is to practice a mock disaster simulation. The objective is to have people better prepared for a real disaster by running through a simulation, and to gain a better understanding of their community and how to better support each other. Participants apply what they learned in previous activities to identify skills, resources, and needs (Activity 2), decide what actions to take based on collective experience and knowledge (Activity 3), identify safe and danger zones based on the map (Activity 4), what actions to take based on the community plan (Activity 5), and assist victims with emotional and/or physical injuries.

The mock disaster simulation in this 2022 workshop was a train derailment event, located near the MAC Islamic School. The train derailment was chosen because there is a large rail yard (CN Walker Yard) nearby. There is a risk of train derailments spilling petroleum, toxic materials, explosion and fire, etc.



Debrief & Identify Community Plan Revisions (Activity 7)

The objectives of this activity are to identify practical lessons learned during the Mock Disaster Simulation (Activity 6) and to identify ways to improve the Community Plans (Activity 5).

Debrief of Mock Simulation (Activity 6):

Group 1:

What worked well?

- Communication
- Identifying resources nearby (first-aid, food, community center, vet/donut shop)
- Gathering of supplies and someone acted in role of leader naturally
- Identified things to occupy time/entertain young people (children/youth)
- Group size meant that the 'parent' could rely on others to care for her child when 'parent' was worked up
- Helped each other
- Used resources creatively

What needs to be improved?

- Quickly taking stock of group size and makeup

- Identify someone as leader so that all community members are aware
- Stay calm and take a minute to plan
- Knowing to offer help
- Confusion took over

Group 2:

What worked well?

- Recognition of individual needs
- Constant effort of checking on people
- Teamwork
- Solution oriented
- Adaptability
- Able to use resources at hand very well

What needs to be improved?

- Lack of communication
- Lack of person in-charge (officially designated)
- Nobody knew how many people needed help
- Where to go?
- No cellular network
- Identification of modes of transportation

Revision of Community Plans (Activity 5)

Group 1:

- Rely less on vehicle transportation
- Identify resources that can serve multiple purposes
- Take a full community inventory

Group 2:

- Designate one point of contact in case of emergency in advance (outside of the community)
- Appoint a person in-charge
- List of resources in terms of transportation, food, and medical supplies



Building Momentum (Activity 8)


This activity strengthens community ownership of disaster planning by identifying how community members will proceed after the workshop. The objectives of this activity are: 1. To realize that long-term success will require ongoing effort on part of community-based volunteers; 2. Provide opportunities for participants to think about what they can do to continue increasing preparedness; and 3. To identify potential leaders and volunteer assistants to build momentum in their community. Wrap-up and hand out certificates for completing the workshop.

Participants used the following questions to inform their plans moving forward regarding community disaster preparedness:

1. What can you do in your community to continue awareness and preparation in case of an emergency?
2. Is there an opportunity to build an “Emergency Preparedness Team” to continue thinking about preparedness in the community?
3. How can you translate what you learned today in your household?
4. How can you translate what you learned today in your neighbourhood?
5. What resources (information, materials, contacts, etc.) would you need to continue emergency prep for these different locations (household/neighbourhood/workplace)?
6. Who would you need to involve or contact to be more prepared?

The following are the participant’s responses to the above questions:

1. Drop a note or knock-on neighbours doors to solicit interest; host workshops and share resources; host block parties to help facilitate social connections, and informally establish resources; connect with Inglewood Community League; catch basin cleanup can possibly be a community opportunity
2. Community League; Abundant Communities Edmonton; community cleanup; teams within high-density housing complexes
3. Make an emergency plan; make an emergency kit as a community; have emergency drills
4. Block emergency planning; skills and resources inventory; **MEET YOUR NEIGHBOURS!**
5. Centralized location (virtual/web) for lists and resources; join community leagues; include business



Post-Workshop Survey (Activity 9)

(See Effectiveness of WR!+ Workshop 2022 section and Appendix 2 below)

Wrap-Up & Certificates

The wrap up consists of handing out certificates of completion to each participant and extending gratitude to them for their participation and taking the time to come to the workshop. Gratitude is also extended to others who helped make the workshop a success. For the Inglewood WR!+ Workshop, the community champions were thanked for their contributions (See Acknowledgements section below).



Effectiveness of WR!+ Workshop 2022

To evaluate the effectiveness of the workshop, pre- and post-workshop surveys were conducted. Ethics approval was obtained from the University of Calgary Conjoint Faculties Research Ethics Board to evaluate the workshop. The pre-workshop survey questions are divided into the following categories: Awareness, Social Connections, Self-efficacy and Sense of Agency. The post-workshop questions were divided into the following categories: Motivation and Action, Social Connections, Self-Efficacy and Sense of Agency, Visioning, and Workshop Activities.

Participants also had opportunities to express their feedback on the workshop activities by posting what worked well and what could be improved on a flipchart page taped to the wall with two columns labelled as Apples and Onions (respectively). This feedback, along with survey results, will be incorporated into future workshops for continuous improvement. Below is a summary of the most relevant survey results for the purpose of this report.

In total, six individuals associated with the Inglewood community in Edmonton participated in the 2022 workshop. Three of the individuals shared that they are employed in the community and the other three shared that they are residents. Five out of the six participants chose to complete the voluntary pre- and post-workshop surveys.

Participants who chose to fill out the pre-workshop survey indicated that they heard about the WR!+ workshop from community organizations and through Facebook.

Awareness

Raising participants' level of awareness of hazards is one of the major focuses of the WR!+ as it drives one's willingness to engage in understanding more about emergency preparedness. To enhance our understanding of participants' awareness and possible preparations taken, questions were asked in the pre-workshop survey.


1. Personal Preparedness

In the pre-workshop survey (pre Q. 7), four out of five participants had personally experienced a disaster (not including COVID-19). The majority of participants (three out of five) were somewhat confident in being prepared for a potential disaster (pre Q. 8), while one participant was very confident, and one participant was not very confident.

When asked about the actions taken in the household to prepare for a disaster (Figure 1), there were only two participants who have done so. One of the participants shared the following:

- *“Storing of emergency equipment like batteries, solar operated battery as well, medical supplies/first aid, blankets, non-perishable food, environmental gear, pet food, carrier. Supplies store at family homes as well. As well as training myself.”*

Figure 1: Pre-Workshop Survey Question 9




Note. Have you or anyone in your household taken any actions to be prepared for a disaster?

The majority of participants (four out of five) have photocopies or electronic copies of important documents (such as insurance, social insurance number, medical records) that they can access online or at an alternate location to their home (pre Q. 10). The above results demonstrate that even among those participants who have previous disaster experiences, only some have completed certain emergency or disaster preparation.

2. Community Preparedness

Participants revealed the hazards they are most concerned about (pre Q. 4). More participants (three out of five) were concerned about crime or security issues rather than natural hazard disasters. For the level of confidence towards the community in preparing for a disaster (Figure 2), three out of five participants expressed that they were not very confident. One participant shared they were somewhat confident, and one participant shared they were not confident.

Figure 2: Pre-Workshop Survey Question 5



Note. How confident are you that your community is prepared for a disaster?

When it comes to the actions taken by the community to prepare for a disaster (pre Q. 6), only one out of five

participants realized the actions taken by the community. Two out of five of the participants believed that there were barriers to preparedness, and they were:

- “Economics – The neighbourhood has a high population of workers with low socio-economic status, 70% of housing is high density (apartments), and a high incidence of English as a second language”
- (Lacking) “community engagement”

The above results implies that general participants perceive several barriers to disaster preparedness in their community. Some participants may not even know about the related work done by the community before the workshop.

3. Motivation & Action

In the pre-workshop survey (Figure 3), all research participants (n = 5) indicated concern regarding various natural-hazard and human-induced events. Extreme weather events, such as ice storms and heat waves, have particularly drawn all participants’ attention, followed by floods and tornadoes. Among the events listed, four out of five participants expressed they are most concerned about natural hazards related to water and wind (pre Q. 3). Only one participant stated their most concerning events to be human-induced hazards, which include contamination or shortage of water and/or food. This shows that participants are well-informed about different kinds of potential hazards.

Figure 3: Pre-Workshop Survey Question 2

#	Answer	Count	%
1	Blizzards, winter storms, ice storms or extreme cold	5	17.86%
2	Heat waves	5	17.86%
3	Floods (due to, for example, a river overflowing or heavy rains)	3	10.71%
4	Tornadoes	3	10.71%
5	Hurricanes	1	3.57%
6	Storm Surge or Tsunamis	0	0.00%
7	Droughts	0	0.00%
8	Earthquakes	1	3.57%
9	Wildfires or Forest Fires	3	10.71%
10	Landslides or Avalanches	0	0.00%
11	Industrial or transportation accident involving hazardous materials	2	7.14%
12	Act of terrorism or terrorist threat	1	3.57%
13	Rioting or civil unrest	0	0.00%
14	Outbreak of serious or life-threatening illness	1	3.57%
15	Extended power outage	2	7.14%
16	Contamination or shortage of water or food	1	3.57%
17	Don’t know / prefer not to say	0	0.00%
18	Other (Please specify)	0	0.00%
	Total	28	100%

Note.

Which natural-hazard events (including extreme weather) or human-induced events (including terrorism or unrest) do you believe your community is likely to experience in the next 5-10 years?

Participants *indicated* an ongoing understanding of hazards in the post-workshop survey. All participants (n = 5) agreed that the workshop has motivated them to start or continue working on disaster preparedness with their social communities, especially among their family members, colleagues in the workplace, friends and neighbours

(post Q. 1 & Q. 2; See Appendix 2). Working on disaster preparedness with their social community, they stated actions to make connections with the neighbours in their immediate area (post Q.2):

- *“Initiate a community league committee”*
- *“Ensure all documentation is up to date and gathered and that networking (phone numbers/who to call) is in place.”*
- *“social media”*

The motivation toward improving disaster preparedness within their social communities shows participants’ understanding of the importance of community support in preparing for emergencies. This satisfied one of our project goals of building community resilience.

In addition, the post-workshop survey asked participants to assess whether their home emergency plan at home (post Q. 3). Only one out of five participants expressed they believe their home emergency plan is adequate. Two out of five participants expressed their willingness to improve their home emergency plan and felt confident they can improve it on their own whereas one participant did not feel confident that they can improve on it on their own. All participants (n = 5) agreed that the workshop has motivated them to create or revise their household emergency plan, indicating. These high levels of motivation to take further actions after the workshop. Examples of the subsequent steps identified by participants are:

- *“Check expiry dates and add supplies”*
- *“Organize important documents”*
- *“Review and update”*
- *“Think what I need”*

4. Information & Messaging

Prior to the workshop, participants were asked questions in the pre-workshop survey pertaining to information and messaging regarding disaster preparedness. Two participants indicated that they were aware of public service campaigns from their municipal government and the Red Cross that provided information on what to do in the event of risks. Two participants shared that they were not aware of public service campaigns (pre Q. 19). The chart below shows who participants would like to receive information from about how to plan and prepare for disasters (Figure 4). Four out of six participants indicated that they would like to receive information from the local government (e.g., city/town hall, municipal services), while three out of six participants indicated that they would like it from not-for-profit/charitable organizations (e.g., Red Cross, Salvation Army, United Way, shelter).

Figure 4: Pre-Workshop Survey Question 17

#	Answer	Count	Percentage (%)
1	Family	0	0
2	Friends	1	6.67
3	Neighbours	1	6.67
4	Police (9-1-1) or law enforcement	1	6.67
5	First responders, such as paramedics or firefighters	2	13.33
6	Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional	1	6.67
7	Insurance agent/company	0	0
8	Utility company/provider	0	0
9	Bank, financial institution, financial advisor	0	0
10	Other professionals, such as a lawyer	0	0
11	Local government (e.g., city/town hall, municipal services)	4	26.67
12	Provincial government (e.g., representative or service)	2	13.33

13	Federal government (e.g., representative or service)	0	0
14	Faith or cultural organization	0	0
15	Not-for-profit/charitable organization (e.g., Red Cross, Salvation Army, United Way, shelter)	3	20
16	I don't know / Prefer not to say	0	0
17	Other (Please specify)	0	0
	Total	15	100

Note. From who would you like to receive information about how to plan and prepare for disasters?

Participants also shared how they would like to receive information on disaster preparedness (Figure 5). The two most popular *responses* are through websites or Internet (four out of six) and workshops or meetings, either online or in-person (four out of six), followed by government websites or government internet sources (three out of six). The reason may also be due to the credibility of the information and the rapid speed of the information flow.

Figure 5: Pre-Workshop Survey Question 18

#	Answer	Count	Percentage (%)
1	Newspaper stories	0	0
2	Newspaper ads	0	0
3	Television news	2	13.33
4	Television ads	0	0
5	Radio news	0	0
6	Radio ads / Media	0	0
7	Government website / Government Internet source	3	20
8	Websites / Internet (other/unspecified)	4	26.67
9	Print materials, pamphlets, fact sheets/brochures	1	6.67
10	Books	0	0
11	Social media (Please specify)	0	0
12	Workshops or meetings, either online or in-person	4	26.67
13	Communicating with a person one-on-one, either by phone, online or in-person	0	0
14	Schools	0	0.00%
15	Email subscriptions	0	0.00%
16	Mail	0	0.00%
17	Outdoor advertisements like billboards and signs	1	6.67%
18	Don't know / Prefer not to say	0	0.00%
19	Other (Please specify)	0	0.00%
	Total	15	100%


Note. How would you like to receive information on disaster preparedness?

Social Connections

Social connections are an important part of disaster preparedness and responsiveness. To enhance our understanding of the effectiveness of the Inglewood WR!+ workshop, comparative questions were asked in the pre- and post-workshop surveys.

According to the pre-workshop survey, all five individuals indicated that they knew a few of the people in their geographical community and post-workshop survey results showed no changes (Figure 6).


Figure 6: Pre-Workshop Survey Question 11 & Post-Workshop Survey Question 6 Comparison



Note. Would you say that you know most, many, a few or none of the people in your geographical community (neighbourhood)?

The pre-workshop survey results showed that three participants felt that their neighbourhood is a place where neighbours help each other. One participant specified that they were unsure, and the remaining participant specified that most of the people in their immediate area had language barriers that would require extra care in communication to assist them. Upon completing the workshop, results showed an increase in their perception of their neighbourhood being a place where neighbours help one another (Figure 7). Four participants answered, ‘yes,’ and the remaining participant indicated that they ‘did not not/preferred not to say.’


Figure 7: Pre-Workshop Survey Question 12 and Post-Workshop Survey Question 7 Comparison



Note. In general, would you say your neighbourhood is a place where neighbours help each other?

Results from the pre-workshop survey showed that three participants knew '1 to 5' people well enough to ask for help or support, one knew '6 to 10' people, and one knew 'over 10' people. Post-workshop survey results showed improvement from the initial responses. Two people responded by saying that they knew '1 to 5' people, one knew '6 to 10' people, and two indicated that they now knew 'over 10' people (Figure 8).

Figure 8: Pre-Workshop Survey Question 13 and Post-Workshop Survey Question 8 Comparison




Note. How many people do you know well enough to ask for help or support? This help can be for housing if you were evacuated, financial support, transportation such as car ride, help if physically injured, emotional support and/or other type of help.

Self-Efficacy & Sense of Agency

To help better understand participants' confidence regarding disaster preparedness and responsiveness, some questions asked in the post-workshop survey were the same as those in the pre-workshop survey. In comparing the results of these questions, it was found that:

Participant self-efficacy increased regarding their ability to figure out what to do on their own if faced with a disaster situation (Figure 9). Prior to the workshop, two participants rated themselves as 'excellent', one rated themselves as 'good', one rated as 'neutral,' and one as 'fair.' After the workshop was completed, two participants rated themselves as 'excellent', two rated as 'good', and one rated as 'fair.'


Figure 9: Pre-Workshop Survey Question 14 and Post-Workshop Survey Question 9 Comparison



Note. How would you rate your ability to figure out on your own what to do if faced with a disaster situation?

Participant confidence increased regarding their ability to figure out with their community members what to do during a disaster. Prior to the workshop (Figure 10), two participants rated themselves as ‘fair’, two rated as ‘neutral’, and one rated as ‘excellent.’ After the workshop was completed, two participants rated themselves as ‘excellent’, two rated as ‘good’, and one rated as ‘neutral.’


Figure 10: Pre-Workshop Survey Question 15 and Post-Workshop Survey Question 10 Comparison



Note. How would you rate your ability to figure out with your community members what to do during a disaster?

Participant confidence decreased slightly regarding their ability to be a leader in their community if faced with a disaster. Prior to the workshop, one participant rated themselves as ‘excellent’, three rated as ‘good’, and one did not know/preferred not to say (Figure 11). After the workshop was completed, one participant rated themselves as ‘excellent’, two rated as ‘good’, one rated as ‘fair’, and one did not know/preferred not to say.

Figure 11: Pre-Workshop Survey Question 16 and Post-Workshop Question Comparison



Note. How would you rate your ability to be a leader in your community if faced with a disaster?

Rating Effectiveness of Workshop Activities

Workshop activities provided community members with the opportunity to build deeper social connections with one another and develop their knowledge and skills in reference to disaster preparedness. The post-workshop survey yielded insights related to the activities. Participants were able to share their feedback on what they felt worked well, what could be improved, and overall impressions regarding the workshop. Below is a summary of survey results regarding each activity, as well as general comments and feedback from participants.

Rating of activities

- **Community Bingo** (Activity 2): Four out of five participants ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that the activity was effective for identifying community members in terms of their name, skills, needs, and resources (post Q. 16). The remaining participant indicated that they disagreed that this activity was effective.
- **Sharing Previous Disaster Experiences & Lessons** (Activity 3): All participants ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that the activity was effective for sharing emergency and disaster experiences and lessons learned (post Q. 17).
- **Evacuation Mapping** (Activity 4): Four out of five participants ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that the activity was effective for identifying risks and hazards relevant to their community (post Q. 18). The remaining participant indicated that they were neutral on its effectiveness.
- **Community Plan** (Activity 5): Four out of five participants ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that the activity was effective for identifying plausible responses to a potential disaster in their community (post Q. 19). The remaining participant indicated that they were neutral on its effectiveness.
- **Mock Disaster Simulation** (Activity 6): Three out of five participants ‘agreed’ that the activity was effective for demonstrating the skills and knowledge needed to prepare and respond to a disaster (post Q. 20). The remaining participants indicated that they were ‘neutral’ and ‘disagreed’ on its effectiveness.
- **Debrief & Revising Community Plan** (Activity 7): Four out of five participants ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that the activity was effective for assessing what worked and what areas needed improvement (post Q. 21). The remaining participant indicated that they were neutral on its effectiveness.
- **Building Momentum** (Activity 8): All participants ‘agreed’ or ‘strongly agreed’ that the activity was effective for providing ideas on next steps to create or revise disaster planning (post Q. 22).

All of the survey respondents indicated that they understood the purpose of the WR!+ workshop (post Q. 15). They indicated that the workshop gave them enough time to make social connections (post Q. 23) and that the workshop fulfilled their reason for attending (post Q. 24). Majority (n=4) 'agreed' or 'strongly agreed' that they would recommend the WR!+ workshop to others (one indicated they were neutral) (post Q. 25). Regarding satisfaction levels of interactions between the practicum students (post Q 26) and field instructor (post Q. 27) with community members and implementation of the workshop, participants shared responses of 'exceeds expectations' (n=1) and 'outstanding' (n=4).

Participants shared the following comments (post Q. 26.1 & 27.1):

- *"Thank you so much for your hard work."*
- *"Excellent idea to spark disaster response planning @pre community level --> Good base"*

Participants also shared the following suggestions for workshop improvement (post Q. 28):

- *"If your registration process identifies participants with a high level of knowledge already, ensuring groups are created evenly based on existing knowledge might improve engagement."*
- *"Watch for too much academic language with definitions. Citing sources is academically relevant, but common people don't care."*

Visioning

One of the key goals of WR!+ is to encourage communities to continue implementing the skills and knowledge learned and/or built upon acquired during the workshop. Building Momentum (Activity 8) supported Inglewood community members to begin to consider how they might continue building community disaster preparedness and community resilience, and who they might be able to partner with to help with this initiative. Some of the questions in the post-workshop survey also asked questions to stimulate further ideas about how to build momentum.

Participants shared their feedback on what they would like disaster resilience to look like in their community moving forward (post Q. 12):

- *"A community committee and plan are in place."*
- *"Know action plans/have plan in place with people in particular positions (safety/resources, etc.)."*
- *"Residents are self-reliant for 72 hours."*

To achieve this goal of community disaster resilience, the role that they can play, and what they can contribute, participants shared the following (post Q. 13):

- *"I consider myself a good planner and organizer."*
- *"Participate in communities/plan and participate in "drills" share networking resources."*
- *"Awareness building, programming, events."*
- *"Making connections and spreading knowledge."*

Lastly, participants shared how more people can be involved in disaster awareness and preparedness including relatives, social groups, neighbours, or broader community (post Q. 14):

- *"Use social media and reach out to existing organizations."*
- *"Facebook/flyers/posters/block parties/safety fair to let them know the community has a plan."*
- *"By knowing neighborhood."*
- *"Slowly build pool of participation."*
- *"Good community interactions."*

Conclusion

The purpose of the We're Ready!+ workshop is to facilitate (rather than lead) communities to design and implement their own neighbourhood-level, locally relevant disaster plans, and build their social networks and community capacity, through interactive and engaging activities. Participants in the workshops collaborated to develop their community maps, evacuation plans, and engaged actively in a mock disaster simulation.

Overall, the workshop activities were highly rated by all participants. They accomplished all the tasks confidently and smoothly. The data comparison from pre- and post- workshop survey also demonstrate the positive changes of participants' attitudes, motivations and understanding of neighbourhood support when preparing for emergency. These indicate that the workshop has achieved a great success.

Next Steps

The We're Ready! Plus workshop has received positive feedbacks and brought constructive impacts on the community participants. We are delighted to further put forward the idea by offering the We're Ready! Plus practicum training to social work students at the University of Calgary and disaster and emergency management students at York University for spring/summer 2023. Students will be trained to deliver WR!+ workshops with community members across Canada.

Appendix 1. Pre-Workshop Survey

1. How did you hear about this workshop? (Please choose all responses that apply)

- Community organizations
- Email
- Facebook
- Friends
- Newsletter
- Posters
- Other (Please specify)

2. Which natural-hazard events (including extreme weather) or human-induced events (including terrorism or unrest) do you believe your community is likely to experience in the next 5-10 years? (Please choose all responses that apply)

- Blizzards, winter storms, ice storms or extreme cold
- Heat waves
- Floods (due to, for example, a river overflowing or heavy rains)
- Tornadoes
- Hurricanes
- Storm Surge or Tsunamis
- Droughts
- Earthquakes
- Wildfires or Forest Fires
- Landslides or Avalanches
- Industrial or transportation accident involving hazardous materials
- Act of terrorism or terrorist threat
- Rioting or civil unrest
- Outbreak of serious or life-threatening illness
- Extended power outage
- Contamination or shortage of water or food
- Don't know / prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

3. Of the natural-hazard events or human-induced events listed in the question above (Q.2), which one are you most concerned about? (Please type one response)

4. Thinking about your community, please rate from 1 to 3 which are you most concerned about? (Please move the options below in the order you want to rate them with 1 being the most concerned about)

_____ Natural-hazard disasters
_____ Crime or security issues making your neighbourhood less safe
_____ Other (Please specify)

5. How confident are you that your community is prepared for a disaster? (Please choose one response)

- Very confident
- Somewhat confident
- Not very confident
- Not at all confident

- Don't know / Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

6. Has your community (neighbourhood or municipality) taken actions to prepare for a disaster? (Please choose one response and provide more details)

- If yes, please list which actions:
- If no, what are the barriers to preparedness?
- I don't know / Prefer not to say
- Other (Please Specify)

7. Have you personally experienced any disaster (not including the Covid-19 pandemic)? (Please choose one response)

- Yes
- No
- I don't know / Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

8. How prepared do you feel for a potential future disaster event? (Please choose one response)

- Very confident
- Somewhat confident
- Not very confident
- Not at all confident
- Don't know / Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

9. Have you or anyone in your household taken any actions to be prepared for a disaster? (Please choose one response and provide more details)

- If yes, please list which actions:
- If no, what are the barriers to preparedness?
- I don't know / Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

10. In the event of a disaster, do you have photocopies or electronic copies of important documents (such as insurance, social insurance number, medical records) that you can access online or at an alternate location to your home? (Please choose one response)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know / Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

11. Would you say that you know most, many, a few or none of the people in your geographical community (neighbourhood)? (Please choose one response)

- Most of the people in your neighbourhood
- Many of the people in your neighbourhood
- A few of the people in your neighbourhood

- None of the people in your neighbourhood
- Not applicable - no neighbours close-by

12. In general, would you say your neighbourhood is a place where neighbours help each other? (Please choose one response)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know/ Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

13. How many people do you know well enough to ask for help or support? This help can be for housing if you were evacuated, financial support, transportation such as car ride, help if physically injured, emotional support and/or other type of help. (Please choose one response)

- None
- 1 to 5
- 6 to 10
- Over 10
- Don't know/ Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

14. How would you rate your ability to figure out on your own what to do if faced with a disaster situation? (Please choose one response)

- Poor
- Fair
- Neutral
- Good
- Excellent
- I don't know / Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

15. How would you rate your ability to figure out with your community members what to do during a disaster? (Please choose one response)

- Poor
- Fair
- Neutral
- Good
- Excellent
- Don't know / Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

16. How would you rate your ability to be a leader in your community if faced with a disaster? (Please choose one response)

- Poor
- Fair
- Neutral
- Good

- Excellent
- Don't know / Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

17. From who would you like to receive information about how to plan and prepare for disasters? (Please choose three top choices)

- Family
- Friends
- Neighbours
- Police (9-1-1) or law enforcement
- First responders, such as paramedics or firefighters
- Hospital, clinic, doctor or other medical professional
- Insurance agent/company
- Utility company/provider
- Bank, financial institution, financial advisor
- Other professionals, such as a lawyer
- Local government (e.g., city/town hall, municipal services)
- Provincial government (e.g., representative or service)
- Federal government (e.g., representative or service)
- Faith or cultural organization
- Not-for-profit/charitable organization (e.g., Red Cross, Salvation Army, United Way, shelter)
- I don't know / Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

18. How would you like to receive information on disaster preparedness? (Please choose three top choices)

- Newspaper stories
- Newspaper ads
- Television news
- Television ads
- Radio news
- Radio ads / Media
- Government website / Government Internet source
- Websites / Internet (other/unspecified)
- Print materials, pamphlets, fact sheets/brochures
- Books
- Social media (Please specify)
- Workshops or meetings, either online or in-person
- Communicating with a person one-on-one, either by phone, online or in-person
- Schools
- Email subscriptions
- Mail
- Outdoor advertisements like billboards and signs
- Don't know / Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

19. Are you aware of any public service campaigns (from government or other institutions, organizations, companies) campaigns that provide information on what to do in the event of any of these risks? (Please choose one response)

- Yes
- No

- I don't know / Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

Appendix 2. Post-Workshop Survey

1. This workshop has motivated me to develop (or continue working on) disaster preparedness with my geographical (e.g., neighbourhood) community. (Please choose one response)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know/ Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

1.1 If answered yes: The first action I will take to work on disaster preparedness with my geographical community is: (Please write response)

1.2 If answered no, or don't know/prefer not to say: Please explain why not and what supports or resources you would need to be able to take action. (Please write response)

2. This workshop has motivated me to develop (or continue working on) disaster preparedness with social communities (e.g, social community such as friends or family, workplace, ethnic or faith group, etc.). (Please choose one response)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know/ Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

2.1 If answered yes: What kind of social community are you planning to engage with for disaster preparedness planning? (Please choose all responses that apply)

- Friends
- Family
- Workplace
- Ethnic
- Faith
- Other (Please specify)

2.2 The first action I will take to work on disaster preparedness with my social community is: (Please write response)

2.3 If answered no, or don't know/prefer not to say: Please explain why not and what supports or resources you would need to be able to take action. (Please write response)

3. If you have an emergency plan for your home, is it adequate in its current state? (Please choose one response)

- Yes, it is adequate
- No, it requires more work and I am able to improve it
- No, it requires more work but I am not able to improve it
- Other
- Don't know

4. This workshop has motivated me to create or revise my household emergency plan. (Please choose one response)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know/ Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

4.1 The first action I will take to revise my household emergency plan is: (Please write response)

4.2 Please explain why not and what supports or resources you would need to be able to take action. (Please write response)

This workshop has motivated me to have photocopies or electronic copies of important documents (such as insurance, social insurance number, medical records) that you can access online or at an alternate location to your home? (Please choose one response)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know/ Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

5.1 The first action I will take to have photocopies or electronic copies of important documents is: (Please write response)

5.2 Please explain why not and what supports or resources you would need to be able to take action. (Please write response)

Would you say that you know most, many, a few or none of the people in your geographical community (neighbourhood)? (Please choose one response)

- Most of the people in your neighbourhood
- Many of the people in your neighbourhood
- A few of the people in your neighbourhood
- None of the people in your neighbourhood
- Not applicable - no neighbours close-by
- Don't know/ Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

Now that you have completed the workshop, in general, would you say your neighbourhood is a place where neighbours help each other? (Please choose one response)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know/ Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

How many people do you know well enough to ask for help or support? This help can be for housing if you were evacuated, financial support, transportation such as car ride, help if physically injured, emotional support and/or other type of help. (Please choose one response)

- None
- 1 to 5

- 6 to 10
- Over 10
- Don't know/ Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

9. How would you rate your ability to figure out on your own what to do if faced with a disaster situation? (Please choose one response)

- Poor
- Fair
- Neutral
- Good
- Excellent
- Don't know/ Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

10. How would you rate your ability to figure out with your community members what to do during a disaster? (Please choose one response)

- Poor
- Fair
- Neutral
- Good
- Excellent
- Don't know/ Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

11. How would you rate your ability to be a leader in your community if faced with a disaster? (Please choose one response)

- Poor
- Fair
- Neutral
- Good
- Excellent
- Don't know/ Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

12. What do you want community disaster resilience to look like in your community in 2-3 years? (Please write response)

13. How can this goal of community disaster resilience be achieved? What role can you play/ what can you contribute to achieving this goal? (Please write response)

14. How can more people be involved in disaster awareness and preparedness including relatives, social groups, neighbours, or broader community? (Please write response)

15. I understood the purpose of the We're Ready! workshop. (Please choose one response)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know/ Prefer not to say

- Other (Please specify)

16. The Community Bingo (Activity 2) was effective for identifying community members in terms of their name, skills, needs, resources. (Please choose one response)

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't know/ Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

17. The Sharing Previous Disaster Lessons (Activity 3) was effective for sharing emergency and disaster experiences and lessons learned. (Please choose one response)

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't know/ Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

18. The Evacuation Mapping (Activity 4) was effective for identifying risks and hazards relevant to my community. (Please choose one response)

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't know/ Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

19. The Community Plan (Activity 5) was effective for identifying plausible responses to a potential disaster in my community (Please choose one response)

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't know/ Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

20. The Mock Disaster Simulation (Activity 6) was effective for demonstrating the skills and knowledge needed to prepare and respond to a disaster. (Please choose one response)

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral

- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't know/ Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

21. The Debrief & Revising the Community Plan (Activity 7) was effective for assessing what worked and what are areas for improvement (Please choose one response)

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't know/ Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

22. The Building Momentum (Activity 8) was effective for providing ideas on next steps to create or revise disaster planning. (Please choose one response)

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't know/ Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

23. Did the workshop structure give enough time to make social connections? (Please choose one response)

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't know/ Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

24. Did the workshop fulfill your reason for attending? (Please choose one response)

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't know/ Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

25. Would you recommend this workshop to others? (Please choose one response)

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neutral

- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree
- Don't know/ Prefer not to say
- Other (Please specify)

26. How satisfied were you with the practicum students' interaction with community members and implementation of the workshop? (Please choose one response)

- 5- Outstanding
- 4- Exceeds Expectations
- 3- Meets Expectations
- 2- Needs Improvement
- 1- Unacceptable

26.1 Comments

27. How satisfied were you with the field instructor(s) interaction with community members and overall coordination of the workshop? (Please choose one response)

- 5- Outstanding
- 4- Exceeds Expectations
- 3- Meets Expectations
- 2- Needs Improvement
- 1- Unacceptable

27.1 Comments

28. Other comments (suggestions for improvements) (Please write response)