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Purpose

❖ To share the experiences of a large community-based mental health agency in the implementation of an organizational cultural competence assessment.

Introduction

EMQ Profile

❖ 135 Years of History (1867)
❖ 670 Employees (not including volunteers, interns, registry, etc.)
❖ Service Areas:
   ➢ Santa Clara County
     • 1772 youth/families served FY03
   ➢ Sacramento County
     • 199 youth/families served FY03
   ➢ San Bernardino County
     • 19 youth/families served first five months
   ➢ Foster Family Services
     • Solano, Contra Costa, Los Banos, Alameda, Sacramento, Santa Clara
     • 232 youth/families served FY03

Ethnicity of Youth Served (FY03)

❖ Not Reported
❖ Euro American 36%
❖ Latino American 36%
❖ African American 12%
❖ Asian American 5%
❖ Other/Unknown 2%

EMQ Continuum of Services

❖ Addiction Prevention
❖ Foster Family
❖ Outpatient
❖ Specialized Child Sexual Abuse Treatment (outpatient)
❖ System of Care
❖ School-Based Day Treatment
❖ Residential
❖ Wraparound (Santa Clara, 1994; Sacramento, 1999; San Bernardino, 2003)
❖ Crisis Mobile Team

Presented at the 17th Annual RTC Conference, Tampa FL, 2/29 – 3/3 2004. For more information, contact Eleanor Castillo: ecastillo@emq.org
**EMQ Mission Statement**

To work with children and their families to transform their lives, build emotional, social, and familial well-being and to transform the systems that serve them.

---

**Cultural Competence Activities**

- Budget
- Diversity Fair
- Transcultural Network
  - Monthly Informal Events/Discussions
- Cultural Competence Action Committee (CCAC)
  - Charter in March 2003
  - Composed of senior management, mid-level management, clinical staff, support staff, & Family Partners
  - All counties represented via polycom
  - Weekly meetings

---

**CCAC Organizational Chart**

---

**Cultural Competence Dimensions**

(Cross, Bazron, Dennis, & Isaccs, 1989)

- **Attitude**
- **Practice**
- **Policy**
- **Structure**

---

**Organizational Cultural Competence Continuum**

(Cross, Bazron, Dennis, & Isaccs, 1989)

- **Culturally Destructive**: Actively participate in purposeful attacks on another culture, and dehumanize individuals from different racial and ethnic group.
- **Cultural Ineptness**: Do not intentionally seek to be culturally destructive, but have no capacity to help individuals from different cultures.
- **Culturally Blind**: Believe that color or culture makes no difference and that if the system works, all people regardless of color or culture will be served with equal effectiveness.
- **Culturally Pre-Competent**: Acknowledge weakness in serving some communities and attempt to improve some aspects of services to specific groups.

---

**Organizational Cultural Competence Continuum**

(Cross, et al., 1989)

- **Culturally Competent**: Accept and respect differences among and within different groups; continually assess policies and practices about cultural knowledge and resources; adapt service models in order to better meet the needs of different cultural groups.
- **Culturally Proficient**: Conduct original research, develop new therapeutic approaches based on culture and disseminate information to enhance the knowledge base of culturally competent practices; advocate for cultural competence throughout the systems and for improved relations between cultures.

---

For more information, contact Eleanor Castillo: ecastillo@emq.org
Assessment Process

Pre-Assessment
- Pilot
  - Weigh pros and cons of changing the questionnaire
  - Modified original tool from all items Likert scale to some likert ratings and mostly "Yes/No/Don’t Know" responses
  - Meeting with different groups on multiple occasions
  - Communication Rule of Thumb: Minimum of 3 different means (phone calls, email, letters)

Multiple Phases and Perspectives
- Phase 1
  - Direct employees self-assessment
  - July 2003- One week data gathering period
- Phase 2
  - Consumers
  - September 2003- Two week data gathering period
  - Staff provided questionnaire and self-addressed stamped envelope
- Phase 3
  - Board of Directors, Foster Families

Cultural Competence Self-Assessment Tool
- Cultural Competence Self-Assessment Questionnaire
  - Research and Training Center on Family Support and Children’s Mental Health, Regional Institute for Human Services, Portland State University
  - Administration and Service Versions
    - 6 Subscales:
      - Knowledge of communities
      - Personal Involvement
      - Resources and Linkages
      - Staffing
      - Organizational Policy and Procedures
      - Reaching Out to Communities
    - 20-30 minutes to complete

Cultural Competence Assessment Tool- Consumer
- Revised Client-Rated Cultural Competence Inventory (CCCI)
  - Developed through focus groups and interviews with families of youth receiving mental health services
  - Contact Info: Sarah Hudson, DrPH; Assistant Professor of Psychiatry, Pediatrics and Health Services Administration, University of Pittsburgh
  - Email: schollesh@msx.upmc.edu

Phase 1: Self-Assessment
- Participants
  - Executive, Administrative/Support, and Clinical Staff
  - 64% from Santa Clara County
  - 92% from Sacramento County
  - 100% from San Bernardino County
- Method
  - Supervisor to staff
  - One CCAC member as a contact for each program
  - Spanish and English version
  - Option: Complete as a group or individually
  - Process to debrief and provide feedback
    - CCAC and Programs
  - Questionnaires returned directly to the Outcomes & Evaluations Dept.
Phase 2: Families

- Participants
  - 19% return rate
- Method
  - Spanish and English versions available
  - Programs distributed questionnaires to families
  - Optional staff assistance
  - Self-addressed stamped envelope to return directly to the Outcomes & Evaluations Dept.
  - Raffle to encourage family participation

Phase 1: Self-Assessment

Process Results

- General feedback from staff
- Questions were too general
- Length of the measure
  - Too short; Too long
- Compared our data to the original author’s factor structure
  - Similar factor structure
- Ability to analyze data by STAFF POSITION and/or COUNTY

Phase 2: Families’ Assessment Process Results

- Staff were supportive of process
- Encouraged staff to administer “as many questionnaires as possible”
  - Minimum of 10% per program
- Return rate approx. 19%
  - Goal: 25-30%
- Compared our data to the original author’s data
- Ability to analyze data by:
  - PROGRAM
  - COUNTY
  - Assistance by staff influenced decision responses

Lessons Learned

- Reframe “Resistance” to stages of change
- Consistent communication from CCAC members
- Continually clarify purpose of the assessment
- Sponsorship from all levels
- Empowering Supervisors- Providing them with answers to address staff concerns
- Communicate results to all levels
  - Reports; Meetings; Intranet

Critical Factors & Lessons Learned

Assessment Implications and Plan

- Training
- Bilingual Compensation
- Develop other chartered committees
  - Cultural Competence Liaison Committee
- On-going evaluation
- Tie cultural competence to clinical outcomes