

**Results from Survey of
Members of
National Emergency Psychosocial Advisory Consortium (NEPAC)**

Survey Date:
March 4 – 11, 2011

Number of Respondents:
18

1. Should NEPAC stay together as a network moving forward?		
Answer	Count	Percentage
Yes (1)	18	100.00%
No (2)	0	0.00%
No answer	0	0.00%
2. How would you rate NEPAC's functioning as a group?		
Answer	Count	Percentage
Excellent (1)	0	0.00%
Very Good (2)	8	44.44%
Average (3)	9	50.00%
Very Poor (4)	1	5.56%
Extremely Poor (5)	0	0.00%
No answer	0	0.00%
3. Please state the benefits of NEPAC as a network. In addition, please provide us with suggestions to improve the functioning of NEPAC as a group, particularly if you answered very poor or extremely poor to the previous question.		
Answer	Count	Percentage
Answer	17	94.44%
No answer	1	5.56%
Additional Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Psycho-social emergency support becoming acknowledged as vital in all emergency situations. Each NEPAC member has different educational backgrounds and work settings. This unique knowledge, experience and professional network is vital information to other members. As we share lessons learned before, during and after emergency events, we are able to deliver a better emergency psycho-social response to our local communities/regions. 		
<p>BENEFITS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. could be a 'go to' group of people with expertise in the area of disaster psychosocial considerations 2. discussion & consultation group for questions re: ethics, best practise, etc. 3. advocacy group functioning <p>SUGGESTIONS FOR IMPROVEMENT</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. memberships based on some connection to disaster psychosocial planning & response - experience, knowledge, role 2. commitment to attendance & participation 3. willingness to take on tasks 4. some ability/capacity to travel once a year for meeting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • once a year, face to face meeting would be great! 		
<p>BENEFITS: As a group, we build on each other's wide-based experiences and knowledge. We provide varying perspectives and solutions, thus resulting in more effective delivery of services, not to mention efficiencies in the emergency/disaster field.</p> <p>SUGGESTIONS: We require a strong advocate(s) in government circles who understands the value of the service we provide and who is able to find the resources to enable this group to continue to function effectively. A yearly face-to-face meeting is required to enable us to "energize", build and maintain enthusiasm, and brainstorm.</p>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I believe having a national body to speak out on issues, and to advocate for the inclusion of psychosocial considerations in disaster and emergency response is important. I think that without some core funding, however minor, that it is difficult to sustain a network such as this beyond sustaining a name.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The psychosocial aspects of an emergency tend to get lost in the immediate focus on housing, social services, etc. NEPAC can play a key role in ensuring that psychosocial impacts, which are often very long-lasting, have a voice. On paper, NEPAC has a large group of members but it seems that only a select few are actively engaged in the group. Given the small number of members who are actively engaged, it is difficult to take on new tasks/projects. I think we need some specific activities and specific working groups from the membership to lead them so that the work isn't always falling on the same people.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ability to network through NEPAC with other groups involved in the psychosocial aspect of emergency management is invaluable.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The group provides some leadership and direction around the areas of trauma and psychosocial interventions during emergencies. Unfortunately, for too long, the focus was always on the immediate emergency and little attention was paid to the effects (short & long term) on the individuals, families and community after an emergency. Time and again, presenters from areas of the world where emergencies occurred, indicated that the psychological effects, if not attended could and often destroyed the fabric of lives in families and community. It now appears that we have stepped backwards in identifying and keeping this at the forefront.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NEPAC is a think tank of Psychosocial knowledge and experience. It provides a place to bounce and share ideas with others. It also has the potential as a place to advocate change on a national level.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NEPAC provides an opportunity for national networking and intelligence sharing around major issues including international disasters e.g. New Zealand earthquake
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I am not certain whether or not we have drifted from one of the original goals of creating a program and system that was good for the initial responders to events. It seems that most of our work and planning has not had that particular focus and we seem to have very little participation from those who would be consider initial responders. I believe we need to begin some work in this area also.
<p>BENEFITS: national collective interested in the topic and moving the agenda forward - body of expertise with individuals doing practice and research in the area -mechanism to move forward ideas/issues national and locally</p> <p>IMPROVING FUNCTIONING</p> <p>More focus on "projects" with a start and end component.</p> <p>Teleconference of an hour only is difficult to manage and to sink teeth into topics.</p> <p>Opportunity for some face to face even if through Skype keeps the connections going.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When doing provincial work on any type of emergency preparedness, it is great to have a national group providing information, support and feedback on the psychosocial component. We continue to struggle to get this essential aspect of any all hazard situation recognized as a critical response so it helps to have the backing of the national group. Having such a diverse group also provides a breadth of insight and information that we can put to good practical use. Given we can count on the fact there will always be situations which require a psychosocial response, this group will continue to have relevance into the future.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NEPAC made visible a critical aspect and need in preparing or responding for emergencies. It

fostered inter-disciplinarity and intersectoral cooperation. It was a voice for an important segment of the resource, policy and research agenda on public safety and public health. The functioning was a bit problematic because of the ambiguous legitimacy.

- As above, there is much need for a national group focusing on the psycho social aspects of disasters from the effect on those in the disaster/large emergency and responders as there is some focus on small emergencies, but nothing, other than the work of this group, that is of a national focus. Gives a spot to network, to share best practices especially to hear from specialist like Heleen in BC who is dedicated to this subject and has the support of her Province to allow her to work on this topic in times of non-emergency. Large emergencies WILL happen and this will be noticed if no group, especially the PHAC who is supposed to be the leader in "health" issues in emergencies and they are turning their back on this group, the one group who could help them deal with their mandate, although they appear not to see it as their mandate. A very dangerous stance for them to take!!!
- SUGGESTIONS: expand its membership. Keep it simple. Pay a small fee so one group can chair and provide website and minutes/agenda support so we can share best practices as mentioned; so we can share lessons learned from those who experience involvement in large emergencies; so we can keep up-to-date on issues that arise on this topic and related topics; to provide a logging of possible practitioners who may be able to call on each other and provide mutual aid possibly in times of emergency; To advertise the group in national papers etc so membership can increase and mandate expand accordingly.

- Opportunity for various stakeholders to communicate, share tools, information, resources, work together, understand different needs, support, and promote importance of. In order to stabilize and grow, essential to look at current position federally, provincially, municipally, understand process of government and formalize position for association.

BENEFITS: opportunities to network and share info; this was very beneficial to me during the 2009 H1N1 pandemic as I received fantastic resource information from peers -sharing of other info/protocol related to traumatic events have also been useful
 SUGGESTIONS: Would like to see the group have future face-to-face meetings; this would enhance learning and relationship building

4. To date, NEPAC has been housed with PHAC. Presently there are two options for housing NEPAC in the short-term. Please indicate which you support.

Answer	Count	Percentage
Canadian Psychological Association (1)	12	66.67%
Provincial Government (such as B.C.'s PHSA, Emergency Management, Disaster Psychosocial Program) (2)	3	16.67%
No answer	3	16.67%

Additional Comments:

- I would support either.
- I would support either organization in the short term. The benefit of CPA is that it already houses our secretariat and is located in Ottawa which is the base of federal organizations. On the other hand, B.C. PHSA is a good location because it is program specific in dealing with the psychosocial aspect of emergencies/disasters. Also, I believe B.C. is the leading province with respect to emergency/disaster response/planning.

- I think that the program should be housed in an entity that can represent the breadth of the membership rather than one portion (psychology). Regardless of how the CPA encourage inclusion from an optics perspective if it remains there, it has the appearance of being about psychological interventions which is only one aspect of psychosocial. Further, I think if the Disaster Psychosocial program would house it, that there is a greater likelihood of the network staying current and connected in this specific field and the potential for a synergy in terms of the development of training initiatives, materials etc. something that the BC program has been spearheading. ** there does not appear to be a way of adding into the "other" category below so I will do it here. I think that ultimately NEPAC should be its own entity - should be a national association rather than be housed in one. Funding ideally would come from a combination of organizational membership and government memberships...where each of the provinces and the federal governments, perhaps through health, would purchase membership...or at least sponsor an annual event - conference/workshop that would be moved year after year across the provinces.
- Either one would work for us.
- Needs to be kept at a national level - if kept at the provincial/territory level than certain areas may move forward and others don't. Within Ontario, the CISM and psychosocial impact issue of emergencies has been dropped from EMO and not sure where it would fit in the Provincial Ministry structures.
- I believe a national home is required to ensure that NEPAC is able to provide support and truly represent a national membership
- I think that we need to consider some type of membership structure. For instance, I am a member of the American Academy of Stress Trauma Specialist and my membership is \$80.00 a year or two years for \$140.00. It would seem to me if we were to explore this we would garner enough funds to cover any conference calls required. Much of the remainder of the work we do will be voluntary and would have no costs attached.
- I think that a National Organization makes the most sense but having said that the B.C. alternative is possible because they are the province that has a formal structure and program related to disaster management.
- A national network is a better avenue. However I fear that the strong professional identity of CPA will limit the uptake by other relevant psychosocial actors. Also as CPA has already an advocacy role it does not add a new force around the table as much as if NEPAC was a separate entity. However NEPAC under CPA is better than no NEPAC at all...
- I think the CPA is in the best position with a national focus, national network, already in place and with membership support, hopefully provide a part time/casual position to carry NEPAC forward.
- Open to whatever means is possible. In short term what works best so that not lost. In long-term where makes most sense for access to widest group. P/S should be considered as key to mental wellness in all situations, including emergency management and day to day operations, whether staff or community.
- Either option would be fine by me. However, I have noted my preference.

5. Where do you believe NEPAC should be housed in the long-term?			
Rank	Who	Count	Percentage
Ranking 1	Federal Government	13	72.22%
	National Association	3	16.67%
Ranking 2	Federal Government (1)	2	11.11%

	Provincial Association (4)	2	11.11%
	National Association (5)	11	61.11%
	NGO (6)	2	11.11%
Ranking 3	Federal Government (1)	2	11.11%
	Provincial Government (2)	2	11.11%
	Municipal Government (3)	1	5.56%
	Provincial Association (4)	1	5.56%
	NGO (6)	8	44.44%
Ranking 4	Federal Government (1)	1	5.56%
	Provincial Government (2)	4	22.22%
	Municipal Government (3)	1	5.56%
	Provincial Association (4)	2	11.11%
	NGO (6)	3	16.67%
Ranking 5	Provincial Government (2)	3	16.67%
	Provincial Association (4)	3	16.67%
	NGO (6)	2	11.11%
Ranking 6	Municipal Government (3)	5	27.78%
	Provincial Association (4)	2	11.11%
Ranking 7	Municipal Government (3)	2	11.11%

6. Would you be willing to pay a membership fee to support NEPAC's administrative activities?

Answer	Count	Percentage
Yes	15	83.33%
No	0	0.00%

Additional Comments:

- \$100-300/year to cover costs + occasional travel costs to meet face to face
- \$200.00
- not sure yet about amount
- The Canadian Council of Churches does not provide a budget for this. However, I would be willing to contribute \$50 for a membership fee.
- While I would be willing to pay, I would need to know what that membership brought to determine how much. I would suggest keeping it small to start, and hitting up government bodies for government memberships or sponsorships.
- Cannot comment on amount at this time.
- \$100 - 250 per year
- 100 to 200 dollars
- Perhaps there is a way for all provinces/ territories to take turns paying for the teleconference calls. It is the secretariat function that will be the ongoing cost. I could probably only afford to invest a few hundred \$ in this. But I would do anything I could as in kind support.
- A minimal fee to be accessible to all interested parties (10\$-25\$) which demonstrate clearly 'operationalized' membership and is leveraged by the number of its membership
- I'd pay \$300 at least from my position's budget a year to keep NEPAC going if it's tied to a credible, known agency like CPA or Heleen's office etc

- I'd be willing to pay, however, not necessary if plan smart. Need to look into opportunities to work with government (nationally and provincially), so established as provincial territorial NGO working group nationally with political support to champion. Initially start out with concept of working with government to start out national association with provincial branches. This is the way number of organizations originally started out. One example is The Ontario Association of Emergency Managers (OAEM) – formerly known as the Canadian Emergency Preparedness Association – Ontario Chapter. Excerpt from "Our History: The Evolution of the Ontario Association of Emergency Managers" written by Marg Verbeek, "Since the mid-1990s, emergency management practitioners began meeting to discuss the formation of an Emergency Management Association in Ontario. By the late 1990s, along came Emergency Preparedness Canada (EPC, then PSEPC, now known as PSC or PS) looking for emergency management "champions" within the country to establish a federation of emergency management organizations. In 1999, during Emergency Preparedness Week, the Canadian Emergency Preparedness Association (CEPA)–Ontario was launched. At the same time, eight other Regions of CEPA were established across Canada, each to have its own Bylaw." Since then organization changed and better to look at organization such as IAEM and national / provincial branches but can see how able to start by looking at history of OAEM. One way to gain government and public eye and build support and buy-in is to work with EP Week and get support for topic of Mental Health/Wellness, then Federal government lead will work with group on designing campaign and literature (posters, guides, tools) for provincial organizations to use which then downloaded or ordered by municipalities, NGOs and individuals to use.

- My organization would probably support paying for a membership on my behalf.

7. What are your preferences for staying connected as a group?

<i>Webinars</i>	8	44.44%
• Great idea!! they're much easier and cheaper to arrange now, so great!		
<i>Skype</i>	8	44.44%
• look into it		
<i>E-mail</i>	17	94.44%
• email second choice for considering info only		
<i>Teleconferences</i>	17	94.44%
• first choice of contact		
<i>Other (please specify)</i>	10	55.56%
• Face to face		
• once a year face to face meetings		
• One face-to-face meeting per year		
• once a year face-to-face		
• forum of PTSC-Online		
• conferences		
• annual workshops or conferences in concert with other events		
• website (to catch up on info as participation to calls or meeting is extremely difficult to fit in schedule)		
• combination of various mediums, whatever works best for group		
• maybe one face-to-face meeting a year		

8. Do you want to continue as a member of NEPAC?		
Answer	Count	Percentage
Yes (please specify in what capacity: Chair, co-Chair, Meeting attendee, working group member, etc.)	18	100.00%
No	0	0.00%
Additional Comments:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meeting attendee and working group member • all of them • member • Meeting attendee and working group member • working group member potentially depending on what those working groups are... • Meeting attendee. Working group member when able. • Associate member as my role in emergency management has changed but still very interested in the area • Attending meetings and sitting on an executive committee or board • I was initially very active in NEPAC and have had to pull back this past year due to administrative responsibilities. I would like to continue with NEPAC as a regular member. • I think we all need to be open to filling whatever role(s) the group requires and we all need to be involved for sure as a working group member as a minimum. • As an attendee • Meeting attendee • Member • Yes, by all means, I would like to be involved and although I plan on retiring in the coming months, I will impress upon my replacement of the importance of supporting NEPAC in the future both financially and by participation in all it has to offer. • Whatever role(s) needed to assist group and ensure continues. • working group member 		