MONASH University
Accident Research Centre
Disaster Resilience Initiative

Process Evaluation

LESSONS IN DISASTER:
EDUCATING FOR RESILIENCE
THROUGH MEN'S AND
WOMEN'S EXPERIENCE OF
DISASTER

August 2016

Prepared for

Women's Health in the North (WHIN)

WOMEN'S HEALTH
IN THE NORTH
voice • choice • power

Authors

Caroline Spencer, Naomi Bailey,
Carlyn Muir, Saadia Majeed, Dudley McArdle

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLES

ACRONYMS

AHRC	Australian Human Right Commission
AIFS	Australian Institute of Family Studies
CFA	Country Fire Authority
COAG	Council of Australian Governments
DELWP	Department of Land, Environment Water and Planning
DHHS	Department of Health and Human Services
EM	Emergency Management
EMV	Emergency Management Victoria
GAD	Gender and Disaster
HFA	Hyogo Framework for Action 2005-2015
HFA2	HFA2 Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Reduction
LGA	Local Government Authority
LGBTI	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans and/or Intersex
MUDRI	Monash University Disaster Resilience Initiative
MUARC	Monash University Accident Research Centre
NSDR	National Strategy for Disaster Resilience
SES	State Emergency Service
UN	United Nations
VicPol	Victoria Police
WHGNE	Women's Health Goulburn North East
WHIN	Women's Health in the North

1 INTRODUCTION

OVERVIEW

The basis of this evaluation follows-on from research conducted in Australia and other developed countries and points to the significance of gender in determining disaster experience, recovery and resilience.

Gender-based issues including increased violence against women post-disaster, inadequate support or debriefing for men, and the increase in men's self-harming behaviours post-disaster (such as alcohol abuse, mental health issues and suicide) are particularly relevant to Australians – with our one in six chance of experiencing a disaster (McFarlane, 2005). Climate change will continue to increase the intensity and frequency of extreme weather events, increasing the urgency of attention to gendered impacts of disaster.

There is an identified need for a collaborative effort across both community and the emergency management sector to raise awareness about the impact of gender on disaster experience and outcomes, and to provide the education—and build the capacity—to incorporate gender considerations into emergency management policy, planning, decision-making and service delivery.

CONTEXT

'[O]n 7 2009 the Council of Australian Governments (COAG) agreed to adopt a whole-of-nation resilience-based approach to disaster management, which recognises that a national, coordinated and cooperative effort is needed to enhance Australia's capacity to withstand and recover from emergencies and disasters.' (National Strategy for Disaster Resilience, 2011)

'The starting point for reducing disaster risk and for promoting a culture of disaster resilience lies in the knowledge of the hazards and the physical, social, economic and environmental vulnerabilities to disasters that most societies face, and of the ways in which hazards and vulnerabilities are changing in the short and long term, followed by action taken on the basis of that knowledge.' (Hyogo Framework for Action 2005—15)

Why does the evaluation need a context?

This context will provide the briefest outline of the intersecting fields of disaster management, gender equity and violence against women in order to clearly locate evaluation of the four training sessions on the socio-political terrain in which the training was conducted.

Gender and disaster management

Australian disaster management reflects a seismic shift transitioning from its origins in Civil Defence command and control practices (Krolik, 2013, p. 44) to a whole-of-nation, resilience-based approach. Australia's National Strategy for Disaster Resilience (2011) expresses this change as does the Hyogo Framework 2005-15, and its successor the Sendai Framework 2015-2030 at the international level. The shift broadens understanding of disaster

management in two important ways: disaster management now occurs over a longer period of time including phases of preparation, response and recovery; and disaster management increasingly involves consideration of 'diversity' and gender equity in planning for the safety of particular groups in the community. These often disproportionately vulnerable groups during and after disaster, include women, those with disability, the young, the aged (HFA2, 2014) and LGBTI communities (Dominey-Howes et al., 2013; Gorman-Murray et al., 2014). This change in disaster management practices coincides with other Australian command and control institutions addressing gender equity. The Australian Defence Force (Australian Human Rights Commission, 2013), the Australian Federal Police and the Victorian Country Fire Authority have undergone – or are all undergoing –rigorous reviews of gender inequity cultures. This, when gender inequity determines the clearest indicator of risk for violence against women (VicHealth, 2007), represents an area of current policy focus in Australia under the National Plan to Reduce Violence against Women and their Children (2012-22). This national plan addresses the frightening reality that one in four Australian women experience gendered violence in her lifetime (Cox, 2012). This section contextualises the training intersect of change in disaster management to represent a more inclusive and broader cultural consideration of gender equity and violence against women in public and private life.

A changing perspective of disaster: National and international documents

Three vital documents represent a shift in the understanding of disaster and its impact on marginalised groups: the Sendai Framework 2016 (which succeeded the Hyogo Framework quoted above), the HFA2 Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Reduction (2014), and Australia's National Strategy for Disaster Resilience (NSDR, 2011). Each state and territory in Australia retains its own strategy, operational practices and strategic goals. These documents overlay an existing culture of disaster management that is particularly Australian, related to generational experiences of responding to natural and man-made disasters. This sub-section will take a very brief look at this culture and the national strategy and international frameworks.

Three major documents share the new conceptualisation of disaster: Australia's National Strategy uses the language of a shift to a 'resilience-based approach' to disaster management, evidencing an understanding of safeguarding the community as a whole over time (AIFS, 2012). The HFA2 Asia-Pacific Input Document (2014) depicts a regional document reflecting the Asia-Pacific input to pre-Sendai negotiations, to which Australia contributed, with a dedicated section on inclusion and a separate section on women (HFA2 2014, p20). The Sendai Framework (2016) articulates an international shift toward a broader understanding of disaster and recognition of disproportionate impacts of disaster and disaster management on particular vulnerable groups.

These frameworks and strategy overlay the existing culture of disaster management in Australia. The disaster management sector originates from a 'command and control'

hierarchy (Krolik, 2013, p. 44). Responding to disaster historically focussed on the physical hazard of the natural or built environment and was characterised by a sense of urgency and driving action (Enarson, 2012, p. 168). Contemporary disaster management documents trace a shift toward recognition of the human impacts and engagement with a broad range of stakeholders across the preparation, response and recovery time frame. The language of 'whole-of-nation', 'multi-issue' and 'multi-sectorial' responses permeate all three documents. The language recognises a role for governments, not-for-profits, civil society and business. This exposes disaster management to the changes occurring in other fields like health, social services generally, and government and business.

Particular impacts of disaster: vulnerability and hazard

The supra-national documents clearly identify that, while disasters affect everyone, some groups disproportionately experience impacts or consequences of these events which might include physical, social, economic or environmental impacts. The vulnerable groups identified in these documents include people with a disability, the young, and the aged and minority groups. In addition to these groups, a growing body of work in Australia identifies distinct risks for the LGBTI community (Dominey-Howes et al., 2013; Gorman-Murray et al., 2014). During and after disaster, women represent as both particularly vulnerable and particularly well-placed to increase the resilience of communities to 'build back better' in the wake of disaster (HFA2, 2014, p20). Two different approaches emerge in the frameworks to addressing the vulnerability of particular groups during disaster. This sub-section will contextualise the push to accommodate diversity in disaster management and the issue of gender and disaster.

The national and international documents suggest best practice promotes addressing the needs of the vulnerable groups in the community by ensuring their participation in disaster planning response and recovery to build resilience. Groups include LGBTI communities, older people, young people, women and people with a disability. The first approach to particular vulnerability broadly refers to 'inclusion'. Using this approach ensures 'vulnerable individuals have equitable access to appropriate information, training and opportunities' (NSDR, 2011). The underlying premise of this approach elucidates that existing practice around planning for disaster, responding and recovery are sound and adequate and the same approaches can extend to accommodate particular needs of vulnerable groups, once those needs are known. This model of inclusion classically folds those on the margins into the values and practices of those in the centre.

At least one of the leading disaster documents deals with the issue of women and gender somewhat differently. The HFA2 document demonstrates what emerges more strongly as a tension between practices focussed on women's health and safety, and practices focused on disaster management which demonstrates this tension well in its section on women and disaster:

> 'Though the call for inclusivity [of marginalized groups] covers the need to include women, it would seem […] that there is a requirement for a clear, stand-alone message. Gender-based social, economic and cultural constructs marginalize women across all community groups irrespective of class, caste, economic standing, status, ethnicity and age […] Such vulnerabilities are reflected in terms of higher female mortalities, injuries, sexual and other forms of violence […]' (HFA2, p.20)

Addressing women's experiences of disaster poses an additional set of challenges that intersect with a vast body of work on women's rights and gender equity and requires fundamental changes to approaches to disaster management. This approach requires the centre or 'mainstream' of disaster management to move away from (problematic) practices that discriminate on the basis of gender, toward less discriminatory practices. The HAF2 provides some direction on how Asia-Pacific nations, including Australia, see best practice in responding to this challenge:

> 'It is important that planning, investment and implementation is informed by sex and age disaggregated data and *gender analysis* at every level, and that resourcing, and budgeting for actions that include women and promote gender equality are developed.' (Emphasis added, HFA2 p.20)

This result shows two different approaches to addressing gender and disaster. The first, 'inclusivity', might result in better access to existing training for women and other groups identified as vulnerable, about the risks and hazards in disaster. The second approach, the call for gender analysis and gender equity, signifies a deeper challenge.

Gender-equity in disaster management

Disaster management and recent cultural changes in this field do not occur in a vacuum. Unprecedented work in Australian institutions addresses the culture of gender inequity. Several Australian command and control institutions are currently engaged in reviewing their practices from a gender equity perspective. At the same time, unprecedented federal and state/territory interest in, and action on, addressing violence against women exists. A call for gender analysis of, and gender equity in, disaster management aligns with this work. Both gender equity work and work on violence against women provide useful tools and approaches to implementing change. Exposing disaster management to the 'whole-of-nation' approach means government, industry, experts, not-for-profits, community and individuals share common interest in these policies and practices. This section contextualises the challenges of gender and disaster using work undertaken in emergency services institutions and the corporate space, a gender analysis of disaster and the approaches employed at a national and state/territory level to address behaviour change and violence against women.

Several Australian emergency services accept the challenge for gender analysis and gender equity. The Australian Defence Force, the Australian Federal Police (AFP Commissioners speech, 2016) and the Victorian Country Fire Authority work to review their culture of gender inequity. This involves the reflective task of considering-closely held cultural beliefs about the roles of men and women and addressing male privilege. The former Australian Sex Discrimination Commissioner (2013), Elizabeth Broderick who now works with the Australian

Federal Police, conducted a review of discriminatory practice in the Australian Defence Force while the Victorian Human Rights Commissioner conducted a review of the CFA. These reviews produced useful evidence and strategies for addressing institutional bias. In a corollary in the corporate space, Broderick's Champions of Change model engages men in positions of power in business to use their influence to increase gender equity (AHRC, 2014). This model focuses on reaching men with structural power as a key strategy to achieve change. Recognising the impact of gender on disaster planning response and recovery implies a deeper challenge of this kind, asking for a more reflective engagement than the inclusion approach.

A gendered analysis of disaster can account for the ways in which women in Australia experience an increase in violence during and after disaster (Parkinson, 2012; 2015). It can also account for the evidence of the negative impact of gender stereotypes on men's mental health and wellbeing during and after disaster (Zara & Parkinson, 2013). The Federal Government, under its National Plan to Reduce Violence Against Women and their Children (2012-22) explicitly names gender inequity as the single most influential predictor of increased violence against women. Each state and territory retains a plan to address gendered violence that incorporates prevention and addresses gender inequity. These national and local plans approach violence against women through a public health model, using primary, secondary and tertiary techniques to organise training in prevention, early intervention and response. Groups developed several models for behaviour change in the violence against women sector, including the UN Typologies for Training on Gender Equity (UN Women, 2016), the Ecological Model for understanding violence and affecting change (Heise, 1998) (sometimes called the socio-ecological model) and the recently developed Our Watch Theory of Change (Our Watch, 2015). Each approach promotes action at the individual, relationship, community, societal and public policy levels in order to encourage change. These models represent a rich evidence base, which recognises the difficult project of behaviour change, and encourage action on multiple fronts (UN Women, 2016).

Context summary

The context in which training on gender and disaster is occurring is complex and multifaceted. The Sendai Framework, the HFA2 and the National Strategy recognise a broad cycle of disaster that includes planning, response and recovery, and the need for a multi-sectoral, whole-of-nation response that engages a broad range of stakeholders focused on resilience. These documents also recognise the needs and vulnerabilities of diverse groups during disaster, including women. Two distinct approaches to gender and disaster appear in the frameworks and literature, one could broadly be called 'inclusion' and the other 'gender equity'. Implementing the change required for adoption of these new approaches to disaster management poses certain challenges. Work being done on gender equity in other emergency services will offer insights into addressing inclusion and gender equity. Strategies to address violence against women also provide examples of coherent evidence-based

approaches to the difficult work of behaviour change. This brief overview contextualises the evaluation of the training in the landscape of disaster management, gender equity and violence against women.

LESSONS IN DISASTER: THE SESSIONS

GOVERNANCE

An advisory group guided the project as a sector reference group drawing membership from multiple agencies across the emergency management sector. The advisory group met quarterly to provide oversight, content advice and facilitate networks. Appendix 1 lists the members.

Two Project Managers jointly coordinated the project with one external consultant, and one WHGNE/WHIN researcher, under the guidance of a Reference Group. The project managers established the overarching goals and specific objectives for the project and were responsible for determining the project's activities. The project managers described the process used to determine the goals, objectives and activities in a transparent manner.

A key component of the project involved communication, including face-to-face meetings, between the Project Managers and senior management of emergency service organisations to:

- tailor and refine the content for each education session;
- identify specific organisational training needs, and
- identify examples of organisational best-practice in relation to gender-equity and/or the inclusion of diverse groups.

SESSION DEVELOPMENT – CURRICULUM CONTENT

The session development and curriculum content hones the significant research experiences and developers of the Gender & Disaster (GAD) Pod, an initiative of two Victorian Women's Health organisations, Women's Health Goulburn North East (WHGNE) and Women's Health in the North (WHIN), working in partnership with Monash University Accident Research Centre (MUARC). Formally established in 2015, the GAD Pod promotes an understanding of the role gender plays in survivor responses to natural disaster, and to embed these insights into emergency management practice. Since undertaking qualitative research in the aftermath of the 2009 Black Saturday bushfires, the Pod partners led, or collaborated on, a range of initiatives intended to raise awareness about the implications of gender in the human experience of disaster and its aftermath, and to inform responses to women and men in future disasters. With support and funding from State and Federal governments and agencies – and critical input from emergency management leaders and workers, community members and workers, experts in the fields of masculinity, gender and disaster, and federal, state and local government departments, the GAD Pod continues to further initiatives in the area of gender and disaster.

Using the experiences to develop the GAD Pod and the lived experience of Australian disaster survivors, the *Lessons in disaster: Educating for resilience through men's and women's experience of disaster* project was created to educated emergency management professionals, volunteers and community members on the importance of gender to disaster experience, recovery and resilience.

The project piloted the delivery of one each of the four education sessions:

- Identifying Family Violence after Natural Disaster (Family Violence)
- Gender Equity in Disaster (Gender Equity)
- Men and Disaster
- Living LGBTI in Disaster (LGBTI)

The four sessions included participants from all levels of the emergency management sector and from multiple organisations including the CFA, MFB, SES and the Office of the Emergency Management Commissioner, with additional places specifically allocated to State and Local Government, community members and workers. The new Victorian Emergency Management Training Centre in Craigieburn hosted the pilot sessions. The design of this interdisciplinary approach capitalised on the diverse knowledge and experience of different groups, and reinforced a joint commitment and collective approach to gender and disaster planning.

Following the piloted education sessions, participant feedback informed modifications to each of the pilot education sessions, which were then adjusted, repackaged and referred back to the advisory group. The Men and Disaster, Gender Equity in Disaster, and Living LGBTI in Disaster and training packages were made available online via the project partners' websites and accompany the Family Violence training package which organisations and communities can now download at no cost.

The project differs from existing education and training options, in that:

- the content was based in the lived experiences of local disaster survivors. The Identifying Family Violence after Disaster and Men and Disaster training was based on the only qualitative research available on this issue and conducted in Australia with men, women and workers who survived and/or responded to the Black Saturday bushfires. The Gender Equity training differed from other gender modules, by drawing on disaster situations and disasters' aftermath, situating the training in stereotypes immediately recognisable to those present from Emergency Management and incorporating in the training session, statistics provide by participating attendees which related to their organisations.
- it proposed an interdisciplinary and multi-level approach, which drew together workers from all levels of the emergency management sector (from senior management to front-line workers), in addition to state and local government personnel, volunteers and community members.

- it enjoyed the support of, and commitment from, senior ESOs.
- it drew on the combined knowledge of: disaster survivors, ESO leadership and community members (who formed the Reference Group), women's health researchers from WHGNE and WHIN, and the academic expertise of both the Monash University Accident Research Centre and leading experts in masculinity and gender studies.

IDENTIFYING FAMILY VIOLENCE AFTER NATURAL DISASTER (Family Violence)

Aim

The Family Violence Training Package aims to assist in ensuring that the safety of women and children is met after natural disaster and offers participants the knowledge and skills to identify family violence after natural disaster and to provide referrals where appropriate.

Learning Objectives

To provide participants with:

- An understanding between natural disaster and family violence
- A definition of family violence
- The causes of family violence
- The prevalence of family violence in Australia
- The factors influencing family violence after natural disaster
- Ways to talk about family violence
- Approaching women about family violence
- How to keep records

Format

Topic 1 Information about family violence after disaster
Topic 2 Practical skills
Topic 3 Safety and referral pathways

GENDER EQUITY IN DISASTER (Gender Equity)

Aim

The Gender Equity Training Package aims to broaden the understanding of the impact of gender in the delivery of effective emergency management services and to assist services to develop strategies to address gender inequalities.

Learning Objectives

To provide participants with:

- Increased awareness to recognise their own personal values about gender
- Knowledge regarding gender related terminology and gender analysis
- Skills to recognise and evaluate the effect of personal values about gender
- Increased awareness of the value of building a gender responsive organisation

- Increased knowledge, skills and confidence in the design, delivery and evaluation of gender sensitive skills and programs.

Format

Topic 1 Gender equity in the workplace
Topic 2 Compare and contrast
Topic 3 Working towards change

MEN AND DISASTER

Aim

The Men and Disaster Training Package aims to broaden the range of constructive behaviours for women and women before, during and after disasters.

Learning Objectives

To provide participants with:

- An understanding of the concepts of sex and gender and their impact on men's responses to disasters.
- An awareness of challenges faced by men in disaster contexts
- An awareness of the consequences of hyper-masculine behaviours on men, on other people, on the family and organisations
- Knowledge to identify the implicit and explicit behaviours if individuals and the organisational practices that support rigid gender roles
- Ways to take action to broaden the range of constructive behaviours for women and men
- Strategies for individuals, organisations and communities to enact before a disaster to facilitate constructive responses by men in and after disasters
- Strategies to assist individuals, organisations and communities on dealing with men's responses to disasters and their aftermath

Format

Topic 1 Research findings approach
Topic 2 Sex, gender and stereotyping
Topic 3 Risks, benefits and disasters
Topic 4 Exploring the harms
Topic 5 Learnings from Black Saturday
Topic 6 Reducing the harms: pre disaster
Topic 7 Reducing the harms: post disaster

LIVING LGBTI IN DISASTER (LGBTI)

Aim

The LGBTI Training Package aims to broaden the understanding of the impact of being LGBTI in the delivery of effective emergency management services and to assist services to develop strategies to address inequalities.

Learning Objectives

To provide participants with:

- Skills to recognise and evaluate the effect of personal values and behaviours regarding LGBTI people
- Increased knowledge, skills and confidence in the development and implementation of strategies to build LGBTI sensitive practices in the workplace.

Format

Topic 1 Where do you stand?
Topic 2 Working towards change
Topic 3 The Rainbow Tick

2   EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

PROCESS EVALUATION FRAMEWORK

Process evaluations are undertaken to assess the effectiveness of project delivery (Scheirer, M., 1994). More specifically, process evaluations aim to identify: the key components of a session that have been delivered effectively; to whom the session has been delivered effectively; and the conditions under which the session is delivered effectively (Steckler, A. & L. Linnan, 2002).

Steckler and Linnan (2002) defined an appropriate framework for the conduct of a comprehensive process evaluation with seven widely accepted components. These guide the current evaluation and the following represents an adapted Public Health Model approach to suit the purpose of this evaluation.

1. **Context:** Aspects of the larger social, political and economic environment that may influence session implementation.
2. **Targeted Audience*:** The proportion of the intended target audience that participates in a session.
3. **Sessions*[1] delivered:** The number or amount of intended sessions delivered.
4. **Participant Engagement*:** The extent to which participants actively engage with, interact with, or use, materials provided (measures engagement).
5. **Conformity*:** The extent to which the session was delivered as planned.
6. **Recruitment:** Procedures used to approach and attract participants.
7. **Implementation:** The extent to which the session has been implemented and received by the intended audience.

PROCESS EVALUATION AIMS

The overarching aim is to evaluate four pilot education sessions tailored to emergency management professionals, volunteers, and community members:

- Identifying Family Violence after Natural Disaster (Family Violence)

---

[1] *'Targeted Audience' replaces 'Reach', 'Sessions Delivered' replaces 'Dose', and 'Conformity replaces 'Fidelity'.

- Gender Equity and Disaster (Gender Equity)
- Men and Disaster
- Living LGBTI in Disasters Training (LGBTI)

Based on this aim, the **objectives** of the process evaluation were to:

a. Assess the number of participants and their organisation/community to determine the extent of ESO and community participation in the pilot session delivery.
b. Assess participant feedback to gauge participants' self-reported understanding of specific topics pre and post-training,
c. Assess the participant perceptions of teaching, and the relevance and usefulness of learning tools (such as case studies).
d. Identify key implementation issues and document potential improvements or modifications to the training content.

3 METHODS

EVALUATION PROJECT STEERING GROUP

The MUDRI evaluation team, working as external evaluators, met with the two project managers and the Chair of the Project Advisory Group and agreed on the parameters and evaluability for this evaluation. The project managers willingly arranged for project documentation and responded to requests for further information and clarification during the evaluation process. The project managers and Chair of the Advisory Group were also provided the opportunity to comment on the draft report before finalising the report.

ETHICS APPROVAL

The Monash University Human Research Ethics Committee approved the ethics application for a Low Risk Research Project: No CF16/2150 – 2016001051.

DESKTOP REVIEW OF PROJECT AND TRAINING DOCUMENTS

The session designers and workshop facilitators provided the researchers with comprehensive project and training documents for each of the sessions. Each researcher took responsibility for one group and reviewed the documents. These documents provided contact details for survey participants and provided evidence of the development process used by the project managers as they described their collective actions in advancing the project and describing the content and interactions within each of the sessions.

SURVEY RESEARCH

Why a Survey?

Survey research supports process evaluation by collecting empirical data to determine the effectiveness of a planned event or events, in this case the sessions in the Lessons in Disaster

program. A telephone survey combined with a structured questionnaire (See appendix 2) enabled respondents to comment on questions. The benefits of a telephone survey include:

- A quick, easy and cost effective method versus the slow, labour intensive and costly method of face-to-face interviews
- two-way discussion between researchers and respondents ensured clarity about the questions
- Greater control with data collection with four interviewers engaged in the project. Enables interviewers to clarify any issues that may arise with lead investigator.

(Babbie, 2016)

Survey design

The evaluation team designed a structured survey questionnaire based on the evaluation criteria and on questions from the original feedback questionnaire that participants completed at the end of each session. Because survey participants hold responsible and demanding positons, the evaluation team considered the time commitment required for participant responses. Matrix questions offer a quick and efficient means to answer questions, consequently, eleven of the thirteen survey questions comprised matrix questions with Likert response categories. Three of the matrix questions had contingency questions and another two open-end questions captured qualitative data specific to each participant.

Survey Participants

To gain as representative perspective of the total population of those who attended the sessions, researchers selected five participants from each session (approximately 25% from each group) for a phone interview. As participants attended multiple sessions, researchers compared attendance sheets and carefully selected survey participants to avoid duplication and talking to the same participant twice.

Phone interviews

Each researcher contacted survey participants and invited them to participate in the evaluation of the Lesson in Disaster Program and those who agreed received an Explanatory Statement and a Consent Form, which was signed and returned to the evaluation team. Some survey participants responded immediately, while others needed to make an appointment at an alternate time.

FOCUS GROUP

Why a Focus Group?

Adopting a focus group approach in the evaluation allowed insight into the translation of knowledge from the women's health field to the emergency management field against project objectives. This approach provides valuable data on the interpretation and implementation of objectives; audience identification and segmentation (distinguishing the

different characteristics of audience members); and strategic approaches to addressing barriers to uptake of a broad multi-dimensional inclusion and gender equity understanding of resilience. With this data the program could be compared with international best practice to capture challenges and innovations.

These training programs are the first of their kind in Australia and, as such, present unique challenges. A process evaluation model acknowledges that training programs such as these are part of a broader ecosystem of responses, measures, policy settings and cultural changes. While the approach to disaster management has shifted to incorporate broader stakeholders and multi-issue responses, change manifests over time, and requires a complex web of activity in order to generate impacts (this is supported by the ecological model for understanding violence against women and typologies of gender equity training explored in the above contextual information). Pre-existing research and evaluations can offer insight into 'what works' when addressing similar topics like gender equity or violence against women, but fall short of offering clear knowledge on 'what works' when it comes to training at the intersect of disaster management, inclusive planning, response, recovery and gender equity.

4 FINDINGS

SESSIONS DELIVERED

HOW MANY SESSIONS WERE DELIVERED?

Key findings: Summary findings show that one of each session was delivered:

- Identifying Family Violence after Natural Disaster (Family Violence)
- Gender Equity in Disaster (Gender Equity)
- Men and Disaster
- Living LGBTI in Disaster (LGBTI)

TARGETED AUDIENCE

SURVEY PARTICIPANTS FOLLOWED-UP FOR THIS EVALUATION

Key findings: Summary findings in Table 1 show researchers contacted 47 survey participants for a telephone survey. Of these

43% of survey participants contacted agreed to a phone interview (20)

26% of survey participants contacted declined a phone interview (12)

19% of survey participants that researchers tried to contact could not be reached (9)

9% of survey participants contacted had no memory of participation despite appearing on attendance sheet (4)

4% of survey participants contacted were on leave (2), and

2% of survey participants contacted had left their organisation (1)

Table 1: Survey participant follow-up for this evaluation

	Total number contacted for phone interview	Outcome	Reasons for non-participation
Family Violence	12	• Agreed and interviewed n=6 • Declined n=4 • Could not be contacted n=2 • No memory of participation n=2	• Participant marked as in attendance at the workshop , could not specifically remember this workshop or differentiate it from other similar workshops they have attended (n=2) • Had workplace training during the data collection period and would not be available for interview (n=2)
Gender Equity	14	• Agreed and interviewed n= 4 • Declined n=5 • Could not be contacted n=1 • No memory of participation n=1 • On leave n=2	• Participant marked as in attendance at the workshop, but could not remember the session. n=1
Men and Disaster	16	• Agreed and interviewed n=5 • Declined n=3 • Could not be contacted n=6 • No memory of participation n=1 • Left organisation n= 1	• Participant marked as in attendance at the workshop, but could not remember the session. n=1 • Participants agreed to a phone interview at a specified time but failed to answer or called back. n=2
Living LGBTI	5	Agreed and interviewed n=5	
Total	47 contacts	20 agreed to a phone interview 12 declined a phone interview 9 could not be contacted by researchers 4 had no memory of participation despite appearing on attendance sheet 2 contacts on leave 1 contacted left their organisation	

WHAT MADE SURVEY PARTICIPANTS CHOOSE TO PARTICIPATE?

The session organisers targeted people in middle management primarily within emergency services and affiliated organisations with exposure to a busy, variable and diverse workload. Senior management often "nominated" participants who found they had other commitments and therefore had double bookings. Some nominated participants delegated attendance to others usually in more junior roles within the organisation. This appeared to happen more frequently in the fire-related services. In some cases, circumstances rather than choice appeared to dictate who finally attended.

Key findings: Summary findings in Table 2 show what made survey participants choose to participate in a session:

Interest in Topic

90% of survey participants (18) selected 'interest in the topic' as the main reason for choosing to participate in the session.

Manager recommended my participation

10% of survey participants (2) reported their manager recommended their participation while two selected 'other' as their reason for participation.

Colleagues were attending

Nil response

Other

10% of survey participants (2) reported that their job related to the topic.

Non-participation and drop-outs

Factors influencing non-participation included people choosing not to continue to participate for personal reasons e.g. too many government personnel present, memories evoked, and location of training. Factors influencing people dropping-out included unexpected work-related commitments e.g. the Lancefield fires prevented approximately 12 people from attending the Gender Equity and Disaster training session. Personnel from DHHS, SES, DELWP, CFA, local government and other ESO's simply could not attend due to commitments at the fires and affected communities.

Table 2: What made survey participants choose to participate?

	Family Violence	Gender Equity	Men and Disaster	LGBTI	Total
Interest in topic	5	3	5	5	18
Manager recommended my participation	1		1		2
Colleagues were attending					0
Other		1	1		2

RECRUITMENT

HOW DID SURVEY PARTICIPANTS HEAR ABOUT THE SESSION?

Key findings: Summarise findings in Table 3 show

35% survey participants heard about the session by their Manager (8)

20% survey participants heard about the session by WHIN/WHGNE (4)

30% survey participants heard about the session by EMV or associated agency (6)

10% survey participants heard about the session by word of mouth (2)

5% survey participants heard about the session by a work email (1)

NB 5% survey participants heard about the session from more than one source.

Table 3: How did survey participants hear about the session?

	Family Violence	Gender Equity	Men and Disaster	LGBTI	Total
Manager	2	3	1	2	8
WHIN/WHGNE	1		2	1	4
EMV or associated agency	2		2	2	6
Word of mouth	1		1		2
Other (work email)		1			1

WHAT WERE THE DEMOGRAPHICS OF SURVEY PARTICIPANTS?

The attendance sheet provided the organisations and roles of each survey participant.

Demographics

Key findings: Summary demographics findings in Table 4 of **survey participants' organisation**:

40% of survey participants came from an Emergency Services Organisation (8)

30% of survey participants came from a Local Government Authority (6)

25% of survey participants came from the State Government (5)

5% of survey participants came from the Community (1)

Key findings: Summary demographic findings of **survey participants' organisational role**:

5% of survey participant's organisational role was as an advisor (1)

5% of survey participant's organisational role was as a Senior Manager (1)

5% of survey participant's organisational role was as a Coordinator (1)

15% of survey participant's organisational role was as Emergency Management (3)

30% of survey participant's organisational role was as Manager (6)

10% of survey participant's organisational role was as Policy & Strategy (2)

15% of survey participant's organisational role was as Officer (3)

5% of survey participant's organisational role was as Operational (1)

10% of survey participant's organisational role was as Unstated (2)

Table 4: What were the organisation and role demographics of survey participants?

Family Violence			
Male n=2 Female n=4	**Organisations** • Central Goldfields Shire Council (LGA) • Hobsons Bay City Council (LGA) • DPC (Govt.) • CFA (n=2) (ESO) • Macedon Ranges Shire Council (LGA)		**Role** • Emergency Management n=3 • Policy and strategy n=2 • Operational n=1
Gender Equity			
Male n=2 Female n=2	**Organisations** • Macedon Ranges Shire Council n=2 (LGA) • CFA n=2 (ESO)		**Role** • Officer n=2 • Manager n=2
Men and Disaster			
Gender Male n=2 Female n=3	**Organisation** • CFA n=2 (ESO) • VicPol (ESO) • DHHS (Govt.) • Community (Comm.)		**Role** • Operations officer • Advisor • Manager n=3
LGBTI			
Male n=1 Female n=4	**Organisation** • DHHS (Govt.) • VicPol (ESO) • DPC (Govt.) • EMV (Govt.) • Nillumbik Shire Council (LGA)		**Role** • Manager • Unstated n=2 • Senior Manager • Coordinator
Total	• ESO • LGA • State Government • Community	8 6 5 1 20	Advisor n=1 Senior Manager n=1 Coordinator n=1 EM n=3 Manager n=6 Policy/ Strategy n=2 Officer n=3 Operational n=1 Unstated n=2

Key findings: Summary findings in Table 5 show the organisational demographics of survey participants from across all four sessions.

30% of survey participants came from an Emergency Services Organisation 24)

29% of survey participants came from a Local Government Authority (23)

32% of survey participants came from the State Government (26)

9% of survey participants came from the community (7)

Table 5: Summary demographics for all sessions

	Family Violence	Gender Equity	Men and Disaster	LGBTI	Total
Organisations					
ESO	5	5	7	7	24
LGA	6	7	6	4	23
Govt.	7	7	7	5	26
Community/Other	3	1	2	1	7
Total Survey participants	21	20	22	17	80
Role					
Operational	5	1	3	4	13
Strategic/Policy	7	5	2	3	17
Management	6	6	11	4	27
Other/unspecified	3	8	6	6	23
Total	21	20	22	17	80

HOW DID SURVEY PARTICIPANTS FIND THE TIMING & LOCATION AND SETTING OF SESSIONS?

Key findings: Summary findings In Table 6 show in regards to:

Time
95% of survey participants (19) found the session time convenient
5% of survey participants (1) found the session time inconvenient
5% of survey participants (1) found the session time commitment too great

Location
80% of survey participants (16) found the location convenient
20% of survey participants (4) found the location inconvenient

Facilities
100% of survey participants (20) found the facilities convenient

Table 6: How did survey participants find the timing & location and setting of sessions?

		Convenient	Inconvenient	Alternative
Family Violence	Time	6		
	Location	4	2	
	Facilities	6		
Gender Equity	Time	4		
	Location	3	1	
	Facilities	4		
Men and Disaster	Time	5		
	Location	5		
	Facilities	5		
Living LGBTI	Time	4	1	Time commitment too great
	Location	4	1	
	Facilities	5		
Totals	Time	19	1	
	Location	16	4	
	Facilities	20	0	

SURVEY PARTICIPANT ENGAGEMENT

HOW DID SURVEY PARTICIPANTS FIND THE SESSION RESOURCES?

Key findings: Summary findings in Table 7 show survey participants' recalled their engagement with the resources and how they comprehended the session:

60% of the survey participants found the resources very accessible (12)

30% of the survey participants found the resources accessible (6)

10% of the survey participants found the resources OK (2)

Table 7: How did survey participants find the session resources?

	Very accessible	Accessible	OK	Inaccessible	Very inaccessible
Family Violence	3	2	1		
Gender Equity	4				
Men and Disaster	4	1			
Living LGBTI	1	3	1		
Total	12	6	2		

HOW DID SURVEY PARTICIPANTS FIND SESSION CONTENT?

Key findings: Summary findings in Table 8 show how useful survey participants' found the sessions

60% of survey participants found the sessions very useful (12)

35% of survey participants found the sessions useful (7)

5% of survey participants found the sessions OK (1)

Table 8: How did survey participants find session content?

	Very Useful	Useful	OK	Unuseful	Very Unuseful
Family Violence	2	4			
Gender Equity	3	1			
Men and Disaster	3	2			
Living LGBTI	4		1		
Total	12	7	1		

WHY WAS THE SESSION USEFUL?

Researchers asked the participants to list their top 3 reasons as to why the session was useful.

Key findings: Summary findings reveal six themes:

- Knowledge
- Resources
- Increased Awareness
- Discussion
- Presenters
- Contacts

The order of the theme list shows the priority, with themes related to knowledge the most popular.

Knowledge

Knowledge demonstrates how participants gained knowledge about key concepts from the session and felt that they learnt something new or had their existing knowledge reinforced.

A participant from the Family Violence session reported that the learning about the lack of research was useful. Similarly another found the session very powerful because it dispelled myths, while others found the reasons for family violence very useful and why men don't communicate.

The Gender Equity session encouraged one participant to introduce the new gender perspective to their organisation.

The Men and Disaster session proved beneficial for one participant who reported that 'it gave insight into impact on victims when disaster strikes and into how things that get missed, as we don't question people in relation to domestic when disasters impact'. This session helped challenge participants thinking by learning how men and disaster represents a 'hidden topic'; that we have an expectation that men step-up during disasters and that the impact of

disasters not only affects the community more broadly but its impact lasts a long time, and in situations of domestic violence we may force parties back together.

Participant feedback for the LGBTI session identified improved understanding of LGBTI inclusion issues, and pointed to some of the gaps in service delivery.

Resources

Resources reflect how participants reported on the course materials and case studies. Participants from across all four sessions reported that all the resources were very useful. Of particular note was the range of resources available; the quality of the presentations, the practical nature and relevance of case studies, and how participants could use resources in their work context, particularly having access to the GaD Pod.

Increased Awareness

At least one survey participant from each session noted that they had an increased awareness of the issues, whether it be about the reasons why family violence exists, or its frequency and triggers; the impact of men's behaviour following disaster; the women's perspective during disaster events, and getting help to understand people's point of view.

Discussion

At least one participant in all but the LGBTI session, noted that the group discussions and or exercises were very useful. At least three participants noted the interactive nature and quality of the training session, while one noted the 'engagement by participants was excellent and of a very high quality and value added'.

Presenters

Two survey participants noted the quality of presenters, their knowledge and how they spoke with a level of authority and expertise, which made for good facilitation.

Contacts

Two survey participants noted that meeting new people in the arena was valuable

WAS ANYTHING MISSING FROM THE SESSION?

Key findings: Summary findings in Table 9 show

80% of survey participants thought that nothing was missing from the sessions (16).

20% of survey participants thought that something was missing from the sessions (4).

Table 9: Was anything missing from the session?

	Yes	No
Family Violence	3	3
Gender Equity		4
Men and Disaster		5
LGBTI	1	4

If yes, what was missing?

Key findings: Summary findings from qualitative interview data:

Four participants reported that certain aspects were missing from two training sessions.

Three Family Violence participants provided comment: one could not access all the resources and felt having them available would be useful; a second needed a better context and how it all fits with broader sector reforms while a third thought break-out times and spaces for people to manage the emotional content more privately would be useful.

Two LGBTI participants provided comment: one would have liked more takeaway materials and another needed better engagement with an 'older' audience and noted a feeling that it was all geared to younger people.

HOW DID THE SURVEY PARTICIPANTS USE MATERIAL FROM THEIR PARTICIPATION IN THE SESSION THEY ATTENDED TO IMPLEMENT ANY CHANGES IN THEIR WORKPLACE OR PRACTICE IN THE MONTHS SINCE ATTENDING?

Key findings: Summary findings from qualitative interview data about how survey participants used the material to implement changes in their workplace or practice in the months since attending: the order of the theme list below shows priorities, with 'greater awareness' the most popular.

- *Greater awareness*
- *Made change*
- *Planned change*
- *Not made changes*
- *Already using material*
- *Aware but not using*

Greater awareness

Greater awareness relates to participants who reported that they became more aware of the issues and tried to apply their learning to their practice or shared information.

Nine participants from three groups, excluding LGBTI, reported preliminary discussions, greater engagement, a deeper understanding, increased awareness of the practice of others, and more consideration when attending emergencies and interacting with men affected by

fires. One participant commented that the 'learnings had been so useful and had transferred it in so many ways at home and at work', another reported a proactive approach to domestic violence in training and another found the learning helpful for dealing with work-place issues.

Made changes

Made changes relates to a demonstrated or actual change that participants made rather than an increased awareness.

Survey participants from three groups, excluding Family Violence, reported making changes. The types of changes made in the three groups include: implemented domestic violence training, joined a sub-committee related to gender and disaster; incorporated information into handbooks, sub-plans, and community resilience plans to highlight how men work differently. Survey participants from the LGBTI group reported the most changes, for example, LGBTI information incorporated into internal council materials, white ribbon activities, school projects, and family violence and recovery policies.

Already using material

Three survey participants reported that their organisation already used the material. One organisation put lots of effort into this space, another had a team working on gender and disaster issues to build in-house staff capacities, and one participant worked in the area.

Not made changes

Three survey participant reported they made no changes.

Planned changes

Planned changes relate to comments that imply survey participants had thought about changes that either they or their organisation could make.

All but the LGBTI group reported planned changes. Comments such as 'have intentions', 'on the agenda', and 'need to change the forms to protect evacuees' suggest possible change.

Aware but not used

One survey participant reported mentioning to a staff member about the resources but they were already aware of them. The comment provided no indication that the staff member used the information.

WOULD YOU HAVE PREFERRED A DIFFERENT FORMAT FOR THE SESSIONS?

Key findings: Summary findings in Table 10 show

10% of survey participants preferred a ½ day session (2)

90% of survey participants preferred a full day session (18)

15% of survey participants wanted more activity (3)

75% of survey participants found the activity was just right (15), and

10% of survey participants wanted less activity (2)

Table 10: Would you have preferred a different format for the sessions?

	Family Violence	Gender Equity	Men and Disaster	LGBTI
½ day				2
Full day	6	4	5	3
Two 3 hour sessions separated by a couple of weeks				
More activity				3
Just right	6	4	4	1
Less activity			1	1

DO YOU HAVE ANYTHING YOU WOULD LIKE TO ADD?

Researchers asked all survey participants if they would like to add anything.

Key summary findings from qualitative interview data about how survey participants responded included three main categories:

- What people liked
- What people didn't like
- Suggestions

The order shows priorities, with 'What people liked' the most popular.

What people liked

Two LGBTI survey participants commented on the importance of the session believing it 'very important and needs to be implemented more widely' and a 'valuable topic that definitely needs to be pursued, while a Family Violence survey participant reported that it was a 'fascinating topic that was delivered well – it had the potential to be delivered very badly but this was not the case.' Another Family Violence participant was 'impressed with the professionalism of facilitators, while another noted how 'extremely useful it was having a male instructor to involve some participants that may otherwise have been difficult to

engage.' This was a view supported by another participant in the group who noted 'there were a few males in the room who were initially apprehensive, but felt it went well'.

Two Gender Equity survey participants reported that they wanted to participate in similar kinds of training sessions or activities in future.

While comments from some LGBTI survey participant were particularly complimentary about the session in that it was a good initiative with components in the program for everyone, others reported that 'there was a feeling of 'preaching to the converted' or 'much was already known, but it was a good program for others who have had little or no exposure to the issues'.

What people didn't like

Survey participants from the Family Violence and Men and Disaster sessions provided the higher number of comments about what they did not like. For example, the 'material was very basic and introductory and not challenging for those who already have a knowledge base' and 'there was a repetitive element to the content/stories used so colleagues who attended more than one workshop found the content too similar'. In relation to the practical strategies the facilitators 'didn't spend enough time talking about these or ways to initiate conversations about possible family violence in the field'. Similarly, another response noted that 'the workshop elicited a strong emotional response which was not adequately accounted for – there were no break out times or spaces where highly emotional content could be managed less publicly'. One participant in this group felt the workshop had a disappointing finish because 'the final task in the session did not fit with the overall theme of the workshop, and was too much for the time allocated'.

One survey participant in Men and Disaster perceived that he received anti-male sentiments from one of the trainers and felt these were inappropriate comments and said he felt inadequate as a male – 'felt like a slap in the face'. The participant provided no elaboration about the trainer's comment. However, and importantly, what he learned 'was very transferable to others in the program and there were light bulb moments. He said the course was 'very good for promoting the topic'. While this statement reflected a one-in-twenty comment, and could therefore be interpreted as an outlier, the evaluation team leader chose to communicate with the project managers to explore the statement further. The project managers advised quite strongly to the team leader that 'none of the course material nor the presenters are anti-male'. As such, the evaluation team considered both comments and concurred with the project managers' view, as it was a one-off, unsubstantiated statement.

Finally, one LGBTI survey participant reported that elsewhere there are better courses and shorter.

Suggestions

Participants from the Family Violence survey participants provided the most suggestions. These included 'more input from those with an appropriate academic or psychology background to foster a better understanding of why different people react to different situations instead of trying to make it too generic'. Similarly, 'proportionally more time could have been devoted to practical strategies' or 'more information on impact assessments in the community' and 'reform and broader context (e.g. Child Safe Standards)'.

In terms of the LGBTI session content one suggestion proposed a more generalised approach and not just targeted to EM.

WOULD YOU BE INTERESTED IN ANY FOLLOW-UP?

Key findings: Summarised findings in Table 11 show

75% of survey participants said they would be interested in follow-up for themselves (15)

85% of survey participants said they would be interested in follow-up for their organisation (17)

20% of survey participants said they would not be interested in any follow-up for themselves (4)

15% of survey participants said they would not be interested in any follow-up for their organisation (3).

Table 11: Would you be interested in any follow-up?

	Yes	No
Family Violence		
yourself	5	1
your organisation	5	1
Gender Equity		
yourself	4	
your organisation	4	
Men and Disaster		
yourself	3	1
your organisation	4	1
Living LGBTI		
yourself	3	2
your organisation	4	1
Total		
yourself	15	4
your organisation	17	3

CONFORMITY

Conformity is concerned with the extent to which the session was delivered as planned, and represents the quality and integrity of the session as conceived by the session developers.

HOW WELL DID THE FACILITATOR COMMUNICATE COURSE MATERIAL?

*Key findings: Su*mmarised findings in Table 12 show

90 % of survey participants said that the facilitator communicated the course material very well (18)

10% of survey participants said that the facilitator communicated the course material well (2)

Table 12: How well did the facilitator communicate course material?

	Very well	Well	OK	Badly	Very badly	Very well
Family Violence	5	1				
Gender Equity	4					
Men and Disaster	4	1				
LGBTI	5					
Total	18	2				

IMPLEMENTATION

HOW WELL DID THE FACILITATOR COMMUNICATE WITH COURSE SURVEY PARTICIPANTS?

Key findings: Summary findings in Table 13 show

90% of survey participants said the facilitator communicated **very well** with course participants (18)

10% of survey participants said the facilitator communicated **well** with course participants (2)

Table 13 How well did the facilitator communicate with course participants?

	Very well	Well	OK	Badly	Very badly	Very well
Family Violence	6					
Gender Equity	4					
Men and Disaster	3	2				
Living LGBTI	5					
Total	18	2				

To provide the education—and build the capacity—to incorporate men's and women's resilience experiences into emergency management.

The objective of this focus group was to elicit information from six invited key informants about the development, delivery and reflection on the training program *Lessons in Disaster* and its four training modules. The findings from the focus group provided data for the purpose of evaluating the training and understanding the feedback from participants.

Focus Group Attendees

Focus group attendees: Four

Apologies: Two

Four of the six-member team who designed and/or delivered the project participated in the focus group. Characteristics of the focus group:

- The skills set of the group included facilitation, curriculum development, research, training and project management.
- The four attendees were all women who had worked in women's health over many years.
- Three were based in rural areas, and a fourth in Melbourne.
- One participant had conducted a significant research project that identified gendered experiences of the Black Saturday bushfires. This research formed the basis of a needs analysis that identified the gap in training for gender and disaster.
- Two of the attendees had facilitated sessions, one managed the recruitment and event, two had been involved in curriculum development.
- All attendees had participated on other projects associated with gender and disaster and continued to do so.

Practical challenges

Three practical challenges were identified explicitly by the members of the focus group: time frames; illness of the LGBTI presenter; and the venue for training.

1. The funding agreement required that training be delivered in 2015. Though not a formal time frame, the practical reality is that fire season runs from early October to the end of March, with many staff taking leave during April. This left a small window of time to deliver the four training sessions. There was little room for negotiating days or times to better suit participants or presenters. In addition to this small window, disaster is of course inherently unpredictable and one training session, the session on Gender Equity and Disaster, was affected by a significant regional fire outbreak. Though the session had strong enrolment of senior or middle management participants, many organisations were unable to attend or designated attendance to someone not involved in the fire situation and available on the day. A secondary challenge here is evaluation of short-term, medium term and long term outcomes.

2. The experienced LGBTI facilitator fell ill on the day of the session. His knowledge was extensive, particularly due to his involvement in research on the topic. A facilitator with significant experience in LGBTI issues and disaster was found to run the session, however, the group identified the loss of the extensive knowledge of the originally listed presenter.

3. The venue for the training was advantageous in one sense as it was located on the edge of the city making it possible for people living and working in rural and regional Victoria to easily access the training. However, the training room was located in an awkward part of the building, next to staff working areas and the inability to 'talk freely' or gather outside the session room, or run break-out sessions where people could chat freely, meant that networking opportunities were restricted. This limitation was observed as particularly disappointing because it influenced the role that informal support networks can offer when working at institutional change.

Five overarching themes emerged from the focus group. Participants were asked to talk about the following:

- assumptions underpinning the development of the training and recruitment of the audience,
- their sense of whether the training got to the heart of educating and building capacity, and
- reflections on the program challenges and successes.

The following assumptions, principles and reflections emerged:

- an assumption that addressing the issues of violence against women, gender stereotypes and their impact on men, gender equity and LGBTI communities might be challenging for some of the audience group,
- an assumption that recruitment should seek to engage a mix of stakeholders including community, women and younger people, and target middle management in disaster response services
- a deep knowledge of health and training models that come predominantly from women's health paradigms and based in the social determinants of health,
- a persistent attempt to 'keep it real' by translating these models and knowledge into training content that was relevant and meaningful to participants' contexts and personal experiences,

- an assumption that the sessions on family violence and disaster and men and disaster were "more refined as they had been piloted and trialled in the past"'.

The themes presented below draw out the way the underlying presumptions and assumptions shaped the design and delivery of the training, and the basis for the reflection on which sessions worked better.

1. A collaborative strengths-based approach to building the training content.

A collaborative approach to the development of the training was a striking feature of the program staff. The team drew widely on all the skills of the group including research,

curriculum development, women's health practice and knowledge, and facilitation skills. A shared sense of purpose, goals, values and understanding of the issues was very strongly represented in the focus group. Those values and shared understandings included:

- Respect,
- A strength-based approached which focussed on capacity rather than deficit,
- A deep understanding of women's health practice and the models that underpin working with violence, promoting behaviour change and training for gender equity,
- Development of strategies to address any barriers to uptake of information, which included:
    1. The power and importance of 'keeping it real' for the audience by considering their strengths and framing information in ways relevant to them,
    2. The importance of reaching people who could influence change to practices.

2. Respect

The group explicitly supported a strengths-based model of training focussed on capacity not deficit. They recognised and legitimised the expertise of those they would be training. One group member expressed this as planning for 'an adult-learning cohort who come to the sessions with an existing wealth of knowledge. A chalk-and -talk approach wasn't going to work'. So the content would need to be interactive and pitched in a way that avoided oppositional position-taking. It was acknowledged that participants would be at different points on the road - moving from inclusion-style approaches, broadening understandings of the negative impacts of gender stereotyping, to addressing gender equity. It was assumed that people would be able to engage with some of the training sessions and not others, or be able to take one particular kind of action and not another.

A crucial assumption was that the content would be confronting and might be hard for the audience to hear, or indeed that some would feel like they 'had heard it all before and that it wasn't relevant to them'. The training would need to 'join the dots' for participants without 'preaching at them'. One strategy employed to implement this process was the use of personal narratives. Women and men fire fighters and community members were engaged to tell their stories, the assumption being that these personal stories would connect participants to lived experiences, making the need for change real and personal. One participant expressed this as 'connecting the head and the heart' in line with the attitude taken by Elizabeth Broderick in her work with institutional change.

While respectfulness was the explicit approach, it was informed by an expectation that there would be resistance to the information being conveyed. One of the facilitators put it this way: 'I was ready for pushback, prepared for it but, by-and-large, it didn't come.' An anecdote of previous experience was used to illustrate where this assumption came from.

In previous sessions dealing with family violence content conducted before the *Lessons in Disaster* work, one participant demonstrated disrespect, specifically to women trainers. This disrespect took the form of not listening when the female trainer was talking and listening when the male trainer was talking. It extended to being disruptive amongst the groups with which he was sitting. This disruption was identified as a bit of a 'wicked problem', difficult to solve without creating other problems. It remains an unresolved issue. However, it led to some strategic planning about the physical layout of the training room for *Lessons in Disaster*. Instead of group tables, the tables were arranged in an amphitheatre style, and the problem of a disruptor forming a group of dissenters did not recur. This level of attention to detail was demonstrated across many aspects of the training.

The focus on respect, respect for others' expertise, respect for 'where participants were at' in the process of addressing inclusion and gender equity in disaster management practice, brought to the fore several theories that underpinned the training.

3. Theoretical underpinnings of the training modules

The ecological model, primary health model and resilience model of disaster management.

Implicit in much of what was said about planning the sessions was an underlying public health model. When asked explicitly if this model shaped the training all of the participants agreed that it was implicit in their thinking. The training delivered crucial information for intervening to increase resilience and decrease vulnerability at the three key stages of the public health model: prevention, early intervention and ongoing care to minimise harm. While each training session had elements of prevention, early intervention and response, broadly speaking the disaster and gender equity training falls into the prevention spectrum, the men and disaster and family violence and disaster fall into early intervention and ongoing care. The LGBTI training falls across the spectrum as it aims to change practices to avoid harm and to respond to particular vulnerabilities.

Active learning

While it was not mentioned explicitly, recruitment across a range of stakeholders, planning for influence, and training for action at the personal level, community level and organisation level are consistent with the ecological model. The ecological model encourages action at the individual, relationship, community, society and public policy levels. In each training session people were asked to participate in exercises that encouraged them to think about actions they could take at the personal or organisational level to act for change. The focus group described a moment they witnessed in the room when the implications of gender equity and disaster went on like a light bulb for some participants.

One key challenge when training in gender equity in any sphere is acknowledgement that structural power is gendered. Many institutions argue that leadership roles are

simply awarded on merit. Participants in the focus group described this light-bulb moment for those who attended the gender equity session. Attendees were asked to leave their chairs and form an imaginary line that represented the spectrum of efforts being made by their organisation to train for leadership roles. Questions were asked about the ways men and women were trained for leadership. The result was a powerful visual representation of the 'men in uniform' clustered at the bottom end of the line which represented poor effort being made toward training both men and women for leadership roles in their organisation. It became obvious to them that their organisation was only training men for leadership roles. This powerful physical representation 'joined the dots, without preaching' so that attendees could literally see the problem.

Along with these active learning strategies, the training then gave people an opportunity to reflect on what efforts they could make for change in their sphere of influence.

Encouraging people to act at the level at which they have influence and in ways they feel confident aligns with the resilience-focus of the National Strategy, which invites in a broad range of stakeholders and promotes learning and improving on disaster practices in a continuous process of planning, response and recovery.

4. Reaching people with the power to influence change

One of the consequences of the collaborative approach the project team took to developing the training was a shared knowledge, shared goals and shared values. When it came to recruiting the right people to participate in the training the advantages of this approach became evident in an interesting way.

How to: reach the right people

The high attendance rates at the sessions and the participation of significant numbers of middle management is a notable achievement. One team member managed the recruitment and the venue for the training. A decision was taken by the team to emulate the Champions of Change model (explained in the context section above) and reach out to middle management to participate in the training. Likely services were identified through existing networks and the team member cold-called them to encourage participation. The recruiter was able to use her in-depth knowledge of the issues and broad understanding of the training content to 'sell' the training to potential participants. This involved time-consuming telephone conversations. This recruitment strategy would not have worked in a different staffing system – where, for example, recruitment was treated as a low administration-level task done by someone without the in-depth knowledge of the issues.

The team also identified that there needed to be a mix of people in the room, described as 'people who didn't fit the norm: community members, women in policy, people in community development roles and junior staff'. This focus was described as 'keeping it real'

and 'making it real', ensuring that the stories from outside the experience of disaster management institutions – stories from the community perspective - were included.

The recruitment strategy was seen by the group as vitally important to achieving the objectives of the training. Providing the education was one step in the process, tapping enough of the right people with the power to influence their institution was crucial to achieving the second element – capacity building.

5. Reflection on *Lessons in Disaster*

The consensus among the group was that the Family Violence training and the training on Men and Disaster were the most successful. The sessions were attended well and the content aligned with the group and the environment in a way that the group felt translated the content well for the audience.

The Lancefield Fires affected attendance at the Gender and Equity session, and the group felt that the content in that session was and is more challenging for the attendees (some were last minute "stand-ins" for those unable to attend).

The LGBTI session was, in general, attended by junior representatives of organisations, which one member of the group felt represented a perceived lack of importance placed on this session by the organisations who registered attendees.

Summarising, the group felt that considering the time pressures and the nature of the content, the perceived success of the sessions was largely due to the recruitment strategy and the high skill level of the facilitators. The preference of the group was for a face-to-face delivery style because of the nature of the content, however, recognising that not everyone can get to an in-person session, the group felt there was room for the development online training resources.

Conclusion

The themes that emerged from the focus group suggest a deep understanding of the challenges and opportunities for training in *Lessons in Disaster*.

- The group assertion that this training is necessary is supported by the national and international literature that identifies a gap in knowledge and practice.
- The challenges of the content were considered to be its potentially confronting nature and the deeper challenges of gender equity in shifting disaster management practice. This assumption is reflected in the national and international literature discussed in the context section. Participant feedback will help to gauge the accuracy of this assumption.
- Practical efforts were made to run the training at convenient times and locations. It is clear that efforts to ensure audience segmentation were undertaken in recruitment to ensure capacity building for policy change. Measuring the success of this approach is difficult. Feedback from participants is one indicator. However, the institutional

change required to address inclusion and gender equity will unfold over time and will involve shifting closely-held beliefs about men's and women's roles. It is too early to claim success as a result of the training yet.

- Assumptions that underpin the training design come largely from women's health and gender equity models.
- Innovation was introduced to 'keep it real' for disaster management staff, translating the models for action with narratives and personal accounts. This method drew on a strengths-based, respectful approach that gave participants the opportunity to 'join the dots' for themselves. Participant feedback will help gauge the success of this method of translating knowledge between fields.
- In some places the models used to encourage action for change among participants in the training align with the National Strategy. However, it seems clear from the focus group that these models sometimes do not align with the culture of disaster management on the ground.

The strong sense from the group, which is supported by models of change explored in the context section, was that this training is not a silver-bullet solution, but rather part of an ongoing practice to address inclusion and gender equity issues in disaster management. The group reported that the sessions achieved the objectives of the training program, by providing education and recruiting the right people to build capacity for the policy shift to include men and women's experiences of disaster. When matched against the evidence-base of health models and models for change explored in the context section, this is borne out in the short term. Medium and long-term outcomes unfold over a longer time frame.

FINDINGS FROM DESKTOP REVIEW

As previously noted, the session designers and workshop facilitators provided the researchers with comprehensive training documents which demonstrated evidence of extensive consultation. The pilot program goals and objectives were clearly based on observed need and within the contextual framework previously outlined. A fourth session resulted from media attention relating to the need for a discussion around LGBTI issues in Disaster. An external expert provided a LGBTI session in consultation with the project managers utilising their own intellectual property. The comprehensive nature of the training documentation not only facilitated the review and analysis by the evaluation team but also revealed how the session designers developed and refined each session prior to delivery. The documents also enabled the evaluation team to confirm that the project managers used participant feedback to inform modification for the ongoing online training packages which are now available online.

The evaluation team was impressed with the transparency of the project managers and the thorough internal evaluation undertaken for the four sessions. The project managers listened to the feedback from the participants as they modified and repackaged the sessions for ongoing use.

The evaluation team can confirm that the project partners have made available these repackaged training programs on the GAD Pod website.

The project documentation provides extensive, quality participant handouts and associated resources. Each of the four sessions was conducted in small group format incorporating short sequence lectures, interactive discussions and group tasks such as quizzes, small group cases studies and role play. Participant resources included session notes, PowerPoint presentations and guidelines for the interactive activities. The evaluation team was impressed with the quality of these resources and the level of interactivity within each of the sessions.

5 GENERAL DISCUSSION

SUMMARY

The overarching aims of the Lessons in Disaster process evaluation were to:

1. Evaluate the delivery processes and the implementation of the sessions, with a view to refining these processes as required, and gaining a better understanding of relevant issues for possible future session implementation.
2. Assess the level of engagement of emergency managers to participate in this type of session

In summary, the MUDRI evaluation team believes that the *Lessons in Disaster* Project achieved its aims and objectives with excellent and positive feedback from survey participants and focus group members. Our desktop review of the project documents, including the initial feedback following each session, supports these observations. Of particular note was the evidence demonstrating that the project managers modified and repackaged each session as a result of their own evaluation which led to an improved product for future use.

The short-term outcomes from the project as judged by how the participants made use of the information and experiences gained from their participation in the project demonstrate a greater awareness of the session content and encouraging actual change in behaviour as a consequence of their participation. However, this reassuring trend requires further investigation.

POTENTIAL REFINEMENTS TO THE SESSION

As noted above, the project managers refined each session based on their internal evaluation. The evaluation team are not content experts on the project theme, however we believe the suggested refinements appear informed by the evidence they obtained from course participants and framed in the context of the project which is soundly based on their literature review and professional experience.

LIMITATIONS OF THE EVALUATION

There were several limitations relating to the process evaluation, and these must be considered when interpreting the results:

- No evaluation of the impact of project was undertaken by the evaluation team as there was no pre testing of knowledge to determine the baseline at the start of pilot sessions.

- The ultimate impact of the project sits outside the scope of this evaluation. The impacts will be unknown for some time as participants continue in their professional roles and, we hope gradually, adopt their learnings and increased awareness.

- A limitation of all process evaluations is that they are limited in their capacity to provide evidence on outcomes and impact.

FURTHER STUDIES

The *Lessons in Disaster* project exemplifies a well-conducted project which would benefit from continued support with additional research into the medium to long-term impacts of the program.

CONCLUSIONS

Overall, the Lessons in Disaster program achieved its aims and objectives with survey participants from all four groups reporting they accomplished a greater awareness of the issues and a better set of skills to deal with concerns as they arise, either at work, at home or working as a volunteer. Indeed, participants conveyed almost no negative feedback. Significantly, 75% of survey participants would be interested in follow-up for themselves and 85% would be interested in follow-up for their organisation.

While participants reported excellent feedback, the evaluation team was unable to evaluate the impact of the project as there was no pre-testing of knowledge to determine the baseline at the start of pilot sessions. That said, the diversity and seniority of emergency management personnel represented in the program signifies a necessary strength as they are better placed organisationally to initiate change. Encouragingly evidence from survey participants indicates they implemented a range of changes within their organisations following their participation in the program.

Determining what subsequent benefits each organisation might gain from staff participating in the program would be the subject of another evaluation. Nonetheless, the evaluation team reflected on the predominantly positive comments from all participants and believe little steps lead the way, with staff gradually growing their awareness about gender and disaster. A fruitful outcome would be the capacity for organisational policy to include gender equity, however such initiatives will evolve slowly and require the gradual shifting of closely-held beliefs about the roles of men and women in emergency service organisations.

The key informants about development, delivery and reflection on the training program acknowledged that the challenges of the content could be quite confronting, along with the deeper challenges of gender equity in shifting disaster management practice, which reflects broader international trends.

6 REFERENCES

AFP Commissioner's Speech, Commissioner of Australian Federal Police, *Building Capabilities for Tomorrow*, speech delivered Feb 2016, viewed at https://www.afp.gov.au/news-media/national-speeches/australian-strategic-policy-institute-building-capabilities-tomorrow

AHRC, (2014), *Male champions of change: Progress Report*, viewed on 29 June 2016 at: https://www.humanrights.gov.au/our-work/sex-discrimination/publications/male-champions-change-progress-report-2014

Australian Institute of Family Studies (2012), Natural disaster and community resilience framework, viewed on 29 June 2016 at: https://aifs.gov.au/cfca/publications/natural-disasters-and-community-resilience-framework/introduction

Babbie, E., (2016) *The Practice of Social Research*, 14th Ed, Cengage Learning, Boston USA

Cox, P. (2012), *Violence against women in Australia: Additional analysis of the Australian Bureau of Statistics' Personal Safety Survey, 2012: Key findings and future directions*, Sydney, Australia National Research Organisation on Women's Safety.

Dominey-Howes, D., Gorman-Murray, A., & McKinnon, S. (2013). Queering disasters: on the need to account for LGBTI experiences in natural disaster contexts. 21, 7, 905-918.

Enarson, E. (2012) *Women confronting natural disaster: From vulnerability to resilience,* Boulder, Colarado, Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.

Gorman-Murray, A., McKinnon, S., & Dominey-Howes, D. (2014) 'Queer Domicide: LGBT displacement and home loss in natural disaster impact, response and recovery', *Home Cultures*, 11(2), 237-262.

Heise, L. (1998) 'Violence against women: An integrated, ecological framework,' *Violence Against Women*, 4:262–490.

Krolik, M. (2013) 'Exploring a rights-based approach to disaster management', *Australian Journal of Emergency Management*, 28(4), 44-48.

McFarlane, A. (2005). Psychiatric morbidity following disasters: Epidemiology, risk and protective factors. In J. J. López-Ibor, G. G. Christodolou, M. M. Maj, N. N. Sartorious & A. Okasha (Eds.), *Disasters and mental health* (pp. 37–63). West Sussex: Wiley

Our Watch, (2015) *Change the Story: A shared framework for the primary prevention of violence against women and their children in Australia*, Melbourne, Viewed June 28 2016 at https://www.ourwatch.org.au/getmedia/0aa0109b-6b03-43f2-85fe-a9f5ec92ae4e/Change-the-story-framework-prevent-violence-women-children-AA-new.pdf.aspx

Parkinson, D. (2012). *The Way He Tells It - Vol. 1 Relationships After Black Saturday*, Wangaratta: Women's Health Goulburn North East.

Parkinson, D. (2015) *Women's experience of violence in the aftermath of the Black Saturday bushfires.* A Thesis Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Clayton: School of Social Sciences, Faculty of Arts, Monash University.

Scheirer, M., ed. (1994) *Designing and using process evaluation*. Handbook of practical session evaluation.

Sex Discrimination Commissioner, (2013) *Audit Report: Review into the Treatment of Women at the Australian Defence Force Academy,* Sydney, Australian Human Rights Commission.

Steckler, A. & L. Linnan, (2002) *Evaluation for public health interventions and research*. San Fransisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

UN Women, 2016, *Typologies on Training for Gender Equity,* Santo Domingo Training Centre, UN Women Training Centre: viewed on June 29 at:
http://www2.unwomen.org/~/media/headquarters/attachments/sections/library/publications/2016/typology-on-training-for-gender-equality-en.pdf?v=1&d=20160503T200520

VicHealth, (2007) *Preventing violence before it occurs: A framework and background paper to guide the primary prevention of violence against women in Victoria*, Melbourne, VicHealth.

Zara, C., & Parkinson, D. (2013) Men on Black Saturday: Risks and Opportunities for Change, Women's Health Goulburn North East.

7   FRAMEWORK & STRATEGY DOCUMENTS

HFA2, Asia-Pacific Input Document for the Post-2015 Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction Risk sensitive development as the cornerstone of resilience and sustainability
Viewed on 28 June 2016 at: https://www.unisdr.org/we/inform/publications/38055

National Strategy for Disaster Resilience (NSDR): Building our nations resilience to disaster
Viewed on 28 June at: http://www.coag.gov.au/node/81

The National Plan to Reduce Violence against Women and their Children (2012-22)
Viewed on 28 June 2016 at
https://www.dss.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/08_2014/national_plan1.pdf

United Nations Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030
Viewed on 28 June 2016 at: http://www.unisdr.org/we/coordinate/sendai-framework

United Nations Hyogo Framework For Action 2005-2015
Viewed on 28 June 2016 at: https://www.unisdr.org/we/coordinate/hfa

8 APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1 ADVISORY GROUP MEMBERSHIP

Chair – Professor Frank Archer	(MIRI – now MUARC)
Andrew Wilson- Annan	(Consultant)
Andrew Wilson	(EMV)
Mark Somers	(SES)
Steve Fontana	(VicPol)
Euan Ferguson	(CFA)
And later Joe Buffone	(CFA)
Professor Bob Pease	University of Tasmania)
Daryl Taylor	(Community)
Steve O'Malley	(MFB)
Helen Riseborough	(WHIN)
Deb Parkinson	(WHGNE/WHIN)
Judy Jeffrey	(Consultant/WHGNE)

MONASH University

SURVEY QUESTIONS FOR PHONE INTERVIEW

Evaluation of: "Lessons in Disaster (LID): Educating for resilience through men's and women's experience of disaster" project.

Evaluation of Lessons in Disaster Sessions held in late 2015

Group __: Training session participants

Chief Investigator: Dr Caroline Spencer

Monash University Disaster Resilience Initiative

Phone: + 61 3 9905 4397

Email: caroline.spencer@monash.edu

Co - investigators: Dr Carlyn Muir,
Ms Naomi Bailey, Mr Dudley McArdle,
Dr Saadia Majeed

Monash University Human Research Ethics Committee for a Low Risk Research Project: No CF16/2150 - 2016001051

Welcome

Introduction: My name is _____ and I am a co-investigator for this project.

Can I confirm with you that you have read the explanatory statement, that you give your consent to participate in this interview and you have returned the signed copy of your Consent Form?

If at any stage you wish to terminate the interview, please let me know.

Would it be ok to commence the interview now?

1   Which session(s) did you attend?

	✓
Gender Equity in Disaster	
Identifying Family Violence after Natural Disaster	
Men in Disaster	
Living LGBTI	

2   How did you hear about the session?

	✓
Manager	
WHIN/WHGNE	
EMV or associated agency	
Word of mouth	
Other	

3   Why did you choose to participate in the session?

	✓
Interest in topic	
Manager recommended my participation	
Colleagues were attending	
Other	

4   Did you find the session resources accessible?

Very accessible	Accessible	OK	Inaccessible	Very inaccessible

5   Did you find session content useful?

Very useful	Useful	OK	Unuseful	Very Unuseful

Why was it useful?

List top 3 reasons
1
2
3

Why was it not useful?

List top 3 reasons
1
2
3

6   Was anything missing from the session?

	✓
Yes	
No	

If yes, what was missing?

7 Please comment on the convenience of the following?

	Convenient	Inconvenient	Alternative
Time			
Location			
Facilities			

8 How well did the facilitator communicate course material?

Very well	Well	OK	Badly	Very badly

9 How well did the facilitator communicate with course participants?

Very well	Well	OK	Badly	Very badly

10 Would you have preferred a different format for the sessions (e.g. ½ day/full day/more or less interactivity)?

	✓
½ day	
Full day	
Two 3 hour sessions separated by a couple of weeks	
More activity	
Just right	
Less activity	

Why would you have preferred a different format?

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                     │
│                                                     │
│                                                     │
│                                                     │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

11   Have you used material from your participation in the session you attended to implement any changes in your workplace or practice in the months since attending?

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                     │
│                                                     │
│                                                     │
│                                                     │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

12 Would you be interested in any follow-up?

	YES	NO
For yourself		
For your organisation		

13 Do you have anything you would like to add?

```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                                                     │
│                                                     │
│                                                     │
│                                                     │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

Thank you for your time today.

Do you have any questions?

Are you happy for me to come back to you if I need further clarification?

APPENDIX 3 FOCUS GROUP THEME LIST

MONASH University

INITIAL THEME LIST FOR FOCUS GROUPS

Evaluation of: "Lessons in Disaster (LID): Educating for resilience through men's and women's experience of disaster" project.

Evaluation of Lessons in Disaster Sessions held in late 2015

Group __: Curriculum developers and/or session facilitators

Chief Investigator: Dr Caroline Spencer

Monash University Disaster Resilience Initiative

Phone: + 61 3 9905 4397

Email: caroline.spencer@monash.edu

Monash University Human Research Ethics Committee for a Low Risk Research Project: No CF16/2150 - 2016001051

Co - investigators: Dr Carlyn Muir, Ms Naomi Bailey Mr Dudley McArdle, Dr Saadia Majeed

Welcome

Introduction: My name is _____ and I am a co-investigator for this project.

Introduction of Focus group attendees. Check that participants can hear each other clearly and clarify any procedures for the smooth conduct of the focus group.

Can I confirm with you that you have read the explanatory statement, that you give your consent to participate in this focus group and that the focus group be audio-recorded, and you have returned your signed copy of the Consent Form?

If at any stage you wish to terminate the Focus Group please let me know.

Would it be ok to commence the Focus Group now?

Background: The objective of the focus group is to illicit information from five key informants about the development, delivery and reflection on the training program *Lessons in Disaster*. The information will provide data for the purpose of evaluating the training and cross-checking the feedback from participants. The focus group method allows for:

- Reflection on the translation of knowledge from the women's health field and the emergency management field against project objectives

- Identification attitudes and beliefs that drive program design including audience segmentation (the characteristics of audience members including their influence over practice in their organisation/community)
- Identification of delivery methods that worked and methods that could be improved
- Capture of insights for future development in this field.

The focus group will cover three phases in the project:

- Curriculum Development: audience and assumptions
- Curriculum Delivery: the training sessions, and
- Reflection on the process and training

Initial statement: Why a Focus Group?

These training programs are the first of their kind in Australia and, as such, present unique challenges. Pre-existing research or results from (un)like evaluations fall short of offering clear information on 'what works' when it comes to training in this field. In this context, the focus group approach seeks to both generate evaluative data and capture challenges and innovations. A process evaluation model acknowledges that training programs such as this are part of a broader ecosystem of responses, measures, policy settings and cultural changes. Outcomes manifest over time, and require a complex web of activity in order to generate impacts (see Our Watch Theory of Change 2014). This is the case in general and can be extended to the field of emergency management and an understanding of resilience as it is experienced differently by men and women.

This training program occurs as an exchange between two predominantly parallel service delivery systems: those of emergency management and women's health. The focus group provides valuable evaluative information in the form of contextualising data, data on the interpretation and implementation of objectives, audience identification and segmentation (that is distinguishing the different characteristics of audience members) and strategic approaches to addressing barriers to uptake of a broad multi-dimensional understanding of resilience. The findings from this focus group build on the previous section 2.1 to generate an understanding of the contextual challenges that contribute to the landscape in which the feedback from participants' surveys can be analysed and interpreted.

The focus group will address three phases of training delivery. The three phases delineate between planning, delivery and reflection. Planning should encompass 'a research and development phase in which training solutions are generated and audience needs identified'. The delivery is 'an outcomes phase in which those solutions are tested'. And the learning phase is 'a reflective consolidation phase in which what went well and what went badly can be incorporated into practice'. The role of these phases in the evaluation of *Lessons in Disaster* is consequently three fold: to reflect on the translation of knowledge from the women's health field to the emergency management field against project objectives; to identify how well the training met the needs of the identified audience and objectives of the project; and to capture insights for future development in this field – a key strength in process evaluation technique.

Initial thematic questions

The Focus Group will introduce questions set within a time box for each topic. The drill down questions function as prompts to ensure the facilitator covers off on as much as possible in the time

given to each topic. The drill down questions have been prioritised. It is expected that in answering the question participants will cover at least some of these topics, which is to say the facilitator won't need to ask them all. Lucky, because there is simply not enough time. The top line questions have been circulated to the participants before the focus group so that the time we spend together will be most profitable.

Curriculum Development [20 mins]

The objective of the training was 'to provide the education—and build the capacity—to incorporate men's and women's experiences of resilience into emergency management policy, planning, decision-making and service delivery'.

1. What assumptions underpinned the curriculum you developed for Lessons in Disaster? [10mins]

Drill down questions

Research & theory?

Effective training techniques?

Public Health approach to men's and women's resilience?

Audience (which groups were included/excluded?)

Practical (funding)

Were you comfortable with the program's objectives?

2. How did you anticipate the needs of the audience? [10 mins]

Drill down questions

What was your understanding of the knowledge-base within EM services sector and where did this understanding come from?

Curriculum Delivery [20 mins]

3. How well do you think the training session got to the heart of providing 'the education—and build[ing] the capacity—to incorporate men's and women's resilience experiences into emergency management policy'? [20 mins]

Drill down questions

Were there any practical problems?

Did you make any changes to the program delivery [approach rather than content] over the process of the training modules?

Describe an example of training content/technique that really cut through.

 - An example of training content/technique that didn't work as well as expected.

Describe an interaction that gave you a sense of the impacts or the challenges of working in this space.

How closely did delivery match the way you thought the curriculum would run?

Reflection on process and training sessions [20 mins]

Describe some of the challenges of delivering these training sessions at the intersection of Emergency Management and Women's Health.

Drill down

Impacts in the room: challenges/successes (light bulb moments) [individual change]

Describe some of those who seemed to 'get it'/understand what you were talking about? [Segmentation of audience]

What other projects do you rely on to support the participants to incorporate gender into EM? [Organisational change/cultural change]

Was face-to-face and effective delivery mechanism for this information? Do you think other platforms/mechanisms would work?

What worked/did not work about delivering the LGBTI work in this suite of training programs?

Did you get a sense as to whether participants were likely to implement their learnings after the session?

Amendments for the future – barriers and solutions?

Thank you for your time today.

Do you have any questions?

Are you happy for me to come back to you if I need further clarification?