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A Brief History of French Canada

• French and British colonies settled in North America in the 16th century.
• At the end of the Seven Year War, France ceded its colony (called Nouvelle-France) to Great Britain, but Francophones continued to reside in Canada.
• 1969: the federal government declared French and English as the two official languages of Canada.
• 1982: the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms protects the rights of members of both linguistic communities.
Francophones in Canada Today

• More than 6,600,000 Francophones live inside the province of Québec, as a linguistic majority. (Statistics Canada, 2013)

• More than 1,000,000 Francophones live outside the province of Québec (Statistics Canada, 2013). They are considered an Official Language Minority Community, as are the Anglophones living in the province of Québec.
Francophone Groups in Canada

Mother Tongue Groups in Canada

http://francopresse.ca/index.cfm?voir=article&id=66430
Language and Health

• Language has been shown to be a social determinant of health (Bouchard et al., 2013).

• There are many possible risks related to not receiving health or social services in the patient’s/client’s preferred language, including:

  - Poorer satisfaction with services received (Bowen, 2001)
  - Higher risk of hospital readmission (Drouin & Rivet, 2003)
  - Challenges with medical follow-up (Anderson et al, 2003)
Active Offer

- **Active Offer** is a proactive approach, where health care and social service professionals offer the patient/client the choice of services in both official languages before he/she needs to request it.

- The concept of Active Offer **must be taught** to actual and future professionals as they will not automatically offer the choice to patients/clients.
Research Objective

- To develop and evaluate a training program aimed at providing university professors teaching in the fields of health and social services at a bilingual university with the necessary tools to teach the concept of Active Offer in their courses.
Specific Objectives

1. **Structure** the training program content.
2. **Offer** the training program in a university context.
3. **Evaluate** the training program.
Obj. 1 Methods: Structure Training Program Content

- Based on results of Active Offer research in health and social science domains.
- Linked with an Active Offer learning tool created by a research team from University of Moncton (province of New Brunswick).
- Grounded in adult education course planning principles.
Obj. 2 Methods: Offer the Training Program

• 3 workshops (each lasting 3 hours).
• Workshops aimed to attain learning objectives in the following categories:
  • Knowledge (i.e. statistics, language laws, historical data)
  • Know-how (i.e. Active Offer course planning)
  • Attitudes (i.e. openness toward Active Offer approach and concept)
• Learning activities included group discussions, periods of self-reflection, presentations from peer-experts, case study, video, etc.)
Obj. 3 Methods: Evaluate the Training Program

A. **Evaluation of learning**
   - Pre and post evaluations of participant knowledge (questionnaires).

B. **Evaluation of satisfaction**
   - Participant evaluations of satisfaction for each workshop (questionnaires).

C. **Evaluation of the application of new knowledge**
   - Focus group with participants 6 months following training (thematic discussion and observation by team members).

D. **Evaluation of the training program**
   - Evaluation of training content, participant engagement, and instruction/facilitation (criterion-observation by team members during workshops).
Participants

• 150 University of Ottawa professors from Social Work, Psychology, Nursing, Rehabilitation Sciences, and Medicine programs were invited.

• 25 responded to the invitation, 7 could attend all 3 workshops (time commitment was identified as the most important obstacle to participation):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 professors from the School of Rehabilitation Sciences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 professors from the School of Nursing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 CNFS coordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 clinical placement coordinator (Occupational Therapy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results A: Evaluation of Learning

Pre-training questionnaire highlights:
• Participants had basic knowledge related to Active Offer.
• They did not integrate information related to Active Offer in their courses.
• They did not all agree that teaching the concept was their responsibility.

Post-training questionnaire highlights:
• Participants showed that they better understood the concept of Active Offer.
• They felt well prepared to integrate the concept into their courses.
• They all agreed that teaching Active Offer was their responsibility.
Results B: Evaluation of Satisfaction

Highlights of workshop satisfaction questionnaires:

• Participants increased their awareness of the challenge of accessing French services for the francophone linguistic minority communities.
• They expressed an increased sense of responsibility in terms of teaching Active Offer to future professionals.
• They enjoyed the opportunity to exchange with each other during group conversation and reflection times.
• They appreciated the course planning template.
• They were satisfied or very satisfied with the workshops.
Results C: Evaluation of the Application of New Knowledge

Focus group highlights:

• 4 participants presented the AO theme in courses, 1 will present AO in her upcoming summer course, 1 presented AO to colleagues

• Obstacles to integrate teaching on AO in university programs include: a need for buy-in from the dean and program directors, lack of space in the curriculums to add teaching material, the challenge of not “over-saturating” students with AO-related teaching.

• Participants felt that the training met all the objectives, however, they felt that the level of instructions did not match all of their individual needs.
Results D: Evaluation of the Training Program

**Highlights of recommendations:**

- Review the time allotted to each activity (i.e. more time for group discussions).
- Re-organize the training manual for participants (i.e. increase ease of use).
- Review the activities to be completed by participants outside of the workshops.
- Add a method to identify the learning needs of the students in their class pertaining to Active Offer.
- Add English resources so as to increase awareness of Anglophone faculty colleagues.
- Add resources to integrate the concept of Active Offer in courses relating to pediatrics and family health (current resources are adult-health specific).
- Take into account that not all participants have the same knowledge and/or learning needs related to Active Offer.
Conclusions

- According to the specific objectives, the training program was developed, delivered, and evaluated.

- Although positive results were received, the training in its current format does present with certain challenges, most importantly, the time commitment. A web-based training is therefore recommended.

- As well, a tool to identify participants’ former knowledge, know-how and attitudes vis à vis Active Offer would be beneficial as this would allow the web-based training to be tailored to the needs of the participant.
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