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Overview

- Determine current perceptions of the MRC program in Massachusetts
- Examine desired outcomes (by region) of the MRC program
- Supplement this information with existing objective data
- Complete analysis/report
- Develop regional strategic plans to take units to desired outcomes
Methodology

Online survey of regional stakeholders, including MRC unit leaders

Survey link distributed to MRC unit leaders on March 16, 2018

Survey distributed to other stakeholders (MEMA, HMCC lists) on March 16, 2018

Recipients of link encouraged to forward it to other key stakeholders

Survey closed on March 30, 2018
Respondents by Public Health Region:

- Region 1: 14%
- Region 2: 24%
- Region 3: 19%
- Region 4A: 13%
- Region 4B: 12%
- Region 4C: 3%
- Region 5: 15%

207 Respondents in Total
Respondents by Role

- CERT leader: 1.0%
- Community health center staff member: 0.5%
- EMS: 3.4%
- HMCC sponsoring organization staff member: 1.9%
- Hospital or health care organization staff member: 7.3%
- Local emergency management official: 27.7%
- Local public health: 35.9%
- Long term care staff member: 1.0%
- MEMA regional staff member: 0.5%
- MRC unit coordinator: 11.7%
- MRC unit director: 3.9%
- Other: 5.3%
Top MRC Priorities

- Community Partnerships
- Volunteer Engagement
- Responding to Emergencies
- Volunteer Training

Similar priorities for unit leaders and non-unit leaders, though differentiation in how they are ranked.
MRC Services Desired

Ability to deploy volunteers within the MRC coverage area
Seen as “extremely” important to both sets of respondents.

Providing staffing support at shelters
Unit leaders - 83% say it is “extremely” important.
Non-unit leaders - 58% of non-unit leaders rate it as “extremely” important.

Providing staffing support at flu clinics and EDS clinics
MRC unit leaders place high priority on these services.
Less true for non-unit leaders – especially for flu clinics. 68% of non-unit leaders say this service is “extremely” or “very” important, compared to 87% of unit leaders.

Setting up and managing shelters
75% of non-unit leaders said it was an “extremely” or “very” important service.
92% of unit leaders said it was an “extremely” or “very” important service.
This indicates that there needs to be education on the fact that MRC units are not tasked with this service.
In general, non-unit leaders believe the **ability of MRC units to provide desired services** is much more limited than unit leaders do.

The **ability of a unit to deploy volunteers within the unit coverage area in an emergency** is the service seen as most desired by unit leaders and non-unit leaders.

The majority of unit leaders believe that the unit either exceeds (17%) or meets (54%) this demand.

The majority of non-unit leaders, though, believe this service is either “available but limited” (40%) or not available (17%).
Barriers to Provide Services – Open-Ended Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Potential Barriers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Leaders and Non-Unit Leaders</td>
<td>• Lack of volunteers – either through recruitment, retention, or availability during an actual emergency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non –Unit Leaders</td>
<td>• Lack of integration of the MRC program with local emergency management.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential causes:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Isolation of the MRC program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Lack of awareness of what MRC units do</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Cultural barriers with town EMS/Fire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit Leaders</td>
<td>• State liability issues for volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of transportation to disaster sites during poor weather conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Desired Skill Sets for MRC Volunteers

- Administrative/Office assistance
- Community Organising/Outreach
- Cultural Competency Training
- Emergency Preparedness Training
- Grant Writing
- IT Support
- Leadership/Management
- Marketing and Communications - Design/Writing
- Media
- Medical Training
- Translation/Interpret Services
- Volunteer Coordination/Management

Unit Leaders vs. Non-Unit Leaders
Actual Skill Sets Provided

In general, non-unit leaders were unfamiliar with the actual skill sets of MRC volunteers.

In terms of skill sets that are most important to unit leaders and non-unit leaders – medical training and emergency preparedness training – most unit leaders seemed satisfied with the capacity of their volunteers to meet demand.

The skill sets that were identified with the most gaps – categorized as “available but limited” or “not available” include grant writing (94%), Translation and Interpreter Services (82%), Media (76%), IT support (80%), and Marketing and Communications (72%).
Credentialed Volunteers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of Credentialed Volunteers (BP1 Q4 Reporting)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region 1*</td>
<td>1,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 2</td>
<td>878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 3</td>
<td>1,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 4A*</td>
<td>1,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 4B*</td>
<td>1,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 4C</td>
<td>1,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region 5*</td>
<td>2,002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Region 1: Springfield MRC and Greater Westfield MRC unit’s numbers are based on Q3 reporting.
- Region 4A: 4A MRC unit’s numbers are based on Q2 reporting.
- Region 4B: 4B MRC unit’s numbers are based on Q2 reporting.
- Region 5: Bridgewater MRC unit’s numbers are based on Q3 reporting

**Capacity to Manage Additional Volunteers (N=25)**

- Definitely yes: 52%
- Probably yes: 16%
- Might or might not: 20%
- Probably not: 8%
- Definitely not: 4%
Unit leaders could select any population-group that makes up their unit to answer this question.

The total number of mentions was 69.

Based on all populations mentioned, baby-boomers were mentioned almost 32% of the time of the time, followed closely by adults aged 30-54 (30%).

Other than youth volunteers, young adults were mentioned the fewest number of times.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Region 1</th>
<th>Region 2</th>
<th>Region 3</th>
<th>Region 4A</th>
<th>Region 4B</th>
<th>Region 4C</th>
<th>Region 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portuguese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Creole</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mon-Khmer, Cambodian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Volunteer recruitment methods vary across regions

• Types of recruitment
  • Volunteer word of mouth
  • Unit website
  • Social media sites
  • Public presentations
  • Fairs/Community Events
  • Colleges/Universities
  • Other service organizations
  • Outreach to hospitals
  • Outreach to Community Health Centers
  • Outreach to Long-term care organizations
  • Outreach to emergency management personnel (police, fire, EMS)

• Example: Outreach to colleges and universities is not an important method in some regions, while it is very important in others
Volunteer Retention

**Volunteer Satisfaction**
- Some units survey their volunteers on their satisfaction levels at least annually.
- Others have no record of ever surveying volunteer satisfaction.

**Volunteer Training**
- Some units survey their volunteers on training interests at least annually.
- Others have no record of ever surveying this topic.
Among non-unit leaders, there does appear to be a clear sense of how many volunteers are needed in the region.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Estimated</th>
<th>Desired</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region 1</td>
<td>100 or fewer (70% of respondents)</td>
<td>51 – 500 (56% of respondents)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Region 2 | 100 or fewer (68% of respondents) | • 3 respondents - “50 or fewer”  
• 4 respondents - “More than 1000.”  
• 5 respondents - “Don’t Know”  
| Region 3 | 100 or fewer (67% of respondents) | • 3 respondents - “50 or fewer”  
• 2 respondents - “More than 1000.”  
• 7 respondents - “Don’t Know”  
| Region 4A | 101 – 750 (60% of respondents) | 1/3 - 51-250  
1/3 - 750 or more  
1/3 – “Don’t Know”  
| Region 4B | 50 or fewer (67% of respondents) | 51 – 250 (about half of respondents)  
| Region 4C | • 50 or fewer (1 respondent)  
• 251 -500 (1 respondent)  
• 501-750 (1 respondent) | 51-250 (over half of respondents)  
| Region 5 | 50 or fewer (67% of respondents) | • 51 – 250 (about one-quarter)  
• 251-500 (about one-quarter)  
• “Don’t Know” (a little less than one-quarter)  

Perception of “Active” Volunteers (Non-Unit Leaders)
- 55% of unit leaders are willing to deploy volunteers anywhere in the U.S.
- 30% of unit leaders are willing to deploy volunteers only within the unit jurisdiction or a sub-region of the overall jurisdiction (such as a municipality)
• Unit leaders believe over 90% of their volunteers will travel 0-10 minutes
• Unit leaders do not believe that more that 30% of their volunteers will travel over 2 hours
• Almost 20% of unit leaders believe none of their volunteers will travel more than 2 hours
• In inclement conditions, 45% of unit leaders believe *none* of their volunteers will travel two or more hours.

• Over 40% of unit leaders believe *none* of their volunteers will travel 1-2 hours in inclement weather.

• No unit leaders believe that more than 30% of their volunteers will travel 1-2 hours in inclement conditions.
Increased communication between unit leaders and non-unit leaders in each region would be beneficial.

Unit leaders could understand more clearly expectations placed on MRC units in their region by other stakeholders.

Other stakeholders could have a more accurate view of MRC capacity.

Unit Coordination with Non-MRC Stakeholders
Additional Information in Regional Reports

- Overview - # Units; Communities Covered; Population Covered
- Credentialed Volunteers in Region (by Unit)
- Mission and Purpose of Units
- How Units Set Priorities
- Barriers to Providing Services
- Recruitment Methods
- MOUs
Small Group Discussion – Key Topic Areas

- Volunteer Recruitment
- Volunteer Retention
- Deployment/Response Techniques
- Relationships with External MRC Stakeholders
MRC Priorities (Unit Leaders)

- Establish Community Partnerships (N=28)
- Expand Funding Resources (N=27)
- Improve Risk Management Strategies (N=27)
- Improve Volunteer Retention Strategies (N=27)
- Increase Volunteer Engagement (N=27)
- Plan and Conduct Drills (N=28)
- Provide a Response, as needed, to Emergencies (N=28)
- Update Unit Administration Policies and Procedures (N=27)
- Update Volunteer Utilization Policies and Procedures (N=27)
- Volunteer Recruitment (N=27)
- Volunteer Training (N=27)

Extremely Important | Very important | Moderately Important | Slightly Important | Not At All Important
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Not At All Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish Community Partnerships (N=133)</td>
<td>43.61</td>
<td>37.59</td>
<td>21.26</td>
<td>16.54</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expand Funding Resources (N=127)</td>
<td>38.58</td>
<td>33.86</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>21.26</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Risk Management Strategies (N=125)</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>18.46</td>
<td>2.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve Volunteer Retention Strategies (N=130)</td>
<td>46.92</td>
<td>30.77</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>14.18</td>
<td>3.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Volunteer Engagement (N=130)</td>
<td>51.65</td>
<td>32.31</td>
<td>13.08</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan and Conduct Drills (N=134)</td>
<td>41.04</td>
<td>41.04</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>14.17</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide a Response, as needed, to Emergencies (N=134)</td>
<td>58.21</td>
<td>33.86</td>
<td>14.17</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Unit Administration Policies and Procedures (N=127)</td>
<td>22.05</td>
<td>26.77</td>
<td>32.28</td>
<td>11.81</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Volunteer Utilization Policies and Procedures (N=127)</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>29.92</td>
<td>32.09</td>
<td>13.43</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Recruitment (N=134)</td>
<td>49.25</td>
<td>32.09</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Training (N=133)</td>
<td>48.12</td>
<td>36.09</td>
<td>11.28</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MRC Services (Unit Leaders)
Deploy volunteers within unit coverage area in emergencies (N=117)
Deploy volunteers to parts of the region that are no in unit coverage area in emergencies (N=116)
Provide community education on public health issues generally (N=118)
Provide community education on emergency preparedness issues (N=119)
Provide staffing support at animal shelters (N=117)
Provide staffing support at EDS clinics (N=117)
Provide staffing support at flu clinics (N=117)
Provide staffing support at shelters (N=118)
Set up and manage shelters (N=116)
Set up and manage EDS clinics (N=116)
Set up and manage flu clinics (N=117)
Provide medical support at community events (N=118)
Provide community education on emergency preparedness issues (N=119)