
Cultural Responsiveness Organizational Self-Assessment Summary Report

Prepared: Month Year

Prepared for:
Organization

CR Cultural
Responsiveness
OS Organizational
Self Assessment

Acknowledgements

This Summary Report Template and companion pieces, the Cultural Responsiveness Organizational Self Assessment Facilitation Guide (CROS Toolkit) was produced with the generous support of the Blue Shield Foundation of California, Blue Shield Against Violence.

jdPartnerships, in collaboration with RDP Consulting, led the development of this tool. We would like to express our deep appreciation to the many individuals and organizations, which lent their expertise and insights during the process of designing the CROS Toolkit. Their generosity of spirit and thoughtfulness advanced our own thinking and contributed greatly to this work.

In particular, we would like to acknowledge the following organizations and individuals who played important roles throughout the design and piloting of the CROS Toolkit. We'd also like to offer special thanks to Blue Shield Against Violence Senior Program Officer, Lucia Corral Peña, for her consistent encouragement and vision in support of this work.

CROS Design and Piloting

- Ana Perez, Sujata Warrier, and Oliver Williams, critical review and feedback on CROS dimensions and design.
- Mujeres Unidas y Activas – San Francisco, CA, pilot site
- Asian Women's Shelter – San Francisco, CA, pilot site
- Inter-Tribal Council of California, Inc. – Sacramento, CA, pilot site
- Sandy Juarez Carretero, Spanish translation
- SPR Social Policy Research Associates - Oakland, CA, CROS reliability and validity testing

CROS Summary Report and Facilitation Guide

- W.O.M.A.N. Inc. (Women Organized to Make Abuse Nonexistent) – San Francisco, CA, pilot site
- The Center for Violence Free Relationships – Placerville, CA, pilot site
- The Coalition for Family Harmony – Oxnard, CA, pilot site
- Met-o-graphy – San Francisco, CA, report design and formatting.

Table of Contents

ABOUT THE CROS	4
The Cultural Responsiveness Organizational Self-Assessment and Its Purpose.....	4
Working Definition and Assumptions Underlying Our Conceptual Framework for Cultural Responsiveness	4
Who From Our Organization Provided Input?	5
What Do The Average Ratings Represent?.....	6
CROS SUMMARY SNAPSHOT	7
DETAILED FINDINGS:	
ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE & COMMITMENT	9
LEADERSHIP COMMITMENT.....	12
PERSONNEL PRACTICES	14
CRITICAL ANALYSIS.....	16
OUTCOMES/IMPACT.....	18
COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT.....	20
COMMUNITY PARTNER CAPACITY BUILDING.....	22
STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT.....	23
EVALUATION/ONGOING LEARNING	26

Example

About the CROS

THE CULTURAL RESPONSIVENESS ORGANIZATIONAL SELF-ASSESSMENT AND ITS PURPOSE

The Cultural Responsiveness Organizational Self-Assessment (CROS) is organized into areas which when analyzed in the aggregate speak to an organization's readiness to address application of practices which increase (or maintain) its ability to provide effective services and supports and engage in action that is "culturally responsive." The end goals of increasing cultural responsiveness are to have more effective and sustainable organizations that provide DV services that reach and serve diverse community needs.

CROS explores elements common to many different definitions of cultural responsiveness. **It is not intended to fully capture or account for the full complexity, diversity, and influence of culture.** However, we believe the findings from the organizational self-assessment will:

- Deepen insights as to the way in which culturally competent practice is weaved throughout your organization.
- Provide a snapshot of your organization with regard to where it is now on a developmental continuum of cultural responsiveness for which there is no end-point.
- Help your organization understand, with regard to cultural responsiveness, its strengths as well as identify areas that may benefit from attention and improvement.

WORKING DEFINITION AND ASSUMPTIONS UNDERLYING OUR CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR CULTURAL RESPONSIVENESS

Our Working Definition

Cultural responsiveness is more than "expressing sensitivity or concern" for individuals from all cultures (cultural sensitivity). A culturally responsive organization is one designed to effectively meet the needs of individuals from diverse cultural backgrounds and experiences. It involves understanding the societal oppressions faced by various groups of people, but also respecting the strengths and assets inherent in different communities. This understanding must then be reflected in program services, personnel, philosophies and policies.

We acknowledge that there are multiple definitions of cultural responsiveness as well as ongoing consideration of whether or not "cultural responsiveness" is appropriate phrasing for the complexity of underlying knowledge, philosophies, policies, and practices. With that in mind, we offer a working definition

Our Assumptions

Three underlying assumptions inform the structure and purpose of this tool:

1. Achieving "cultural responsiveness" is a developmental process at both the individual and organizational levels;
2. With appropriate support, individuals and organizations can enhance their cultural awareness, knowledge and skills over time, and
3. There is a wealth of cultural strengths that exist within organizations and/or networks of professionals; the capacity building work is to lift up, increase and strengthen those practices.

Additionally, we recognize that using words like "cultural diversity" touch upon racism, sexism and classism and that "culture" is not neutral. Different cultural groups are ascribed differential status and power.

WHO FROM OUR ORGANIZATION PROVIDED INPUT?

The CROS does not include identifying information for individual respondents. This is intentional as the findings are to help an organization understand how it, as a whole, sees itself. The charts below provide information about whom from your organization completing the assessment described by role and tenure. This is useful in understanding the findings because different roles likely have different types of information, depth and breadth of context and may in fact have different types of relationships. With regard to tenure, length of stay or relationship to the organization influences perspectives. While organizations differ in size, age, and staffing, the overall composition of respondents (and thus the perspectives that are included/missing) can be important to keep in mind when reviewing this summary.

TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS		#
RESPONDENT TENURE		% OF RESPONDENTS
Less than 1 year		%
1 to 3 years		%
4 to 6 years		%
7 to 9 years		%
10 to 20 years		%
20 or more years		%
<i>Missing</i>		%
RESPONDENT ROLE		% OF RESPONDENTS
Staff		%
Board		%
Volunteer		%
Other		%
<i>Missing</i>		%

WHAT DO THE AVERAGE RATINGS REPRESENT?

The continuum used to summarize and organize findings parallels the response options used in the CROS, positioning average ratings along a continuum from those *practices, policies, and attributes, experiences, or outcomes* that are not yet in place to those that are sustaining.

For example: questions about organizational policies used response options depicted in the top row “Policy” of the continuum. Questions about stakeholder involvement used response options in the second row “Practice,” and questions about client and staff outcomes reflect those in third row “Attribute, Experience, or Outcome.”

The continuum’s five color-coded five categories are used throughout this summary.

	CONTINUUM OF CULTURAL RESPONSIVE DEVELOPMENT				
	Not yet in place (1.0-1.9)	Emerging (2.0-2.9)	Gaining Traction (3.0-3.9)	Well-Established (4.0 -4.5)	Sustaining (4.6 – 5.0)
POLICY	Policy does not exist.	Policy is written but followed infrequently	Policy is generally followed but is not written.	Policy is written and generally followed.	Policy is written and followed with little exception.
PRACTICE	Practice is not in place	Practice happens MUCH LESS OFTEN than there is opportunity to do so.	Practice happens LESS OFTEN than there is opportunity to do so.	Practice happens MOST OF THE TIME there is opportunity to do so.	Practice happens EVERYTIME or ALMOST EVERYTIME there is opportunity to do so.
ATTRIBUTE, EXPERIENCE, or OUTCOME	Attribute, Experience, or Outcome is TRUE FOR NONE of the target population	Attribute, Experience, or Outcome is TRUE FOR LESS THAN HALF of target population	Attribute, Experience, or Outcome is TRUE FOR ABOUT ONE HALF of target population	Attribute, Experience, or Outcome is TRUE FOR MORE THAN HALF of target population	Attribute, Experience, or Outcome is TRUE FOR ALL OR ALMOST ALL of target population

CROS SUMMARY SNAPSHOT

ORGANIZATION: POLICIES & PROCEDURES	##	CRITICAL ANALYSIS	##
<p>Written policies exist and associated practices are implemented that: 1) support building and developing a linguistically and culturally competent staff, 2) ensure processes for soliciting, reviewing, and acting upon client feedback, 3) prevent discrimination and harassment, and 4) affirm client cultural backgrounds.</p>		<p>Critical analysis recognizes that cultural/culture is not neutral and that different cultural groups are ascribed differential status and power. With this in mind an organization routinely engages in critical analysis to better understand those things that contribute to the existence, impact, and effective prevention and treatment of domestic / intimate partner violence.</p>	
ORGANIZATION: INTEREST & SUPPORT	##	CLIENT OUTCOMES	##
<p>There is interest in and support of cultural diversity across the organization.</p>		<p>Clients' experiences with the organization reflect its cultural and linguistic responsiveness.</p>	
ORGANIZATION: COMMUNITY REPRESENTATIVENESS	##	STAFF OUTCOMES	##
<p>Acknowledging that culture is not static and people belong to multiple cultural groups, race, ethnicity, gender, sexuality, age, nationality, religion, and other socially-defined characteristics of your client / partners are represented within organization.</p>		<p>Staff's personal experiences with the organization reflect its cultural and linguistic responsiveness.</p>	
LEADERSHIP ACTIVE COMMITMENT	##	ENGAGEMENT OF COMMUNITY RESOURCES	##
<p>Organizational leaders have a clear vision of what cultural responsiveness means. They hold it as a priority and actively demonstrate support for creating a culturally competent environment.</p>		<p>Organization engages individuals/groups/communities as often as there is opportunity to do so, enhancing outreach, understanding, and access to resources to best meet the needs of clients/partners.</p>	
LEADERSHIP OPPORTUNITY	##	ENGAGEMENT OF SYSTEMS	##
<p>Persons of diverse backgrounds are encouraged and supported to pursue leadership opportunities.</p>		<p>Organization engages systems as often as there is opportunity to do so, enhancing outreach, understanding, and access to resources to best meet the needs of clients/partners.</p>	
STAFF PRACTICE	##	COMMUNITY PARTNER CAPACITY BUILDING	##
<p>Staff practices reflect capacities associated with cultural and linguistic responsiveness.</p>		<p>Organization actively engages with other organizations serving to strengthen collective capacity to effectively serve clients/partners.</p>	
MANAGEMENT PRACTICE	##	STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT	##
<p>Management practices reflect capacities associated with cultural and linguistic responsiveness.</p>		<p>Organization actively and systematically engages stakeholders so that critical processes include diverse perspectives and experiences.</p>	
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT	##	EVALUATIVE PRACTICE / ONGOING LEARNING	##
<p>Staff and Volunteers at all levels are offered training and professional development in cultural responsiveness.</p>		<p>Organization actively and systematically engages in evaluation to understand impact and improve practices.</p>	

Not yet in place (1.0–1.9)	Emerging (2.0–2.9)	Gaining Traction (3.0–3.9)	Well---Established (4.0–4.9)	Sustaining (5.0–5.9)
-------------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------

Detailed Findings for CROS Domains