

Facilitator's Guide

Compassionate Engagement Modules

From the
Peer Engagement and Evaluation Project



Index of Scenarios

1. Methadone Scenario 1:
 - Treating patients with dignity and respect
 - Stereotyping patients
 - Managing risks to society and patients
2. Methadone Scenario 2:
 - Treating chronic pain in opioid dependent patients
 - Physicians promoting use of methadone
 - Fully informing patients about methadone patient rights, responsibilities
 - Carry privileges
3. Methadone Scenario 3:
 - Treating concurrent disorders in patients
 - Educating patients about the risks of polysubstance use
4. Methadone Scenario 4:
 - Replacing opioid analgesics with methadone for treatment of pain
5. Shelter Scenario 1:
 - Required evidence of abstinence to access services
 - Searching clients' belongings
 - Confiscation of harm reduction supplies
6. Shelter Scenario 2:
 - Prohibiting harm reduction supplies in facilities
 - Client privacy
 - Gossiping and professionalism
7. Community Health Centre Scenario 1:
 - Recording personal information of harm reduction clients
 - Availability of supplies
8. Community Health Centre Scenario 2:
 - Forming supportive relationships with patients
 - Secondary distribution of supplies
 - Commenting on drug use
9. Community Health Centre Scenario 3:
 - Confidentiality breaches
10. Hospital Scenario 1:
 - Flagging patient charts
 - Stigmatizing language
 - Appropriate triaging
11. Hospital Scenario 2:
 - Not treating patient concerns
 - One issue per visit policy
12. Hospital Scenario 3:
 - Treatment of acute pain

Guide for Facilitators

This learning module is designed to engage peers,¹ practitioners and policy makers in dialogue to identify feasible and acceptable solutions that will reduce stigma and discrimination, and improve access to harm reduction and health care services.

It is recommended that a person who has lived experience with drug use co-facilitate the modules.

Supplies:

- Computer with PowerPoint (2010 or later)
- Projector, screen and speakers²
- Flip-chart and markers
- *Respectful Language and Stigma Regarding People Who Use Substances* hand-out

Part 1: Narrated photo-series

These learning modules can be tailored to meet the needs of the community members being engaged. Facilitators can identify what issues are most prevalent in community and are relevant to their audience, and select scenarios accordingly. Please see the attached index for a list of issues addressed in each photo-series.

Note that each scenario is based on lived experiences as represented in the paraphrased statements.

Part 2: Facilitated Discussion:

A. How did the situation unfold, and why?

Discussion Questions	Facilitator's Discussion Notes
<i>Focus on Behaviours</i>	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How did the staff member or the peer's behaviour positively or negatively affect the situation? 2. What reason might there be for each to have behaved the way they did? 3. What are some possible outcomes? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Note what was done well - Ensure discussion focuses on both Peers and service providers (avoid temptation for each to blame the other). - Question 1 asks about the situation: Focus on the immediate outcomes of behaviours that were witnessed in the scenario. - Question 3 asks about longer-term outcomes that may occur outside of the scenario. Consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Tension and mistrust between peer and service provider o Peer could avoid using the service in future o Peer might not seek other forms of assistance from the service o Peer may not refer other PWUD to the service

¹ Peer – a person whose lived experience with drug use informs their professional work

² Scenarios in PowerPoint contain audio

Facilitated discussion (cont.) How did the situation unfold, and why?

Discussion Questions	Facilitator's Discussion Notes
Focus on Service Design	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How did the way the Harm Reduction service was designed or run positively or negatively affect the situation? 2. Why might the service be designed the way it is? 3. What are some possible outcomes of the service design? 	<p>Consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Physical layout - Processes or rules - Roles and responsibilities (front-line workers, leaders and managers) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Question 1 asks about the situation: Focus on the immediate outcomes of service design in the scenario. - Question 3 asks about longer-term outcomes that may occur outside of the scenario. Consider: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Negative perceptions of the service among PWUD o Peers avoid using the service o Peer might not seek other forms of assistance from the service. o Peer may not refer other PWUD to the service
Focus on Stigma	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How might stigma have contributed to negative outcomes in these scenarios? <p>Definition: Stigma is the process of marginalizing people by alienating and devaluing them³. This is usually in response to a trait to which society attaches negative stereotypes.</p>	<p>Consider:</p> <p>Internal stigma: How PWUD put themselves down or adopt and accept negative stereotypes.</p> <p>Stigma in relationships: How PWUD are stigmatized in their personal, family or social relationships.</p> <p>Stigma in organizations: How organizations (institutions, governments, or society) are structured and run contribute to stigma.</p> <p>Stigma in communications and language: How words and terminology stigmatize PWUD⁴.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use People First language - Avoid negative stereotypes or pejorative terminology (E.g. "Junkie")

- B. Designing a Better Outcome: If everything was done in an ideal way, what would you expect to see?
- From the service provider
 - From the person who uses drugs?
 - In the way the service was run

³ Livingston J, Milne T, Fang M, Amari E. The effectiveness of interventions for reducing stigma related to substance use disorders: a systematic review. *Addiction*. 2011;107(1):39-50.

⁴ Consult the [Respectful Language and Stigma](#) hand-out available from the [Toward the Heart](#) Website.

Part 3: Theatre of the Oppressed:

Under circumstances in which people who experience oppression may have their experiences and perspectives dismissed or negated by others, Theatre of the Oppressed provides participants an opportunity to speak without interruption.

How it works:

- Ask for volunteers to begin by re-enacting the scene in the narrated photo-series
- Encourage other “audience” members to consider the “ideal situation” the group identified in Part 2 above
- When someone in the audience has an alternative to a behaviour or any aspect of the service design, they can intervene by calling “freeze.” The intervener can take the place of an actor, or introduce a new character. If the intervener does not want to be on stage, they may call out their suggestion for the current actors to perform.
- The intervener and other actors on stage act out the scene to completion.
- Spect-actors are encouraged to take roles that they are likely to experience in real life.
 - Reference: Augusto Boal’s Forum Theatre for teachers

Part 4: Summary: Options and Opportunities

The purpose of this section is to summarize the whole exercise by identifying positive approaches to reduce stigma and produce a positive outcome in the situation. This section may reinforce ideas participants expressed during facilitated discussion, or introduce new ideas for consideration.

Discussion Questions	Facilitator’s Discussion Notes
1. How might Service providers contribute to improving the outcome of the situation?	Invite participants to identify how each group could contribute to improving outcomes in situations like the one in the scenario.
2. What could leaders and management change to produce a positive outcome?	Record their ideas on the flip chart.
3. How could Peers participate in producing a better outcome to situations like this?	There are a couple of suggestions for each group in the “Notes” section below the PowerPoint slide. This list is not exhaustive, but can be used to start and guide the discussion.

Acknowledgments for Scenarios:

Dr. Jane Buxton, *Harm Reduction Lead, HRSS*
Ashraf Amlani, *Epidemiologist, HRSS*
Emily Ogborne-Hill, *HRSS*

Alissa Greer, *Project Coordinator, PEEP⁵*
Charlene Burmeister, *Peer Research Assistant, PEEP*
Katie LaCroix, *Peer Research Assistant, PEEP*
Hugh Lampkin, *Peer Research Assistant, PEEP*
Brian LeBlanc, *Peer Research Assistant, PEEP*
Cheri Newman, *Peer Research Assistant, PEEP*
Samona Marsh, *Board Member, VANDU*
Craigh Pushie, *Board Member, VANDU*

Jon Vincent Photography

Jessica Bridgeman, *Harm Reduction Coordinator, Interior Health*
Monica Coll, *Peer Engagement Lead, VCH*
Erin Gibson, *Harm Reduction Coordinator, Fraser Health*
Griffin Russell, *Harm Reduction Coordinator, VIHA*
Reanne Sanford, *Harm Reduction Coordinator, Northern health*
Jeff Walsh, *Harm Reduction Coordinator, Interior Health*
Sara Young, *Harm Reduction Coordinator, VCH*

Dr. Keith Ahamad, *Researcher, BC Centre for Excellence in HIV/AIDS*

Janine Stevenson, *First Nations Health Authority, CIE⁶*
Sheila Martens, *CIE*
Sally Maguet, *CIE*

Cheryl Prescott, *Senior Practice Lead, BCCDC CPS Education*
Monica Durigon, *BCCDC CPS Education*

Prepared by:
Heather Burgess, *PEEP, HRSS*
James Tigchelaar *BCCDC CPS Education, CIE*



⁵ PEEP – Peer Engagement and Evaluation project

⁶ CIE – Compassion Inclusion and Engagement