



Champlain Regional Planning Table for Trans, Two Spirited, Intersexed and Gender Diverse Health Services

Meeting: March 20, 2017. 6 - 9pm

Location: Centretown CHC boardroom, 400 Cooper St., Ottawa

Present:

Community members:

Mikki Bradshaw, Maëlys McArdle, Kaeden Seburn, Mel Thompson, Jaina Tinker.

Trans Health Information Ottawa: Serena Rivard.

Service Providers: Tammy DeGiovanni, CHEO; James Fahey, Champlain LHIN; Jane Fjeld, Youth Services Bureau of Ottawa (as lead agency for child and youth mental health); Stephanie Hemmerick, Seaway Valley CHC; David Hesidence, Royal Ottawa Mental Health Centre; Laurie Rektor, Family Services Ottawa, Simone Thibault, Centretown CHC (representing 6 Ottawa CHCs).

Erin Flemming, Project Coordinator

Regrets: Patricia Vincent, Benny Michaud, and Devon McFarlane.

Minutes:

1. **Welcome:** We acknowledge and honour that we hold this meeting on unceded Algonquin Territory. To be present on this land is an honour, a privilege and not a right.
2. **Approval of minutes of meeting February 20, 2017:**
 - Approved by all
3. **Results of service mapping interviews:**
 - Thirteen interviews total will be completed by March 21, 2017
 - Service providers were excited at the work the table is doing and quickly made time in their busy schedules to partake in the interview
 - There were noticeable trends across the interviews as to recommendations for increased gender affirming health services across the region
 - Some of the community members from the table had questions around the specifics of some of the responses (e.g., when service providers received particular trainings, etc.). There was further discussion that at this point in time we are not getting into really specific details, but doing an overall scan of what service providers are currently doing
 - All results from the interviews are [as](#) self-reported

- The interviews covered a cross-section of service providers who work in primary health care, mental health care, and community services and were selected based on the suggestions made during the pilot interviews and by the community members at the table

4. Results of community engagement:

Intersex Interviews:

- One student came forward for the interview but after some discussion with the facilitator it was determined that they had not received services specifically related to their intersex condition
- A youth came forward for the interview that was unsure whether they were intersexed. After some discussion with the facilitator they opted out of the interview and were referred to the trans focus group for youth

Trans Youth Focus Group:

- Held on Saturday March 18, 2017
- Nine participants total
- Group was open to anyone under the age of 18 or over the age of 18 who had accessed services within the last five years. Four participants were over the age of 18, five were under the age of 18
- Some participants found out about the focus group through CHEO, one participant through the University of Ottawa, one participant through Carleton University
- There was lots of discussion

Francophone Focus Group:

- Held Saturday March 18, 2017 at 1 PM and 4 PM
- A teleconference number and a video link made available to potential participants
- One participant total was interviewed
- Interview lasted approximately one hour

People of Colour Interviews:

- Completed an informal email survey with three participants
- All three participants do not currently live in Ottawa, but have within the last five years
- People of colour from the gender non-binary and trans community typically leave Ottawa to receive services elsewhere

Rural Focus Group:

- Held Sunday March 19, 2017 from 1 PM to 3 PM
- Rika went to Cornwall to co-facilitate the focus group with Jaina
- Seven participants total. Six in person and one via Skype
- Age range of participants was early 20's to the very elderly



- Participants provided endless amounts of responses
- One thing people spoke about was the lack of apparent advertising or knowledge of any services both inside and outside the rural areas, particularly Hawkesbury and Akwesasne. Participants wished they could attend supports and services but were not aware of anything available
- Lots of participants discovered that they were unaware of mental health services

Parents of Trans, Two-Spirit, Intersex, and Gender Diverse Children/Youth/Young Adults

- Patricia provided some feedback from conversations she had with some parents to Erin
- Not sure if she will have time to facilitate focus group
- Interview questions were sent via email to FSO mailing list for parent support group

Two-Spirit Focus Group

- Benny sent out a report to table member's pertaining to her focus group

ACTION:

- Kaeden and Mikki to send focus group/interview results by March 21, 2017
- Jane and Tammy to send Erin their ideas around gaps, recommendations for improved clients pathways among partners and next steps and priorities for increasing gender-affirming health services, and a suggested outline for the report by March 21, 2017

5. Online survey:

- In regards to the online survey community members at the table created, James indicated he had a few key concerns with it.
 - Key issues around privacy
 - Introduction
 - Preamble around the business case

Privacy Issues:

- ✓ Privacy issue is the biggest concern
- ✓ Service providers from the table were not comfortable with asking the survey participants for personal information. The question becomes "How will it be stored/shared? Some service providers from the table checked in with their respective privacy officers and all are concerned. Suggestions by community members were to remove the section if the survey asking for a person's email and donate the money that person would have received to an organization. Another suggestion was to remove the questions asking for more information (e.g., Please explain). Even if this was done, there would still be concerns around small data sets in the survey

- ✓ Survey provider would have to be one which stores data in Canada. Google survey may be stored in the USA
- ✓ Legal entities (organizations) would have obligations if the survey was disseminated as a part of the table. Organization would have to see raw data, and would have to have a staff person(s) review such. Through the “scrubbing process” important information may be lost

Purpose of Survey

- ✓ Purpose of survey when it was developed was to supplement/provide more data to the information gathered through the focus groups/interviews
- ✓ Through the focus groups approximately 27 participants have been reached thus far. That doesn’t capture the broader demographics

Other Options to Disseminate the Survey

- ✓ Question arose around whether a community group like THIO would be better suited to send out the survey and share the results with the table. Community members/community groups do not have the same legal obligations an organization would have
- ✓ If community members and/or a community group sent out the survey the cover page could not have the RPT logo or any of the participatory organizations logos
- ✓ Maëlys indicated that she could set up a survey utilizing a survey provider who stores their data in Canada and would provide aggregate data. Could have completed by March 26, 2017
- ✓ If THIO did it they could have the survey out by March 27, 2017 and have it up for two weeks
- ✓ If THIO does it they could potentially share the aggregate data. They may or may not decide to ultimately share this data with the RPT
- ✓ Question across around whether the timelines fit with the work of the RPT, how much detail is going into the report, and what is the audience for the report
- ✓ If time does not permit, a suggestion was made to make the survey a part of the recommendations in the report.

ACTION:

- THIO to keep survey questions as is and disseminate
- THIO may or may not share aggregate results with the RPT
- Simone will have the survey translated

6. Discussion on report outline/elements:

- Questions arose around the audience for the report-Is it just going to the LHIN or the broader community. This decision will impact how much detail is in the report, word smithing, etc)
- Community members indicated that context for the report matters as well. There could for example be names in the report that community members see and will not read the report as a result
- James indicated that answering the four deliverables is important for the LHIN. Just responding to deliverables however will not build more trust with the community however
- One suggestion for an outline for the report was the following:
 - Vision
 - Process
 - Summarizing gaps identified by service providers and community
 - Recommendations (short-term, medium-term, long-term, and things beyond the table we should be advocating for)
- A suggestion was made to include the following aspects in the report:
 - Findings related to the four deliverables
 - Short, medium and long term plans
- Some suggestions for gaps and recommendations to include in the report are the following:
 - Service providers/OHIP and who gets paid
 - Education for support staff and providers
 - What's funded under which category through OHIP. Education and support in billing
 - Need for community based mediation or ombudsman to review things between service providers and clients
- It was indicated that we need to flag differences between urban and rural in the report
- Some community members indicated that they would like to see commitments made (e.g, where would money go, what would it go towards, etc.). This incited a discussion around whether the table was creating a business plan or report. It was indicated that now is not the time for a business case. That we were working in a staged process and a business case could potentially come in the future. It was indicated that right now we can focus on what's important to achieve in the short term and long term, one area being how we can do better with and without funding
- Information garnered through the table and final report could be of use to other service providers
- Discussion around co-writing the report. It was indicated that Erin is the staff person for the community members and service providers. The table is writing it together through discussions. Erin would welcome people to reach out to if she was unsure/needs assistance. There were concerns around Erin writing the report from a white, cis-gendered lens. Even if Erin writes what the table is telling her, she is still putting a specific lens on



it. One suggestion was to have a member of THIO contracted out to write a draft of the report and have Erin add pieces in the draft. Another suggestion was to have Erin write her draft in Google docs so the community members could review (have a writer than a safety review)

ACTION:

- All community members agreed to provide feedback/answer questions from Erin as the report is being drafted
- Erin to send out sections of the report once she drafts them to community members at the table for review
- Erin to send out draft report to all table members on April 8th or 9th, 2017 so they can set aside time to review the report before the RPT meeting on April 10, 2017
- Final report will be disseminated to all members of the RPT, all participants involved in interviews and focus groups, and the broader community

7. Other business:

- Budget details will be updated to members of the table via email
- Communications and how we can make the information coming from and work produced by the table more accessible to the community. Suggestion was to look into contracting out the work from Sam Bradd to create graphics of the work the RPT has done. For more information on Sam's work please visit his website Drawing Change at www.drawingchange.com.

ACTION: Kaeden to look into the cost of hiring Sam Bradd

- Everyone who played a part in the process will be recognized in the final report

8. Next meeting:

- April 10, 2017