Evaluation of the Seeing Oneself Pilot in Saskatchewan

Carolyn Camman, MA

Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science

and Justice Studies

University of Saskatchewan

UNIVERSITY OF SASKATCHEWAN

January, 2015

Evaluation of the Seeing Oneself Pilot in Saskatchewan

Prepared by:

Carolyn Camman, MA

Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science and Justice Studies

University of Saskatchewan

With the assistance of:

Dr. Hendricus Van Wilgenburg

Department of Political Science & Department of Philosophy

St. Mary's University

Prepared for the:

Royal Canadian Mounted Police "F" Division

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Introduction

In 2013, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) "F" Division supported the pilot implementation of the "Seeing Oneself" program at three sites in southern Saskatchewan. The "Seeing Oneself" program is a cognitive-behavioural substance abuse early intervention program for youth. It is intended to reduce alcohol and substance abuse and associated antisocial behaviours by directly addressing youth's reasons and motivations for using substances and building relevant coping skills.

Evaluation Methodology

The purpose of the current evaluation was to assess the quality of the pilot implementation of "Seeing Oneself" in Saskatchewan in terms of its fidelity to the tested and supported program model, as well as to investigate the effectiveness and sustainability of the program within the Saskatchewan context.

Several data sources were engaged for the present evaluation, including key stakeholder interviews, surveys, and document and literature review. A total of six interviews were conducted with stakeholders involved in the Saskatchewan pilot implementation, including representatives of each site and of the RCMP administration in charge of overseeing the pilot. Four supplemental interviews were conducted with individuals involved in the program at other locations, including the program developer and a prior program evaluator. Seven youths at two sites participated in surveys. Additional performance monitoring and training workshop survey data were provided by the prior program evaluator.

The collected qualitative data were analyzed using thematic analysis to identify consistent themes relating to the program implementation. The findings within each theme were organized by a description of what occurred in the pilot, followed by a comparison to the program literature and findings from other sites where the program has been implemented.

Findings and Conclusions

Six key themes were identified. The first four themes reflected the specifics of the implementation process:

- **Site Selection:** The process used to identify sites at which the program was to be implemented. Subthemes included the characteristics of each site as well as the criteria used in selecting them.

- **Facilitator Selection and Training:** The process by which facilitators were identified, recruited, and trained to deliver the "Seeing Oneself" program. Subthemes included the facilitator selection process, facilitator characteristics, facilitator training, training feedback, and the implementation of the training.

- **Participant Involvement:** The process used to identify and engage youths in the program. Subthemes included the screening and selection process which identified eligible youth, the characteristics of the participants, and the degree of engagement in and attrition from the program.

- **Program Delivery:** The process by which the program was structured and its content delivered to the participants. Subthemes included the frequency and duration of the sessions, the program setting and format, as well as feedback on the strengths and challenges of the program delivery methods used.

Overall, each aspect of the pilot program implementation was consistent either with the intended program design or, where there were no set standards in the program itself, with past implementations of the program. The program was received well by all stakeholders with minimal suggestions for improvements.

The latter two themes reflected issues relating to the program effectiveness and long-term viability.

- **Program Outcomes:** This referred to the changes which were expected to occur as a result of the program as well as those changes which were actually observed. These changes included increased knowledge and self-awareness among the youth, improved coping and decision-making, reduced antisocial and increased prosocial behaviour, particularly with respect to substance abuse.

- **Sustainability:** This referred to factors which were identified as impacting the on-going operational status of the program, including what resources the program requires in order to run and what the sources of support for these resources are.

Overall, there were some preliminary indications of program effectiveness for at least some youth, though the scope and potential longevity of these outcomes could not be determined. Regarding program sustainability, the lack of long-term planning with regard to what a sustainable implementation of the program would entail made it challenging to confirm whether the program was or was not sustainable. The sustainability of the program depends on the willingness and ability of the program partners to support it.

Recommendations

If based on the information presented in this report there is interest in continuing to support the "Seeing Oneself" program in Saskatchewan, the following recommendations regarding best practices for the implementation of a new program apply:

1. **Develop a long-term plan for how the program will be implemented and sustained** to ensure that the program is implemented according to appropriate standards and within reasonable expectations for what the available resources will be. This plan should also include:

   a. **Well-defined roles and responsibilities for the RCMP and the community partners** to facilitate sustainable planning for all stakeholders and support program continuity regardless of staff turnover.

   b. **Explicit and realistic goals and objectives** for both process-related performance standards as well as expected outcome targets to facilitate program consistency over time as well as across sites. Appropriate and realistic means for tracking the achievement of these goals and objectives should be included as well.

2. **Communicate the plan with all relevant stakeholders** to ensure that all partners are aware of the larger expectations around the program as well as their respective roles and responsibilities. Ideally community partners will be included in the planning process itself to ensure that their perspectives and needs are represented.

3. **Involve evaluators in the planning and implementation process** to assist with the identification of realistic and meaningful goals and program standards as well as aid in the development of a system for long-term data tracking and program performance monitoring.

4. **Build relationships with invested partners that have strong leadership and sufficient capacity to support the program** so that the RCMP will not be primarily responsible for sustaining and monitoring the program. These partnerships may be with local community stakeholders as well as with other government branches and departments, non-profit organizations, or other invested parties.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

In 2013, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) "F" Division supported the pilot implementation of the "Seeing Oneself" program at three sites in southern Saskatchewan. This pilot was initiated by the Drugs and Organized Crime Awareness Service (DOCAS), under the "F" Division Community Policing, consistent with its goals to develop and implement sustainable strategies for community policing, crime prevention, and crime reduction, and to encourage youth in avoiding drug involvement (Wright, 2013). The stated expectation of the implementation of the "Seeing Oneself" program was that "youth participating in the [Seeing Oneself] training will change their behaviour about drugs and alcohol and ultimately reduce crime involvement in their communities" (p. 3, Wright, 2013).

This report contains the findings from the evaluation of this initial pilot process with regard to the success of its implementation. Specifically, the extent to which the program was implemented in a manner appropriate to its design, its success in meeting the intended goals, and recommendations for further RCMP involvement with the "Seeing Oneself" program.

Program Description

Developed by Dr. Nancy Comeau, the "Seeing Oneself" program is a cognitive-behavioural substance abuse early intervention program for youth. It is intended to reduce alcohol and substance abuse and associated antisocial behaviours by directly addressing youth's reasons and motivations for using substances and building relevant coping skills (Conrod, Castellanos, & Mackie, 2008; Conrod, Castellanos-Ryan, & Mackie, 2011; Conrod, Stewart, Comeau, & Maclean, 2006). Specifically, three parallel interventions were developed based on three different personality-risk profiles into which youth may fall (see Table 1). These interventions target the specific reasons that youth have for using substances based on their personality profiles and provide alternative means of coping which allow youth to meet the same needs in more constructive ways.

Table 1. Substance abuse personality risk profiles.

Profile Type	Reason for using substances
Anxiety Sensitivity (AS)	To cope with feelings of anxiety, relieve stress and negative physical sensations of anxiousness and nervousness, fit in socially
Sensation Seeking (SS)	To satisfy need for excitement and stimulation, relieve boredom and restlessness, have fun, work off excess energy
Negative Thinking (NT)	To reduce feelings of sadness, worthlessness, guilt, hopelessness, despair, and irritability, to withdraw socially or as a social facilitator

Note. See Conrod et al., 2006, 2008, and 2011 for in-depth discussion of the research support for these three personality risk profiles.

The program is intended for adolescents at risk of substance abuse, including both alcohol and drugs, based on their score on a screening tool which is included in each workbook. The screening tool is based on the Substance Use Risk Profile Scale (SURPS; Woicik, Stewart, Pihl, & Conrod, 2009). Youth are asked to respond to a series of questions representing one of the three personality factors—a score of "medium" or higher on a personality subscale indicates that the youth is at risk for substance abuse in relation to that factor.

The version of the program implemented in Saskatchewan is a derivation of the program which has been adapted to be culturally relevant to Aboriginal youth though an extensive collaborative process involving Aboriginal youth, community members and elders (Comeau et al., 2005; Mushquash, Comeau, & Stewart, 2007). With the guidance of a review panel which included Maliseet and Mi'kmaq First Nation members, the program workbooks were changed to include relevant Aboriginal teachings and concepts (Comeau et al., 2005). Local Mi'kmaq teens also contributed artwork to the manuals, and the example scenarios included in the workbook were composites based on the qualitative interviews with the participating youth. A follow-up outcome evaluation was conducted to verify the effectiveness of the new manuals for students from four high schools in two Mi'kmaq First Nation communities in Nova Scotia in 2005 (Mushquash et al., 2007).

The program itself is supported by a manual/workbook which contains a series of exercises laid out in chapters. Led by a trained facilitator, youth go through the exercises which are intended to introduce them to their personality factor, learn to identify the kinds of feelings that lead them to substance abuse, think about the negative consequences of substance abuse, and, with the support of the facilitator, identify alternative ways of meeting their needs which have more positive consequences. They are taught to identify the precursors to substance abuse impulses (including physical sensations, actions, and thoughts). They learn specific techniques for challenging destructive thought processes and substituting with constructive thought processes. The workbooks are interactive and promote personalization through writing and drawing, as well as discussion with the facilitator and the other participants (if delivered in a group setting). The program can be offered in small groups or in one-on-one sessions.

Evaluation Methodology

Evaluation purpose

The purpose of the current evaluation was to assess the quality of the pilot implementation of "Seeing Oneself" in Saskatchewan in terms of its fidelity to the tested and supported program model, as well as to investigate the effectiveness and sustainability of the program within the Saskatchewan context.

Components of program implementation included the site selection process, facilitator selection and training, participant selection, program delivery mode, program outcomes, and overall sustainability needs of the program. The primary evaluation questions were:

1. Was the program implemented in a manner consistent with the Seeing Oneself model as it has been developed in the literature?
2. Was the program implemented in a manner appropriate to the selected sites and communities where it was piloted?
3. What factors, if any, influence the sustainability and potential success of the program and may inform future implementations?

Evaluation approach

An *implementation evaluation* approach was employed (Wholey, Hatry, & Newcomer, 2004), focusing on identifying the specific manner in which the program was delivered at each site and whether this conformed to the expectations of the original program design. Attention was also paid to any areas for potential improvement in how the program was implemented or recommendations for how to support program expansion beyond the pilot phase.

The evaluation approach was also primarily *qualitative* and *descriptive*, relying on narrative data gathered through interviews and program documents (Patton, 2014). This was due to a lack of comprehensive quantitative data, the retrospective nature of the evaluation, and the relatively small scale of the pilot. In particular, this limited the power of the evaluation to detect or confirm that program outcomes were achieved (discussed further in the section in this report on "Program Outcomes", p. 40).

Minimal guidelines were provided at the outset of the evaluation for determining what would constitute a 'successful' pilot of the "Seeing Oneself" program. It was also not evident that such guidelines were developed and communicated to the individual sites prior to the pilot implementation. As such, the current evaluation cannot present a summative recommendation on whether to continue the program or not. Instead, it reflects an *exploratory* approach to understanding how the pilot was conducted and whether it was successful from the perspectives of the individuals directly involved in the implementation, as well as the degree to which it was consistent with the original program design.

Data sources

Several data sources were engaged for the present evaluation, including key stakeholder interviews, surveys, and document and literature review:

- **Program document and literature review:** All available documentation related to the program, both its current pilot and previous implementations, were collected and reviewed extensively. This included previous evaluation reports, program workbooks, websites associated with the program and implementation sites, the original business case prepared by the "F" Division for pilot funding, tracking data provided by another evaluator associated with the "Seeing Oneself" program, and published literature.

- **Stakeholder interviews:** Two levels of interviews were conducted from April, 2014, to November, 2014. The first level was the *primary interviews* with stakeholders directly involved in the design and implementation of the Saskatchewan pilot, including the program facilitators, the site-based administration, and key stakeholders in the RCMP "F" Division. A total of six primary interviews were conducted, including one facilitator per site.

  Based on the information retrieved, a second level of *supplemental interviews* was also conducted with individuals associated with the program outside of the Saskatchewan pilot. The purpose of these interviews was to collect additional contextual information on how the program is intended to operate and how it has been implemented at other sites. Respondents for these interviews included the program developer, a past program evaluation, and an RCMP member and community member involved in the current New Brunswick implementation of the program, which operates as part of the "J" Division's Youth Intervention and Diversion model.

- **Participant and facilitator surveys:** The initial evaluation plan was to conduct on-site focus groups with the participating youth. However, it was not possible to organize the focus groups before the end of the school year and the facilitators themselves recommended that the youth would be unlikely to volunteer information to an unknown researcher in that format. The alternative was to design brief surveys which were distributed to the youth for anonymous feedback. Two of the three pilot sites were surveyed using this method, with a total of 7 youth participating. (Pasqua First Nation students were not available to be surveyed at the time of the evaluation.)

  In addition to the program participant surveys, a survey of the individuals who received the facilitator training workshop was also conducted separately from the present evaluation. These surveys were designed and distributed by Dr. Van Wilgenburg, who also provided the tracking data noted above, as part of the internal quality assurance process associated with "Seeing Oneself". There were 34 complete responses to the surveys, although some respondents participated in multiple workshops (basic facilitator training and "train the trainer" training) and submitted a survey response for each.

See Table 2 for a complete overview of the respondent sample broken down by affiliation with a specific site or organization (excluding the training workshop survey respondents). See the Appendix (p. 61) for the interview and survey questions used (excluding the tools developed by Dr. Van Wilgenburg).

Table 2. Summary of interview/survey respondents by site or organizational affiliation.

Site/Affiliation	# of Participants	Role in "Seeing Oneself" pilot
Bert Fox High School	4	• Program facilitator/community-school coordinator • Youth program recipients (3)
Leading Thunderbird Lodge	5	• Program facilitator/counsellor • Youth program recipients (4)
Pasqua First Nation School	2	• Former school principal • Program facilitator/RCMP member
RCMP "F" Division	2	• Program coordinator, NCO IC Drugs & Organized Crime Awareness • Former Officer in Charge of Community Policing
RCMP "J" Division	2	• Officer in Charge of Atlantic Youth Intervention and Diversion • Program coordinator, Maliseet Nations Mental Wellness Team
"Seeing Oneself" Program experts	2	• Program developer • Program evaluator

Respondent recruitment

Two complementary methods were used for respondent recruitment. *Heterogeneity* (maximum variation) *sampling*, the practice of deliberately maximizing the diversity of a sample, was used to ensure maximum coverage and representation of all invested parties (Patton, 2014). In practice, this entailed attempting to include at least one participant from every site and involved organization as well as from every level of engagement with the program, from high-level administration within the RCMP to the site-based facilitators to the program recipients themselves. This process ensured that different experiences and perspectives on the program would be represented while also lending strength to any common themes which were identified across the otherwise small but varied sample.

Snowball sampling, or the process of asking each respondent to identify further potential respondents, was also used to access the majority of the sample (Patton, 2014). This is a practical strategy that is useful when the entire pool of potential respondents is not known at the outset and where the existing relationships between respondents can be used to facilitate further access by providing introductions on behalf of the researcher. This approach was especially important in

accessing the adolescent program recipients via the facilitators as well as engaging with individuals from outside of the province and immediate pilot scenario.

Data analysis

The majority of data collected through the interviews and surveys was qualitative in nature. Detailed notes were taken during each interview and the data were analyzed using qualitative content analysis. Specifically, the approach used was *thematic analysis*, which entailed the systematic identification of recurring themes and patterns in the responses of the interviewees (Boyatzis, 1998). These themes represented underlying concepts which described and organized the data or offered an interpretation of it.

The present investigation was based on an assessment of several explicit and well-defined evaluation questions. Therefore, the resulting interview data presented a number of readily-identifiable themes which were identified by grouping participants' responses under the headings of the various topic areas that were explored (e.g., how did the program start, what activities are offered, what challenges have been encountered, etc.). To analyze and identify these themes systematically, these grouped data were analyzed for similar patterns within and across interviews to develop over-arching themes (Braun & Clark, 2006; Flick, 1998). Once the data were grouped under these over-arching themes, they were explored for cohesive subthemes. The over-arching themes developed based on the first round of interviews with the primary key informants were also used to develop the question protocol for the second set of supplemental interviews. The aim of this supplemental data collection was to confirm the appropriateness of the identified themes and to elicit further contextual information for the development of recommendations on how to proceed with the program in Saskatchewan.

The findings of the analysis have been presented according to a logical grouping, either by theme or by site, depending on the nature of the data (i.e., where there were differences across sites, information was presented by site first and then by subtheme; where there were no differences by site, information was grouped by theme only). Wherever possible, quotations have been included to illustrate the findings in the respondents' own words.

Limitations

As with all such projects, there were limitations with the present evaluation. The primary disadvantage of the project is that it was designed retrospectively and without input by the evaluation team at the outset of the pilot. This resulted in a lack of clear evaluation goals to guide the pilot process as well as its subsequent evaluation, and limited the scope of data collection possible. While it was possible to take advantage of the quality assurance data collected on behalf of the "Seeing Oneself" program developer and generously shared with the author of this

report, these data were not collected with the goals of the RCMP "F" Division in mind and did not necessarily speak to all of the issues critical to that organization. The lack of clearly articulated and specific goals and objectives with regard to the pilot process also limits the ability of the present report to make strong conclusions regarding the overall success of the project.

Additionally, because there was no opportunity to develop an appropriate rapport with the youth involved in the project, partly due to the timing of the evaluation project over the summer when the youth were unavailable, this precluded the use of methods such as focus groups and direct interviews with this participant group. As such, the input of the program recipients was relatively limited compared to other respondent groups. There was also a considerable delay between when the pilot was implemented and when the interviews were conducted, and as such the accuracy of reporting may have been diminished due to the difficulties of recollection among the respondents.

The implication of these limitations is that the present evaluation is focused largely on description and comparison of the Saskatchewan pilot to the program literature, externally-articulated standards for program delivery, and, where possible, the experiences of other sites where the program has been implemented, per the evaluation questions outlined above in the "Evaluation Purpose" section of this report (p. 2). This evaluation should not be taken as a conclusive statement on whether the "Seeing Oneself" program is worth pursuing in Saskatchewan in the future.

Ethical considerations

A number of ethical considerations were included in the evaluation to protect the privacy of the evaluation and program participants and maintain the integrity of the evaluation process. First, prior to beginning each interview, each participant was informed about the purpose of the evaluation and was told that the study was being conducted at the request of the RCMP. In addition, each participant was told how they had been identified for the evaluation. They also were asked whether their role and community (but not their name) could be mentioned in the report and were given the ability to contact the evaluator and ask questions about the report and the evaluation process at any time.

Second, all youth who participated in the evaluation were given full anonymity from the evaluator. No identifying or demographic questions were included in any of the surveys. As well, no names or identifying information of program participants were disclosed by any of the adult interview respondents at any point in the evaluation, whether they responded to the surveys or not.

<center>FINDINGS</center>

Overview of Key Themes

As indicated, there were six major themes that were identified in the analysis regarding considerations for the successful implementation of the "Seeing Oneself" program. Each of these themes will be discussed in turn with an in-depth review of the relevant findings for each. The themes have been organized in a semi-chronological order of relevance to the program planning process (e.g., it is necessary to select a program location before identifying facilitators, which is necessary to accomplish before selecting youth and delivering the program). However, these themes are fundamentally inter-related (e.g., "sustainability" should be an underlying consideration for every aspect of this process) and equally important.

The key considerations for implementing the "Seeing Oneself" program are as follows:

1) Site selection: This refers to the process used to identify sites at which the program was to be implemented. Findings under this theme address questions regarding the criteria and process used to identify and select sites, how appropriate and successful this process was, and any recommendations for improvements or changes to facilitate program expansion or sustainability.

2) Facilitator selection and training: This refers to the process used to identify of individuals to be trained in delivering the program as well as the training process in which they engaged. Similar to the site selection process, findings under this theme relate to the expectations and appropriateness of the selection criteria used, feedback on the training experience, and recommendations for improving the training experience or increasing its sustainability.

3) Participant involvement: This refers to the process used to identify and engage youths in the program. Findings under this theme address issues such as how potential participants were selected, the use of the screening process, the characteristics of the participants who were involved, and their level of engagement with the program.

4) Program delivery: This refers broadly to all aspects of program delivery, including the duration and frequency of the programming, the settings in which it was conducted, the format in which it was delivered, the process by which the program content was covered, the role of additional content, and any other relevant considerations for program delivery that were raised. There is also a focus on the perceived strengths and challenges of the program delivery process and recommendation for improvements or changes to enhance program effectiveness or sustainability.

5) Program outcomes: This refers to both the expected and observed *program effects* (i.e., changes in participating youths' knowledge, attitudes, or behaviours or changes in their school or community context which have been attributed at least in part to the presence of the program).

6) Sustainability: This refers to factors which have been identified as impacting the overall sustainability of the program, including what resources are necessary or beneficial to the running of the program as well as sources of support for the provision of these resources. Other findings pertinent to sustainability include indicators of demand for and interest in the program by stakeholders as well as the long-term measurement and tracking of the program.

Theme 1: Site Selection

"Site selection" refers to the process used to identify sites at which the program was to be implemented. The primary data sources for feedback on this process were the site-specific interviews with program facilitators and site administrators as well as the RCMP administrators and related program documentation (i.e., the business case prepared by Sgt. Roxine Wright). Some additional contextual information not specific to the Saskatchewan pilot was provided by the program developer, Dr. Comeau, and a previous evaluator, Dr. Van Wilgenburg. There were two particular subthemes which emerged under this theme: the characteristics of the sites themselves and the process by which the site selection took place.

Site characteristics

Three sites were included in the Saskatchewan pilot:

1) **Leading Thunderbird Lodge (LTL):** A residential youth treatment centre located outside of Fort Qu'Appelle. From their website description, LTL "is designed to meet the needs of male youth between the ages of 12-17 years who are experiencing difficulties related to drug, alcohol and solvent abuse" (Leading Thunderbird Lodge, 2014). LTL accepts youths from across the country for its 3-month residential treatment program, with each intake involving around 15 youths at a time. The centre's mission is to "empower First Nation and Inuit youth by providing a credible, safe and culturally based program that promotes a holistic healthy lifestyle" and specifically to help them identify the underlying causes, immediate triggers and subsequent disadvantages of their substance abuse patterns, improve their personal and social coping skills, and engage in positive and prosocial thinking.

   According to a facilitator interviewed at this site, youth participate in a range of programming, including drug and alcohol education, life skills training, culture-specific

activities (e.g., round dances, bearing, signing, learning Cree, ceremonies and feasts), and outdoor activities (e.g., biking, fishing, golfing). It was reported that the majority of the programming is developed in-house, but no personality-targeted programming similar to "Seeing Oneself" was included prior to the pilot. However, several interviewees identified the fact that Leading Thunderbird Lodge had been one of the participating sites in the early development of the program and partly initiated the return of the program to Saskatchewan via contact with Dr. Comeau, the program developer.

> "The Leading Thunderbird Lodge site had a bit of a history through their elders, some of whom helped guide some of the research work. When it came to actually having the program in this pilot, the elder was very quick to want to involve LTL so there was a nice continuity in this way with the research and the relationships that were already there."
>
> *"Seeing Oneself" program developer*

2) **Bert Fox Community High School (BFCHS):** A high school located in Fort Qu'Appelle which services approximately 300 students from Fort Qu'Appelle and surrounding areas (Bert Fox Community High School, 2014). Bert Fox is also a "designated community school" (a school in which building relationships between the school and community services is a priority; Philips, 2008), and includes a community-school coordinator position, among other resources.

A facilitator interviewed at this site reported that the school is considered to be a high needs and high risk location in need of additional services. She also confirmed there was no similar programming to "Seeing Oneself" available prior to the pilot. "Aboriginal Shield", another substance abuse prevention program administered through DOCAS (Aboriginal Shield Program Resource Guide, 2013), is available at the elementary level for youths in Grades 5 through 8, but there was no similar programming for high school students. However, as with LTL, there was a history of prior involvement with the "Seeing Oneself" program during its initial development (Van Wilgenburg, 2011).

> "There's a real gap in addiction and mental health services for our youth. "Seeing Oneself" fills that gap without requiring outside services. It's hard to get them into treatment centres rurally. With "Seeing Oneself", it's more harm reduction and getting kids to identify their behaviors and their choices."
>
> *Facilitator, Bert Fox Community High School*

3) **Pasqua First Nation High School (PFNHS):** A high school located on the Pasqua First Nation, which is a Salteaux/Cree First Nation between Regina and Fort Qu'Appelle

(Pasqua First Nation, 2014). The school was servicing 25 students at the time of the program pilot.

Similar to Bert Fox, a facilitator and site administrator confirmed there were no similar personality-targeted interventions for high school youth available at Pasqua First Nations School prior to the "Seeing Oneself" pilot. Programs such as "Aboriginal Shield" and "D.A.R.E" (Drug Abuse Resistance Education; "Royal Canadian Mounted Police, 2011) existed for younger students, but otherwise there was a dearth of services for high school students. Unlike LTL and Bert Fox, there was no prior history of involvement in the "Seeing Oneself" program before the most recent pilot.

> "[The RCMP member] came to me and said, "This looks like a good program, would your school be interested in participating?", and because we have such a diverse group of students, I said absolutely, anything we can do for the students."
>
> *Former principal, Pasqua First Nation High School*

Site selection criteria

The most precise information regarding the site selection process was contributed by the RCMP coordinator for the program. It was this individual's responsibility upon taking up her role at DOCAS to implement the "Seeing Oneself" pilot program in Saskatchewan. This process also included the development of a business case proposal for funding to the "F" Division Executive Committee, which also contributed relevant information on the site selection process. Another key informant was the former Officer in Charge of Community Policing for "F" Division who was involved in the initiation of the pilot prior to the assignment of the program coordinator.

Communications with these individuals, supplemented with feedback from the site facilitators and administrators and the original program developer, resulted in the identification of four key criteria:

1) **Past history with program:** As discussed in the previous subtheme, two of the selected sites had historical connections with "Seeing Oneself" from past implementations. One of these sites, Leading Thunderbird Lodge, provided the impetus for the current pilot when they contacted Dr. Comeau, the program developer, in hopes of re-engaging with the program. Dr. Comeau responded by communicating with her RCMP "F" Division contracts and the process was set in motion to bring the program back to Saskatchewan. Dr. Comeau was also familiar with an individual at Bert Fox High School who had participated in the program development five years prior, and this person became an additional contact.

Sustainability of this indicator: This criterion is more incidental than necessary with regard to the expansion of the program to additional sites. It has never been a pre-requisite that sites have existing ties with "Seeing Oneself" in order to engage with the program. However, this criterion does point to the facilitating role of existing relationships in establishing the program in new sites. For example, a former school administrator from Pasqua First Nation School indicated in her interview that she would be interested in bringing "Seeing Oneself" to her current school based on her experience with the program during the pilot. It is also reasonable to expect that word-of-mouth will play a role in raising awareness of the program and demand for it between sites given recent findings regarding another youth-oriented community program in Saskatchewan (Jewell & Camman, 2014).

2) **Proximity to RCMP coordinator:** Another important consideration in the selection of pilot sites was the proximity to the RCMP coordinator, who was based in Regina. Proximity was significant in order to facilitate direct contact and communication between the coordinator and the sites. It also likely made the training process more efficient and cost-effective by allowing individuals from multiple sites to be trained at the same time and without needing to arrange travel to or from more remote locations.

Sustainability of this indicator: While reasonable and appropriate for consideration in the pilot phase of this program, this indicator is highly unlikely to be appropriate as a standard during program expansion. It would unnecessarily and unfairly limit access to the program to a relatively small region in southern Saskatchewan and exclude communities which may have a strong and legitimate need for the program. Indeed, there is no indication that this criterion was intended by anyone to be used beyond the initial pilot site selection process. However, the utility of this criterion during the pilot phase highlights some additional considerations for program expansion plans.

First, expanding the program beyond the region immediate to Regina and the "F" Division RCMP Headquarters will introduce complications for providing direct oversight and support to the program by an RCMP coordinator. The Community Cadet Corps (CCC) program, another community-based program for youth that was recently evaluated, faces a similar challenge with a program coordinator who is based in Regina but travels extensively throughout the province to provide support (Jewell & Camman, 2014). It was found in this report that there was a strong demand for this level of support from the involved communities and that the program was more likely to struggle or fade out in a community where this support could not be provided in a timely manner. However, it is not clear that the "Seeing Oneself" program will face this difficulty to the same degree. "Seeing Oneself" is a relatively short and self-contained program with a well-defined and manualized training and intervention protocol. This lends itself to the

program being adopted into existing community infrastructure with minimal RCMP oversight required. This assumes that the necessary resources and management capacity are available in that community, however. It will also be important to clearly define and communicate the "Seeing Oneself" program coordinator's role and responsibilities to the participating communities to ensure that all partners have similar expectations.

The second consideration raised by the presence of this pilot criterion is the additional cost and logistical challenges that may arise when providing training for remote and rural regions which was not encountered in the pilot. While this should not be barrier to participation by communities, it should still considered in planning stages to ensure that training can be delivered in a cost- and time-efficient manner to these areas. The presence of individuals who have received "train-the-trainer" training and can train new facilitators may also be of particular benefit to these regions.

3) **Demonstrated need:** This criterion was approached in two ways. First, there was an active attempt by the RCMP to identify "high crime" regions, particularly communities with high rates of drug- and alcohol-related crime among youth. This was consistent with the focus of the "Seeing Oneself" program on reducing substance abuse and related antisocial behavior among youth and with the priorities of the "F" Division Community Policing Service and DOCAS to support youth in avoiding drug involvement through crime prevention and reduction programming (Wright, 2014). This lead to the identification of Fort Qu'Appelle as one of the potential Detachment areas in which to identify partner sites. Second, all three of the pilot sites identified a lack of existing programming with which to address the specific need for substance abuse intervention programming for youths.

Sustainability of this indicator: This is a highly appropriate criterion given that "Seeing Oneself" is a targeted program which is not intended to be delivered to low-risk individuals or as a broad-based prevention measure. While there is no indication in the literature or past evaluation that it produces harmful effects when delivered to youth who do not meet its screening criteria, there is still an individual cost associated with delivering the program to each youth. This suggests that the most efficient and cost-effective approach is to deliver the program in areas where a greater proportion of youth are likely to be in need of the program. High-need areas are also more likely to show definitive impact of the program over time. Communities which already have existing programming to address the same need may still benefit from the addition of a new program, but it will be more difficult to attribute any subsequent long-term changes to either program and may not be the most efficient distribution of limited resources.

"I think there has to be more education about what the program is and its availability. I think as a province we need to look at where we're having the highest reported use of drugs and focus on those areas first and then expand the program from there. To me it's a really good program and it doesn't matter if you're a casual user of drugs or more into it than that, it gives options to people. As a program in this province, we need to expand its reach to more people, and we can do that through education and awareness about how they can access that program."

Former Officer in Charge of Community Policing, RCMP "F" Division

4) **Presence of enthusiastic and committed community partners:** Once the high-need communities were identified, the existence of motivated and capable collaborators in those communities was another strong factor in pilot site selection. Although Pasqua First Nation did not have a prior connection to the "Seeing Oneself" program, the coordinator was able to identify an RCMP member at that location who had already formed a close relationship with the school and the youth. This individual was able to act as a liaison and introduced the program to the school. She also became trained as a facilitator and participated in the program delivery itself. Her relationship with the local principal translated into strong administrative support at that location. The community-school coordinator at Bert Fox who had past involvement in the program also became a key contact in her community and became the main facilitator of the program at that site, with support from her administration as well.

Sustainability of this indicator: This criterion is particularly significant to the goal of "Seeing Oneself" becoming a primarily community-led program. One of the challenges noted in the Community Cadet Corps evaluation, which involved a similar goal, was that not all sites had strong community participation and investment in the program, which resulted in increased reliance on RCMP members to sustain the program (Jewell & Camman, 2014). While a community may have a strong need and desire for the program, for the program to be sustainable within the community it also requires local partners who will help oversee, support, and run the program. Specifically this means individuals who are willing and able to be trained as facilitators and deliver the program, and administrators who will support these activities and help ensure that the program has the necessary resources to operate. In the case of Pasqua First Nation, the local RCMP member was involved in program delivery as a facilitator, but was not solely responsible for organizing and running it, which is in keeping with the principle of a community-led, police-supported program.

5) **Community capacity:** One additional criterion which was not formally employed in the pilot site selection process but which may be relevant for program expansion is the overall community capacity available to support the program. This is an extension of the

previous criterion, the presence of enthusiastic and committed collaborators, which is one type of community resource. Other resources which support the program will be discussed in more depth in the "Sustainability" portion of this report, but broadly speaking the successful implementation of the program depends on the availability of trained facilitators, access to youths in need of the program, a physical space for program delivery, sustainable funding for training and for workbooks, and administration and infrastructure to support and organize the program. Communities may vary in the degree to which they can support the program, particularly with regard to on-going funding and, for communities with a high turnover of staff, availability of trained facilitators. A similar issue was raised in a prior evaluation of the program (Van Wilgenburg, 2011).

Because of the nature of the present pilot which focused on only a small number of sites over a short period of time, lack of capacity did not arise as a systemic issue in the current evaluation. However, such issues were noted in the Community Cadet Corps evaluation, which reviewed sites across the province and looked retrospectively at several years' worth of implementation considerations (Jewell & Camman, 2014). Lack of funding and staff burn-out and turnover were two challenges identified in this report which may also impact the "Seeing Oneself" program over time.

While challenges in capacity should not bar communities from accessing the program—particularly because communities which lack capacity are likely to be among those with the greatest need for programming such as "Seeing Oneself"—an assessment of local capacity should be undertaken at the outset of bringing the program to a new location to identify potential challenge areas that may require specific attention or additional planning to address. Programs which cannot be effectively implemented due to resource issues are unlikely to produce the desired outcomes and may skew perceptions of the program's actual utility.

Fidelity to "Seeing Oneself" program design

There are no standard site selection guidelines or criteria within the formal "Seeing Oneself" program design; therefore the fidelity of this process is not at issue. However, the program developer confirmed that, in the past, the selection of participating communities has typically been based off of similar criteria, including informal communications within the RCMP, alignment with RCMP priorities, and a demand from the frontline based on concerns and needs about the communities (N. Comeau, personal communication, October 8, 2014). As such the site selection process employed in the pilot was consistent with past implementations.

Summary

Overall, there were a number of similarities and differences among the three selected sites. All three sites were located in proximity to each other, but each had somewhat different populations and operational contexts, from a small reserve school to a somewhat larger rural high school to a residential treatment facility which services a small number of youth from across the country. Two of the three sites reported past involvement in "Seeing Oneself". Significantly, at each site there was a service gap identified for substance abuse intervention programming for students in Grades 9 to 12. This was consistent with past implementations of the program.

The site selection process was driven by a number of factors. The first two, past history with the program and proximity to the RCMP coordinator, were largely pragmatic and incidental to the nature of the pilot and are not required for program expansion, although existing relationships and informal communication may facilitate interest and demand. The latter two criteria, demonstrated need and presence of collaborators, are likely to remain relevant for future site selection. Overall community capacity to support the program will also likely be an important consideration when choosing future program sites.

Theme 2: Facilitator Selection and Training

"Facilitator selection and training" refers to the process by which facilitators were identified, recruited, and trained to deliver the "Seeing Oneself" program. Primary data sources for this theme included the key information interviews with facilitators and site administrators as well as the supplemental interviews other individuals involved in the development and evaluation of the program as well as implementation at other sites. One additional source of information was the training surveys conducted by Dr. Van Wilgenburg, part of the internal quality assurance process for the program. Dr. Van Wilgenburg designed the training workshop feedback survey and collected data from the individuals who participated in the facilitator training. He shared his data to help inform the present evaluation.

Facilitator selection

- **Selection process:** According to the business case prepared by the RCMP program coordinator, the intention was to recruit community volunteers to participate in the facilitator training, and for these trained facilitators to deliver the program to youth in their communities afterward (Wright, 2013).

  Three facilitators were interviewed for the purpose of this evaluation. One had been involved in the original testing and development of "Seeing Oneself" in the past and

volunteered when she became aware of the new opportunity to participate. One was assigned by his supervisor to take part along with a number of his colleagues. The third, an RCMP member, was given the opportunity to take part because of her existing relationship with community members in one of the selected pilot sites.

> "I was interested in the training. It seemed like something I should know about. I wanted to see what it had to offer. We're always looking for new ideas to implement for teaching stuff. So let's give this a try and see how it goes."
>
> *Facilitator, Leading Thunderbird Lodge*
>
> "It's kind of funny. I was involved for my practicum for my addictions and mental health program. It would have started back five years ago. I was part of the program in Dalhousie. I worked with Nancy right from the beginning. I was one of the only people to work with it all the way through. The original books they used had our student's artwork, the elders from their community. Then it just so happened that the RCMP piloted the actual program and I joined up with them again so I could facilitate. I took the facilitator training as well so I could legally be part of the group."
>
> *Facilitator, Bert Fox Community High School*

- **Facilitator characteristics:** The interviewed facilitators had relatively diverse training and backgrounds. Two of the three facilitators had extensive experience in addictions and mental health, addictions counselling, and in working with youth and Aboriginal youth in particular. One of the facilitators reported that this background or a similar background was helpful to her in understanding and effectively delivering the program, as well as a number of other skill sets and traits that she identified. The third facilitator did not identify any specific training or experience in this area beyond her RCMP training, but did identify her own tendency toward the Anxiety-Sensitivity as assisting her in connecting more effectively with the youth in this group.

> "Having the knowledge of addictions and mental health was helpful to me. … You need to be very comfortable with kids, you need to make yourself aware of the different issues that kids are facing, you need to know your clientele. If you are in a very privileged position and you tried to deliver it, it may be a tough sell. You need to be organized, flexible, supportive. You need to know about outside resources are available if you're going to be referring kids on. You need to be aware of confidentiality, ethical behavior."
>
> *Facilitator, Bert Fox Community High School*

> "I think everybody is going to put their own spin on it. I fall into the anxiety group myself so I could relate to them by using my own ways of dealing with things and they could relate to that and that helped with the buy-in factor for sure."
>
> *Facilitator, Pasqua First Nation High School*

Facilitator training

The basic facilitator training is a 2-day workshop delivered based on a standard set of PowerPoint slides with licensed content (N. Comeau, personal communication, October 8, 2014). Participants receive facilitator versions of the program manuals which include all of the program content of the youth manuals with additional pages that give them specific scripts and tips to use when guiding youth through each page of the program.

To be certified to become a facilitator trainer, the individual must first have received the basic facilitator training (N. Comeau, personal communication, October 8, 2014). They are then led through an additional 2-day workshop with the program developer, Dr. Comeau. Following this, they must deliver, under supervision, a facilitator workshop within a month of this additional training. If they are successful they receive a certificate. The "train-the-trainer" component of the program has only recently been implemented due to the high demand for training in other areas.

The basic facilitator training was delivered twice, once in late May, 2013, and again in late October, 2013. The first workshop was delivered by Dr. Comeau, the program developer and the second one was taught by the four individuals who participated in the train-the-trainer workshop shortly before. In total, 33 people were reported as having taken the basic facilitator training, including the four who were additionally certified to train facilitators themselves.

Training feedback

- **Strengths:** The majority of feedback on the training process was highly positive. Respondents indicated that the material was delivered effectively, in a manner that was useful and interesting. Several respondents, both in the interviews and surveys, commented on the effectiveness of the interactive activities, including the role playing, mock lesson plans and sharing of stories, as well as the cultural elements of the program itself. There was overall a strong perception that the program would be useful for working with youths. Some of the survey respondents also noted their appreciation for the opportunity to network and socialize professionally with colleagues.

> "It just basically laid it out in how they wanted it facilitated. You can read a book but you're not going to get the actual goal, the objective of the lesson, so when you take

> the course it shows you exactly the objective that you're trying to strive for. It gave you different ways of doing the program, different people had different ideas."
>
> *Facilitator, Pasqua First Nation High School*

The survey respondents were given the opportunity to provide ratings of various aspects of the program on a series of 5-point scales. All of the survey questions were worded such that higher scores indicated more positive responses and the average scores on all items were overwhelmingly positive, ranging from 4.2 to 4.7 (see Table 3 for summary of item averages from the basic training workshops). The items themselves covered the workshop content, design, and perceived effectiveness, as well as an overall assessment.

Table 3. Summary of average scores on facilitator workshop quality survey items.

	Average
WORKSHOP CONTENT	
I was well informed about the objectives of this workshop	4.4
The workshop lived up to my expectations	4.5
The content was relevant to the objectives of the workshop.	4.6
WORKSHOP DESIGN	
Training session objectives were clear	4.4
Instructional methods were effective	4.2
Time was adequate to cover content thoroughly	4.2
I learned valuable information/tools/ideas that can be applied to my work	4.6
WORKSHOP RESULTS	
Pre-workshop communications were well-organized	4.2
I accomplished the objectives of the workshop	4.4
I will be able to use what I learned in this workshop	4.6
Overall the workshop was effective	4.5
OVERALL	
Please rate the overall quality of the workshop.	4.4

Note. The first 11 items were rated on a 5-point scale which ranged from "1 – strongly disagree" to "5 – strong agree". The final item was rated on a 5-point scale which ranged from "1 – poor" to "5 – excellent".

- **Challenges and respondent suggestions:** A small number of challenges or areas for improvement were noted. Among the survey respondents, these suggestions included making the workshop more interactive and less oriented to the PowerPoint slides and expanding the workshop time allotment to allow for more discussion. Among the interview respondents, one suggested including more Elder involvement in the training itself. Another suggested increasing the community presence in the training delivery. (It should, however, be noted that among the four facilitator trainers, two were RCMP members and two were community members.)

> "For the future, it would be nice to be able to not to just have the RCMP deliver it—it's not a policing issue, it's a community issue, and when they start training the trainers and take it further than the pilot project, it would be nice to have an RCMP member there delivering it, but also to have someone else there to show the other side of it. In some communities, if they see it as a RCMP project, it might make them nervous and wonder if it's about legal issues."
>
> *Facilitator, Bert Fox Community High School*

It should be noted that the second trainer workshop was delivered by local individuals who had recently been certified as facilitator trainers, compared to the first workshop which was delivered by the program evaluator. The ratings and feedback were nearly equivalent between the two workshops. The ratings and feedback for the "train the trainer" workshop, not presented here, were somewhat lower overall with more suggestions for improvements, but still largely positive.

The training feedback survey has not been included in detail because the fundamental design of the workshop training is beyond the purview of the RCMP to alter. It is a licensed component of the "Seeing Oneself" program design and adjustments and alterations are under the authority of the program developer. The primary issue of relevance for the purposes of this report is that the training was judged to be useful and effective by its recipients, including when delivered by local certified facilitators.

Training implementation

Of the 33 trained individuals, no more than eight actually delivered the program within the pilot period. One facilitator was reported at Bert Fox Community High School, two at Leading Thunderbird Lodge, and either four or five at Pasqua First Nation High School (three simultaneous groups were facilitated with at least one group having two co-facilitators and at least one with only one facilitator).

Given that non-local member RCMP personnel and site administrators were also included in the training, it was clear that not all of the individuals trained in the program were intended to act as facilitators for the program. However, no specific standards, targets, or goals were identified with respect to the number of facilitators to be trained and to implement their training within the pilot period, so it is unclear whether the ratio of facilitators to non-facilitators among the trainees is acceptable for the pilot period. Among the interview respondents, one respondent who did not use their training to facilitate the program indicated that the training was still useful in providing an understanding and awareness of the program in general and would facilitate

program promotion. However, another facilitator indicated that he hoped more individuals at his site will be able to deliver the program in the future to reduce the workload.

> "Looking at the program and seeing how it could be valuable and useful, it made me reflect on my own career and made me think of if I'd made a positive impact when I was arresting people. Also, because I'm spearheading the training, knowing what the provincial policing priorities are and government expectations, I'm better able to articulate the value and the purpose of the program in radio interviews and so on."
>
> *Program coordinator, RCMP "F" Division*
>
> "Initially eight of the workers took part. Then it was decided to do it during the day and not in the evenings, so no one else has worked on it since that time except myself and [the other facilitator]. … I hope there will be more people available to facilitate, so it's not always the same person doing it."
>
> *Facilitator, Leading Thunderbird Lodge*

Fidelity to "Seeing Oneself" program design

There are no defined guidelines for who should be selected as facilitators for "Seeing Oneself" or prerequisite skill sets. The program developer confirmed that typically the facilitators have been selected by the RCMP in cooperation with their community stakeholders at their own discretion (N. Comeau, personal community, October 8). At other sites, volunteers have come from diverse backgrounds, including teachers and educational staff, guidance counsellors, and police officers (Van Wilgenburg, 2011, 2012), as well as addictions counsellors, probation officers, and others (R. Shaw, personal communication, October 24, 2014). Therefore the present pilot has been consistent with previous implementations in terms of facilitator characteristics and the facilitator selection process.

The training itself was conducted and supervised by the program developer and as such can be presumed to have adhered to the standard protocols and best practices for the program. The generally positive feedback from the trainees about the quality of the training and their confidence in their ability to deliver the program was consistent with feedback from other sites (Van Wilgenburg, 2011). There are no specific standards or expectations around the proportion of trained individuals who are intended to subsequently deliver the program that have been communicated in the program documentation or past evaluations. However, a program coordinator at another site where the program is offered indicated that some of their facilitators failed to deliver the program after being trained, and required additional assistance, which resulted in the creation of the program coordinator position (V. Wolfeagle, personal communication, November 6, 2014).

Summary

There were no specific criteria for facilitator selection beyond engaging community volunteers at the identified sites who would be in a position to deliver the program to youth afterward. The facilitators themselves came from varied backgrounds. Some had experience with substance abuse treatment and in working with youth, but not all. This was consistent with previous implementations of the program.

The training itself was received well and given largely positive feedback from all participants, including the workshop that was delivered by four local individuals recently certified to deliver the training. Only about one quarter of the 33 trained facilitators ultimately delivered the program. However, it was not apparent how many of those involved in the training were expected to deliver the program afterward. Other benefits of the training included an increased awareness of the program and ability to support and promote it. All of the training was delivered under the supervision of the program developer and in accordance with its standard protocols.

Theme 3: Participant Involvement

"Participant involvement" refers to the process used to identify and engage youths in the program. The primary data sources for feedback on this process were the site-specific interviews with program facilitators and site administrators and the performance monitoring data provided by the program evaluation involved in the "Seeing Oneself" internal quality assurance process. Additional background information was also provided by the program developer and in the program literature, as well as interviews with the RCMP administrators and the youth surveys and supplemental interviews from other program sites.

There were four identified subthemes in this category. "Selection & screening process" referred to the process by which students were identified as being eligible for the program, including the screening of youth into their specific personality groups. "Participant characteristics" breaks down the specific characteristics of the youth participants. Finally, "engagement & attrition" describes if and how the youth actually engaged in the program.

Participant selection & engagement

1) **Leading Thunderbird Lodge**

   Selection & screening: At LTL, the program was run as part of their overall 3-month treatment program, and therefore all youth in each intake were included in the process. The treatment centre intake itself involves a review by the staff and a clinical

psychologist to identify the youths' needs and their fit for the program. Youth are referred to Leading Thunderbird Lodge by several means, including court and social service worker referrals, as well as self-referrals (Leading Thunderbird Lodge, 2014). The youth themselves come from all over Canada. Upon reaching the "Seeing Oneself" component of the treatment, participating youth were screened into their specific personality risk profiles using the measures included in the workbooks.

Participant characteristics: According to the performance monitoring sites submitted as part of the internal quality assurance monitoring, 25 youth participated in the "Seeing Oneself" program as of April, 2014. The majority were identified as Sensation-Seeking, between the ages of 12 and 17, and First Nation in their background. One-half to two-thirds of the participants were reported as not having histories of offending or of mental health issues, though the majority had combined issues with alcohol and drug abuse. Although gender was not collected as part of the performance monitoring data, all Leading Thunderbird Lodge clients are male. (See Table 4 for a complete breakdown of the reported sample.)

One challenge noted at this site with regard to the participant characteristics was that some of the participants did not have the requisite literacy skills for the program.

> "All the kids are expected to participate. It makes it hard on everyone else for the ones who can't understand the reading and writing because everyone is mixed up and it slows down the group, and the other boys tend to get mad. 'Why do you have to do this for him?' And there's down time and they have to wait."
>
> *Facilitator, Leading Thunderbird Lodge*

Engagement & attrition: Participation in the "Seeing Oneself" program was voluntary in the sense that youth could choose to leave the program entirely or choose not to engage with the programming. Some program attrition occurred before the youth reached the "Seeing Oneself" component of the treatment program but otherwise all youth were given an opportunity to participate. In the performance monitoring reports submitted at this site, it was reported that moving the "Seeing Oneself" component toward the end of the treatment cycle reduced the level of attrition overall, from 30% (3 drop-outs) to zero. The initial attrition rate was also attributed to the lower literacy of these youth and their difficulty in engaging with the written material of the workbook.

A site facilitator confirmed that of these remaining clients, a small proportion in each intake failed to engage with the program, and that these were typically the youth who failed to engage with the treatment program on the whole, not only the "Seeing Oneself" component.

Table 4. "Seeing Oneself" participant characteristics by site.

Site	LTL	BFCHS	PFNHS
Total participants	25	6	22
Personality Type			
Negative-thinker (NT)	9	4	7
Sensation-seeker (SS)	13	-	10
Anxiety-sensitive (AS)	3	2	5
Age			
6 – 11	2	-	-
12 – 17	23	6	22
18 – 24	-	-	-
Aboriginal			
First Nation	22	6	22
Métis	1	-	-
Inuit	1	-	-
Offending history			
No prior charges/convictions	15	6	19
1+ prior charge/conviction	8	-	3
Community sentence	4	-	-
Institutional sentence	3	-	-
Mental health history			
Diagnosed mental health issue	3	-	4
Self-reported mental health issue	7	6	-
Substance use history			
Alcohol abuse	7	-	2
Drug abuse	13	6	4
Alcohol and drug abuse	18	-	-

Note. Raw data provided by Dr. Van Wilgenburg in the form of performance monitoring reports submitted as of April, 2014. The respondent interviews were conducted after this date and reflect more up-to-date information.

> "We have some who say it's boring and they don't want to do it, just like all our programming, and sometimes once they start the program and what it's getting across, they say they don't want to go there. Almost every intake someone will do that, it's only a couple here or there, never the whole group. Some will just sit through and listen but don't do the work, or they'll go and help out with another program. …
>
> "It depends on what you give into a program, is what you get out, so the ones that don't want to participate or don't want to answer the questions, they don't get a lot out of it, the ones that try and want to better themselves, they see themselves in the program and they understand why they get mad and why they react a certain way and why they feel bad about themselves. It depends on what they want to get out of the program."
>
> *Facilitator, Leading Thunderbird Lodge*

The four youth who participated in a survey of their experiences with "Seeing Oneself" reported a relatively positive response. On a 5-point scale of the degree to which they liked the program, the youth reported an average of 4.25, with scores ranging from 3 ("Neither") to 5 ("Really liked it"), and when asked what they did not like about the program, all of the surveyed youth reported that there was nothing they did not like about it. These youth represent only a small and potentially non-representative subset of the overall number of youth who participated in the program at this site.

1) Bert Fox Community High School

Selection & screening: At Bert Fox, the program was run as an alternative to suspension as well as a voluntary intervention. Students who were identified as engaging in higher usage of substances or whose substance use was leading to problematic behavior at school or at home were identified to the facilitator. These referrals came from school staff, family, or the youth themselves. The students were then given the option to participate and during the pilot all youths who were presented with the program agreed to participate. The facilitator interviewed at this site also indicated that if the school can access more workbooks, she would be interested in delivering the program as a school-wide initiative for all students.

Participating students were screened into their specific personality risk profiles using the measures included in the workbooks. A facilitator at the site reported that the screening process worked effectively, though it was sometimes a close decision between whether a student should be in Anxiety-Sensitivity or Negative-Thinking. In these borderline cases, she supplemented with her observations from the school environment which group appeared to be the better fit, and, if necessary, incorporated elements from the other workbooks to students who appeared to fit multiple profiles.

Participant characteristics: According to the performance monitoring report, as of April 2014, six students had participated, although in the respondent interview conducted on May 2nd, 2014, the total was 8. From the formal report, the majority of participants were identified as Negative-Thinking, all were between the ages of 12 and 17, and all were identified as First Nation. Although gender was not included in the performance monitoring reported, the facilitator reported that the participants were a mix of boys and girls, with somewhat more girls. None of the students had prior convictions or charges, though the facilitator indicated in the interview that the male participants tended to have had contact with the law. All participants were indicated as having self-reported mental health issues. They were also reported as being involved in drug use, but not alcohol. Specifically, their substance abuse was typically with cannabis, as well as some alcohol, and a few had used ecstasy and cocaine. The facilitator also described them

as youths who had not done a lot of "deep soul-searching" and who were used to drugs as something commonplace within the home. (See Table 4 for a complete breakdown of the reported sample.)

Engagement & attrition: No attrition or drop-out was reported at this site. The facilitator reported that all youth engaged with the program positively.

> "When the program was explained to the kids, they were all very open to it. They got the idea of the different personalities. All of them liked the program. There was nobody that missed, no drop-outs. Kids will avoid if they don't like something. They wouldn't scream from the rooftops that it was the best thing they've ever done."
> *Facilitator, Bert Fox Community High School*

The three youths who were surveyed at this school indicated somewhat positive responses, suggesting that it was a program where you could "learn stuff", that it didn't "tell you that you should never drink or do drugs", and that it was "okay".

2) Pasqua First Nation High School

Selection & screening: At Pasqua First Nation, the program was run during class time with the expectation that all students would participate, similar to what the Bert Fox facilitator envisioned if more workbooks were available. All students were screened into their specific personality risk profiles using the measures included in the workbooks.

Participant characteristics: There was some discrepancy regarding the total number of participating students. In the site-specific interviews, the number of participants was given as 25. However, in the performance monitoring reports, the total was reported as 22. This may have been due to the failure to include 3 non-participating students (see "Engagement & attrition below). According to the performance monitoring reports, the majority of the youth were identified as Sensation-Seeking, all were between the ages of 12 and 17, and all were First Nation. Although gender was not reported as part of the performance monitoring, in the interviews it was confirmed that there were 20 male students and five female students in that year. The majority of students had no prior charges or convictions. A small number were reported as having diagnosed mental health concerns. A similarly small number were identified as having alcohol or drug abuse history. (See Table 4 for a complete breakdown of the reported sample.)

Engagement & attrition: By being offered to the entire school during regular class time, the program was technically mandatory, although students who did not want to participate could choose not to attend school or not participate in the program in the

classroom. Interviewees at this site differed in their reports of participant attrition—a site administrator indicated that there was no drop-out, while a site facilitator indicated that a small number of students (3-4) dropped out by not attending school. The inconsistency noted above in the reported total number of participants (25 versus 22) supports the likelihood that there was some program drop-out.

Otherwise it was indicated that participants were fairly engaged in the program and positive about the experience. The principal at this site attributed the high participation to the accuracy of the personality risk profile matching.

> "At first it was a free out of school. And then with my group I found that they were excited to come after the first session they realized it wasn't teeth-pulling, it wasn't that bad. Once they became more comfortable, more conversation happened and they did more talking than I did. … It's ability to really relate with the students. The buy-in factor from the students. At first they're not going to want to talk about their problems. Once you get over that wall then you're set."
>
> *Facilitator, Pasqua First Nation High School*

Fidelity to "Seeing Oneself" program design

The two standards for participant involvement in "Seeing Oneself" are that the youth participate voluntarily and that they score above the "medium" cut-off on at least one of the scales included at the front of each workbook. These brief surveys are based on the Substance Use Risk Profile Scale (SURPS; Woicik, Stewart, Pihl, & Conrod, 2009), which identifies each youth as Sensation-Seeking, Anxiety-Sensitivity, or Negative-Thinking.

All three sites largely met these two standards in their implementation. While the structure of the program at LTL and Pasqua was somewhat less voluntary in the sense of being offered as part of a set curriculum, youth were still given the flexibility to not attend or not engage if they did not desire to participate.

All three sites also adhered to the practice of using the screening tool to categorize youth into the appropriate personality risk targets. However, none of the sites indicated that the tool was used to screen youth *out* of the program where they did not meet the cut-off on at least one scale. This is unsurprising at two of the sites where the youth were either already clients at a substance abuse treatment facility or were specifically selected because of their known difficulties with substances. At the third site, given that it was a very small school, it is possible that although all of the students were expected to participate, they also all scored above medium on at least one scale and that this was a non-issue. (The scoring data itself was unavailable for the purposes of this evaluation.)

"Seeing Oneself" is a targeted and voluntary intervention program for at-risk youth, as described in the program documentation and confirmed by the program developer (N. Comeau, personal communication, October 8, 2014). As such, it is not intended to be implemented as a mandatory prevention-oriented program to all youth regardless of risk level. While at a small school such as Pasqua First Nation High School, where all or most of the students may be in one of the risk categories and where it might be more challenging or stigmatizing to single out a small number of youth to either participate or not participate, a school-wide intervention may be appropriate. However, in a larger school such as Bert Fox, this may not be an effective distribution of resources. There is no indication in the literature or in past implementations that the participation of low-risk youth in "Seeing Oneself" is harmful or that they do not derive some benefit from it. However, a failure to score highly on a given personality dimension may reduce the relevance of the workbook experience for them.

Regarding the participant characteristics, the program was not intended to be exclusive to any particular group of youth, although it was designed for students in Grades 9 to 12 and a culturally-informed component was developed for Aboriginal youth in particular. However, the program is expected to be accessible regardless of cultural background—there are French and Cross-Cultural (non-Aboriginal-specific) versions of the workbook that were developed based on demand, which differ only in how the material is presented, not the core content (H. Van Wilgenburg, personal communication, September 24, 2014). In general it is recommended that no more than 12 students participate per personality type at a time to facilitate program delivery (N. Comeau, personal communication, October 8, 2014), although past implementations have included as high as 15 youth per session per personality type (Van Wilgenburg, 2012).

All of the sites included either entirely or mostly Aboriginal youth and the majority of youth were in the appropriate age range, although one site, Leading Thunderbird Lodge, indicating including some participants potentially as young as 10 or 11. This site also reported challenges with literacy and the ability of all youth to move through the workbook at the same pace and may benefit from splitting the program delivery into a slower-paced and faster-paced group.

Participant engagement in the process, as reported by facilitators and the youth themselves, was moderate to high. There was minimal reported drop-out, particularly at the site where participation was completely voluntary. This was consistent with reports from past implementations, where youth were initially resistant and then became engaged and appreciative of the program and its components as the process continued (Van Wilgenburg, 2010).

Summary

All three sites largely adhered to the two main standards for participant involvement—participation was voluntary and participants were screened using the measures included in the workbooks. The actual participant characteristics were also largely in-line with who the program was designed and intended for. However, further roll-out of the program should assert that the program's purpose is to provide intervention to at-risk youth rather than to be a broad preventative measure for all youth regardless of risk. Finally, attrition from the program was low and the engagement of the youth in the program was moderate to high.

Theme 4: Program Delivery

"Program delivery" refers to the process by which the program was structured and its content delivered to the participants. This includes the duration and frequency of the sessions, the setting in which the content was delivered, the program delivery format, and any additional considerations that arose at each site. There was also special attention given to the perceived strengths and challenges of the program delivery methods and recommendations for improvements.

The primary data sources for this theme were the site facilitators and administrators. Additional contextual information was provided by the interviews with the RCMP administrators and program documentation, as well as the program developer and the past evaluator of the program. Surveys with the youth also provided their insights into the strengths and the challenges of the program.

Program delivery characteristics

1) **Leading Thunderbird Lodge**

Timing, duration & frequency: Each of LTL's treatment intake cycles runs for three months. The "Seeing Oneself" component is introduced toward the end of each cycle when most of the program attrition has already occurred, which avoids assigning a workbook to a client inclined to drop-out and conserves program resources. The "Seeing Oneself" component is delivered in 1-hour increments daily during their group programming time. This typically means covering a chapter a day and finishing the program in a week (5 days), although occasionally it requires up to a week and a half if the participants need additional time with the content.

"Usually we get through everything in the workbook. Usually it's not too bad to do. Sometimes it's tougher getting them to understand the difference between positive

and negatives, like using alcohol to take away the headaches from previous drinking is not really a positive. Sometimes sitting through more than half an hour or twenty minutes can be an issue. Sometimes we will talk about something else, get their mind on something else, then try to get them back on track ("Look, there's only six pages left!"), or we'll pick it up again tomorrow."

Facilitator, Leading Thunderbird Lodge

The program began being delivered in July 2013. It was delivered in each subsequent intake for as long as there were workbooks available, which was at least four intakes in total.

Setting: The program was delivered at the LTL residential treatment facility.

Format: The program was delivered in a group format to each personality type separately, for a total of three groups at a time. The site facilitator affirmed that because other aspects of the LTL program are run with the youth separated into smaller groups, re-arranging these groups according to the risk profiles was an appropriate format to use. However, he also indicated that in the future he would break these groups down further for participants with literacy or cognitive challenges who have difficulty keeping up with the other youth, working with them separately.

Content coverage: The program was delivered based on the trained facilitator script and in the order that the workbook components were presented. The facilitator role was to guide the participants through the stories and exercises, answer questions, and support discussion.

"The first chapter is called Discovery and there's an elder's quote on the first place and that has a message. I'll read the quote and ask them what it means to them and they'll discuss it. The next page will be a story, and we'll go through that story. I explain before we start that all the stories are true, and either I'll read the story or they will. And we'll discuss the book and the pictures. The faces have no eyes or mouth so I tell them it's their book so they can fill it in how they like. Then we talk about the feelings and they'll write stuff in the section there under the topic."

Facilitator, Leading Thunderbird Lodge

The facilitator also included additional content based on his own life experiences to supplement the workbook.

"Sometimes what I'll bring in is something that happened in my life if I can, to show them that I'm no different than anyone else. Getting them to talk about their life and

things that they don't have to write on paper but they can talk about in the group, and it helps other people tell their stories, sometimes it's hard for them to open up, but as soon as they hear someone else open up, they don't feel as shy, just getting them talking."

Facilitator, Leading Thunderbird Lodge

2) **Bert Fox Community High School**

Timing, duration & frequency: There was a greater degree of variety in how the program was delivered at Bert Fox. Typically the facilitator covered one chapter per hour per day with each participant or group of participants. In one case, a student completed the entire workbook in a single day because he was on an in-school suspension. Some students covered two chapters in a single session. The scheduling of the sessions depended on the students' schedules. Typically with the facilitator's assistance they would identify a class they could miss and they would do the sessions during that time. The program was run from October 2013 to at least December 2013.

Setting: The sessions took place in the facilitator's private office area.

Format: The majority of the participants received the program in a one-on-one format, although one small group cohort was also conducted. The small group format was run with three girls who were all the same personality type and who were, in the facilitator's words, a "crusty bunch" with much in common with each other:

"It was the first group I did. I felt they would have more strength together, they were all the same workbook, they were all coming from the same kind of home life."

Facilitator, Bert Fox Community High School

Content coverage: The program was delivered based on the trained facilitator script and in the order that the workbook components were presented. The facilitator role was to guide the participants through the stories and exercises, answer questions, and support discussion. She also adapted the program delivery to the cognitive style of the youth participating. The facilitator also included additional content based on her own knowledge to supplement the workbook.

"Personal stories, not of myself necessarily but other students. Sharing stories of other kids who were like them. Even my own kids' stories sometimes. To let them know they aren't the only one. Personalizing things a little bit. I found that was very beneficial, many of the kids thought they were the only ones."

Facilitator, Bert Fox Community High School

Other elements: While the initial pilot group of three completed the program, the RCMP program coordinator provided them with 'diplomas'. For subsequent youth, there has been no similar component. It was not apparent if this was particularly beneficial or not. The facilitator at this site also gave the youth the option of keeping their workbooks at school in her office where they were allowed to access them whenever they wanted and so they did not have to remember to bring them during program delivery, or to take them home. She treated the workbooks as confidential and did not look through them. Finally, the facilitator conducted follow-up check-ins with the youth. She had easy access to them because they were still in school. Some youth "crashed", in her words, and she conducted a review of the program material with them in response.

3) Pasqua First Nation High School

Timing, duration & frequency: The program ran once according to a pre-determined schedule of five sessions spread over three months from October to December, 2013, running during regular school hours like a class.

Setting: The program was delivered in various rooms throughout the school.

Format: The program was delivered in a group format to each personality risk profile separately. Groups received the programming at the same time from multiple facilitators and, for the larger groups, two co-facilitators per group. The Sensation-Seeking group was fairly large and in the future they would consider splitting this group in two.

Content coverage: The program was delivered based on the trained facilitator script and in the order that the workbook components were presented. The facilitator role was to guide the participants through the stories and exercises, answer questions, and support discussion.

> "We would discuss what the book had in it. The book kind of leads you through it. There's a picture and you kind of discuss that, and then you're hitting the topics and you're relating to them about how they're dealing with or not dealing with issues. So with the [Anxiety-Sensitivity] ones, they'll avoid decisions. It's very dependent on student input. Once they start accepting the program, they realize that this is a normal feeling and they shouldn't be ashamed of it."
>
> *Facilitator, Pasqua First Nation High School*

As with the other sites, the facilitator also included additional content based on her own experiences to supplement the workbook.

> "I think everybody is going to put their own spin on it. I fall into the anxiety group myself so I could relate to them by using my own ways of dealing with things and they could relate to that and that helped with the buy-in factor for sure."
>
> *Facilitator, Pasqua First Nation High School*

Other elements: At the end of the program, the youth were given certificates for their participation.

Program delivery feedback

Each site interviewee was also asked to identify what they saw as the key strengths and challenges of the "Seeing Oneself" program. They were also asked to share any suggestions they had for changes or improvements to the program. The majority of this feedback pertained to either the content or the structure of the program. (Comments which pertained to other aspects of the program have been reported under their relevant theme.)

- **Strengths**

Workbook design: The design of the workbook itself was also noted by some respondents as being a highlight of the program.

> "The most useful thing was the layout of the book with the different chapters and areas, colour-coordinated, set up to nice to follow and take in. Just about anybody can facilitate because of the way it was set up."
>
> *Facilitator, Leading Thunderbird Lodge*

> "Kids don't get workbooks nowadays, everything is handouts and photocopies, and kids like getting something that is their own. So to have the workbooks and the fact that they are youth friendly, with elder statements and the kid-generated artwork."
>
> *Facilitator, Bert Fox Community High School*

Relevance of the program to the youth: The program was also described as being highly relevant to youths, including by one student participant.

> "It was interesting about the stories because they were actually from people, not made up by adults. The books definitely have meaning for the clients that they have. It's good that way, they learn more about themselves and why they do certain things because of the kind of person they are."
>
> *Facilitator, Leading Thunderbird Lodge*

> "The one thing I liked about seeing oneself is it was really similar to my life. Back home when I get bored when I stay in one place I'll get up and leave the place and go and see some friend and get high or have a casual drink."
>
> *Youth, Bert Fox Community High School*

Positive-focused approach: A number of respondents, including two student participants, indicated their preference for the positive, non-punitive approach of the program. There were also references to the fact that the program is oriented toward harm reduction and skill-building.

> "[What surprised you about the program?] That we were allowed to take this program instead of being kicked out."
>
> *Youth, Bert Fox Community High School*
>
> "No one was judging us or making us feel guilty."
>
> *Youth, Bert Fox Community High School*
>
> "One of the things we love about it is that a lot of programs, many of them preach abstinence. With 'Seeing Oneself', the harm reduction approach, knowing that these kids have already made some of these choices, scare tactics don't work with them. These kids already know that the world won't end when they use marijuana. It's a bigger picture program. It doesn't shame them for the choices that they've made. The program addresses changing thoughts, getting back on track. A lot of the kids are under the impression that when they mess up they are done. "
>
> *Facilitator, Bert Fox Community High School*
>
> "It's different because it's geared toward youth who are already getting trouble. It's exactly what we need to deal with youth and change behaviors before they get more involved in crime. More effective than handcuffs and jail."
>
> *Program coordinator, RCMP "F" Division*
>
> "What I liked about it was that it was targeted to the three different groups of people and gave them skills they can use throughout their life."
>
> *Former principal, Pasqua First Nation High School*

Workbook content: In addition to the design of the workbook, several respondents also commented positively on the content of the workbooks, particularly the cultural components.

> "[What did you like about the program?] There is a lot of teachings in the books."
>
> *Youth, Leading Thunderbird Lodge*
>
> "I liked the elder quotes, and the teachings in there."
>
> *Youth, Leading Thunderbird Lodge*
>
> "I liked talking about goals and how to get there."
>
> *Youth, Bert Fox Community High School*
>
> "The culture part, getting them back into the culture, that's something we're trying to do, and the quotes and the teaching and stuff, and it's nice."
>
> *Facilitator, Leading Thunderbird Lodge*
>
> "It's Canadian. And I love the incorporation of Aboriginal culture and teaching and messages."
>
> *Program coordinator, RCMP "F" Division*

Other strengths: One individual mentioned that they appreciated the way the program could be adapted to many cultural backgrounds. Another noted that the program was also relevant to the facilitators in addition to the youth.

> "It's a broader perspective. It's not just one cultural dynamic that's involved in the content. It's well-rounded and it can be adapted to other cultural contexts as well."
>
> *Program coordinator, RCMP "F" Division*
>
> "I think the biggest strength for us is that we could see ourselves in these groups and that's the group we were drawn to facilitate. And so not only did the students learn, we learned along with them and we were able to relate to it."
>
> *Former principal, Pasqua First Nation High School*

Regarding the cultural components of the program and the relevancy of the program to the youth, it is worth noting that the program developer also sees these as key aspects of the program. There is literature available which details the process by which Canadian Aboriginal community members and youth collaborated with the program developers to provide a culturally-relevant understanding and content to the program design (see Comeau et al, 2005). In the program developer's own words:

> "The qualitative research that was behind the methodology to developing this approach was very important. The interviews with the youth that were high in these dimensions, these stories fuelled the program. That plus the elders. These gave the

program a life that is as important as the quantitative evidence that helped justify the program.

> "There's a lot of things that can count as knowledge and success can be measured in many ways. Every effort has been made so that the youth and the elders' voices can be heard in the program. That's important because the youth recognize something in the program. It's not something that's evolved from an academic, white, Western researcher whose life is quite removed from an Inuit or an inner-city Toronto youth. Young people have contributed so much."
>
> *"Seeing Oneself" program developer*

- **Challenges**

Time requirement: Some respondents indicated that it was difficult to make time for the program.

> "Just that extra time that we have to put. It fits into the curriculum, but we still have still have to squeeze it in."
>
> *Former principal, Pasqua First Nation High School*

> "It would be nice to have more time to offer it. If it does move off of pilot, I could do it all day every day and I have other things to do."
>
> *Facilitator, Bert Fox Community High School*

Delivering the program to youth with low literacy: One respondent reported difficulty with helping low-literacy youth engage in the program.

> "It's not always a good program for people who have trouble reading and writing, understanding the quotes, doing the exercises. It can make it tougher for them to work with it that way. Sometimes Grade 6 is the max level that they understand. We have kids who are at a kindergarten level."
>
> *Facilitator, Leading Thunderbird Lodge*

The issue of program accessibility was raised with the program developer who indicated that it was a known issue which is typically addressed during the facilitator training.

> "It's still possible to do as part of the process. It's definitely a challenge. Usually the facilitators have some experience with this. This is also covered in the training itself.

The 'rainbow' holistic approach to Aboriginal literacy is a background for the development of the program."

"Seeing Oneself" program developer

Challenges perceived by youth: The youth respondents were also given an opportunity to identify the components of the program they found difficult. It should be noted that these responses do not represent flaws within the program, but rather reflect the students' perspectives of the aspects that were hardest for them.

"[What was the hardest part of the program?] Saying some of the stuff to [the facilitator] that I had not shared with anyone."

Youth, Bert Fox Community High School

"Being honest with [the facilitator]. But turned into good thing."

Youth, Bert Fox Community High School

"Looking at my behavior and how I am screwing up."

Youth, Bert Fox Community High School

"Understanding who you really are."

Youth, Leading Thunderbird Lodge

"The situation you have to make up."

Youth, Leading Thunderbird Lodge

"The circle of life where you have to put mental physically spiritually and emotionally."

Youth, Leading Thunderbird Lodge

- **Respondent suggestions**

More incentives/merchandising: Some respondents suggested that more interest in the program could be generated with the use of merchandising or other incentives. A similar approach has been used in the New Brunswick implementation of the program (V. Wolfeagle, personal communication, November 6, 2014), where communities have been able to offer promotional items or have included cultural activities, such as drum-making or other events, after the "Seeing Oneself" sessions to encourage program participation. Similar strategies were also recommended and in some cases implemented in the Community Cadet Corps program, with the use of incentives such as uniforms and pins

to both encourage youths' interest and to recognize their achievements (Jewell & Camman, 2014).

> "There's nothing really that they can do to increase the youth's motivation. Maybe prizes or something for completing it."
>
> *Facilitator, Leading Thunderbird Lodge*
>
> "One thing is for there to be some merchandising to go along with it so they can do community fundraising, similar to D.A.R.E., and give things to the participants/people running the program. They'd love it, they want that kind of stuff, it's an achievement."
>
> *Program coordinator, RCMP "F" Division*

More audio-visual content: One respondent was in favour of the increased use of audio-visual media content in the program delivery, such as videos of Elders presenting, partly as a means of making the program more accessible to participants with lower literacy levels.

> "The video part would be nice, possibly for the ones who can't understand the words, adding in more pictures and making it easier to comprehend. A lot of them need those pictures, you can't just talk about that stuff. There are some pictures in there, but if there was more it would probably add. When you're trying to explain what to do in the exercises, it can be more difficult to do for the ones who don't understand or comprehend very well."
>
> *Facilitator, Leading Thunderbird Lodge*
>
> "We initially tried to get funding to videotape the elders at LTL to explain the message and make that part of the training (both in English and in his language), but we never got the funding to do, and I thought that would be nice, would add something to the program in general."
>
> *Facilitator, Leading Thunderbird Lodge*

- *Expanded language options*: One respondent suggested that offering the program in additional languages would be useful.

> "I mentioned to someone else before the possibility of doing it in a bunch of different languages. Cree or Salteaux. There's so much that can be lost in translation, so a lot of different languages and delivering it in the youth's own culture as well. Right now it's just certain elders from Saskatchewan and Manitoba, so having elders from certain areas, just for more teachings."
>
> *Facilitator, Leading Thunderbird Lodge*

Fidelity to "Seeing Oneself" program design

One of the intended features of the "Seeing Oneself" is to be highly flexible in delivery mode. In the early testing of the program, it was typically delivered in two 90-minute workshops (Conrod et al., 2006, 2008, 2011; Mushquash et al., 2007). In some versions it was also offered as four 45-minute sessions in order to better suit the school schedule and to help retain student interest (Comeau et al., 2005, Van Wilgenburg, 2012). It is not uncommon for the program to be delivered in school settings, but it has also been delivered in residential settings as well, including correctional settings (Van Wilgenburg, 2010, 2011). Both group and one-on-one formats are acceptable, although it was recommended that groups do not exceed 12 to 15 participants at a time. It was also recommended to not deliver multiple workbooks at the same time (N. Comeau, personal communication, October 8, 2014). All of the program delivery modes reported at each site fell within these parameters.

It was confirmed by the program developer that the most critical component of program delivery is that all of the content is covered in order.

> "There's a great deal of flexibility which allows the facilitator to take a lot of ownership over the program and to build on their existing connection with the youth. Following the book in order is the core and the structure of the book allows for structure for the facilitators and for treatment integrity. … The best practice is to follow the script with each step in the process as the base guide. And that will allow for the integrity of the program to remain consistent."
>
> *"Seeing Oneself" program developer*

All of the sites reported fidelity to this aspect of the program delivery process.

Regarding the inclusion of additional related content (or recommendations to do so), particularly in terms of supplemental cultural knowledge, this was encouraged by the program developer as a means to further enhance the program, as was the inclusion of follow-up support. Follow-up support was also identified as a recommendation made by site facilitators in a prior implementation of the program (Van Wilgenburg, 2010, 2011).

> "[Involving elders] would only strengthen the program and help bridge the knowledge that the youth is getting with the traditional teachings. … We have tried to identify relevant cross-cultural and across community teachings while still respecting the important differences that exist. It's not a problem to add sessions or information as long as the core content is still covered. We can't assume to know or impose the cultural context on all the communities."
>
> *"Seeing Oneself" program developer*

"The program, as a brief intervention, can only do so much unless it's linked to further resources in the community and the school. Involving the youth in leisure activities, on-going relationship between youth and the facilitator—most people interested in being trained as facilitators are already interested in this. Having the on-going support is a good best practice, and linking to existing resources and activities."

"Seeing Oneself" program developer

Summary

Overall, all sites reported appropriate levels of fidelity to the intended "Seeing Oneself" program design in how the program was delivered at each site. The level of variation in the different program modalities reflects the overall flexibility of the program in being adapted to the structure and needs of each site. The identified strengths and challenges of the program were consistent with those identified in past implementations. Overall many more program strengths were reported than program challenges and uptake of the program at each site was fairly positive.

Theme 5: Program Outcomes

"Program outcomes" refers to the changes which were expected to occur as a result of the program as well as those changes which were actually observed. Data for this theme were obtained from all sources, including primary and supplemental interviews, youth surveys, and document and literature reviews.

Background on outcome evaluation

Outcome evaluation, or the systematic assessment of what changes in the client population or their relevant context have been achieved and to what degree these changes can be attributed to the program's operations (Rossi, Lipsey, & Freeman, 2004; Wholey et al., 2004), is often at the forefront of what evaluation stakeholders desire from evaluation activities. However, it is often the case that, at the time that outcome evaluation is requested, the necessary foundational work which such an evaluation requires has not been completed.

For an outcome evaluation to be successful in accurately determining if the program's objectives have been achieved, and, if so, if they have been achieved at least in part due to the program's activities, a number of elements must already have been determined. First, it must be established clearly what the program's objectives are and what specific activities the program will undertake to achieve objectives. This is typically outlined in the program's logic model and accompanying program theory prior to implementation (Wholey et al., 2004). Next, it must be determined if the program has been implemented in practice according to its model, as a poorly-implemented program cannot be expected to generate the intended results. Finally, the outcome evaluation must be planned such that the necessary data on the relevant indicators which

represent the program's objectives will be available. The specific data required depends on the design of the outcome evaluation, the indicators selected, and other logistical considerations.

With respect to the "Seeing Oneself" evaluation, a number of these components were missing at the outset of this report. This is not uncommon when evaluation is incorporated late in a program's implementation, and many useful evaluations are still conducted under less-than-ideal circumstances (Patton, 2008). However, the absence of well-defined and measureable objectives for the pilot and lack of evaluator involvement in the pilot planning process have limited the available options for conducting outcome evaluation in this case. While certain components of the "Seeing Oneself" program have been thoroughly and rigorously tested and evaluation, including the training process and the program content itself, the larger implementation scheme that was piloted in Saskatchewan is not as well defined. Many of its components have been developed at the discretion of the RCMP and site stakeholders, and its overall likelihood of success cannot be determined in the present evaluation.

What follows is the documentation of what objectives were expected by the various stakeholders interviewed, and anecdotal evidence of the achievement of these objectives. It should be noted that, from an evaluation standpoint, anecdotal evidence is not irrelevant or invalid and can contain many important insights into the value of a program when reviewed in the context of other findings (Patton, 2014). However, if a higher standard of evidence is desired, then a more extensively-planned outcome evaluation must be conducted.

Expected outcomes

A number of expected outcomes were identified by various respondents, the majority of which were focused on the youth themselves and short-term changes. Some expected outcomes were defined at the organizational level or reflected more long-term changes.

- **Expected outcomes for youth**

Increased self-awareness and self-knowledge: Respondents believed that youth would gain more insight into themselves and the reasons behind their actions as a result of their participation in the program.

> "The goal is for youth to look deeper within themselves and ask themselves why they make certain choices. "Seeing Oneself" really is a very good name. It gets them to examine themselves a little bit. As adolescents they are at the age of making decisions and starting to change."
>
> *Facilitator, Bert Fox Community High School*

> "It's really having youth look at why they use drugs and alcohol. That breaks it down to, 'Why am I doing this and are there other choices I could be making?'"
>
> *Program coordinator, RCMP "F" Division*
>
> "A lot of it is seeing how they are and that not everyone is this way and there are other ways and that people are different and it's okay to be different."
>
> *Facilitator, Leading Thunderbird Lodge*
>
> "For them to self-identify their problems and their lack of dealing or not dealing with an issue. Why they're choosing to make a risky decision, such as drug use, alcohol use, or why they're pulling away from programs or not going to school."
>
> *Facilitator, Pasqua First Nation High School*

More positive coping & decision-making skills: It was also reported by several interviewees that, as a result of this increased awareness and knowledge, they expected youth would learn new skills for making positive decisions and coping with adverse situations more constructively.

> "My goal was that we assist the students to make better choices in life, to make good positive choices in life."
>
> *Former principal, Pasqua First Nation High School*
>
> "To me it's about giving the kids different tools rather than using drugs. It doesn't come out and say don't do, don't do, here's your personality type, here's why you use drugs, here are positive ways that you can get the same feelings. It gives kids options."
>
> *Former Officer in Charge of Community Policing, RCMP "F" Division*
>
> "I see it as a tool to help with substance use, and why they are using it for certain situations and masking the issues and this brings out the kind of reasons why you're doing things. It's not just a matter of all the negative things, but there are positive ways of dealing with things."
>
> *Facilitator, Leading Thunderbird Lodge*
>
> "They see that they aren't alone, that how they choose to cope aren't the only ways, they see how they can choose differently, and working through that process."
>
> *Program coordinator, RCMP "F" Division*
>
> "If we can get some of these kids thinking and changing, that's only going to make their decisions more positive."
>
> *Facilitator, Bert Fox Community High School*

Fewer antisocial & more prosocial behaviours: In the slightly more long-term, it was believed that youth would overall be more likely to engage in prosocial behaviours and less likely to engage in antisocial or risky behaviours, around substance abuse in particular. This expectation was tempered for some by the awareness that this effect may not be universal.

> "The goal of the program is to assist youth in evaluating the reasons why they use and explore different choices. Basically to change their behaviors through a process of self-examination. …. I'd expect to see that they choose differently, curb their behaviors to be more positive, more focused on future goals and achieving them."
>
> *Program coordinator, RCMP "F" Division*
>
> "Providing students with additional tools to deal with getting older. So they don't become a statistic, not getting arrested, dealing with the drug use, the alcohol use."
>
> *Facilitator, Pasqua First Nation High School*

- **Expected outcomes for RCMP and community**

Crime and substance abuse prevention: Closely tied with the expectation that youth will engage in less antisocial and risky behaviour was the expectation by several respondents that this could translate into reductions in youth crime rates and alcohol and substance abuse among youth.

> "It is about drug use awareness in Saskatchewan. It is about prevention or getting someone off that path. If we got one person off that path, it's successful. If one person doesn't become an addict or doesn't get in trouble with drugs because they took that program, then it's worth it."
>
> *Former Officer in Charge of Community Policing, RCMP "F" Division*
>
> "The expectation is that the youth participating in the training will change their behavior about drugs and alcohol and ultimately reduce crime involvement in their communities."
>
> *Business case prepared by program coordinator, RCMP "F" Division*

Increased community capacity for supporting youth: The presence of the program itself was described by some interviewees as having the effect of increasing available resources to support youth in the community. This is to some extent an *output*, or direct consequence of the program's activities being in place regardless of the actual success of the program, rather than a traditional *outcome*, or a change in status expected to persist

after the program's activities themselves have ended, though one respondent did describe capacity-building as a longer-term change.

> "It was trying to fill that niche where we didn't have anything where people were using drugs and we didn't know how to get them off them without sending them to a treatment centre."
>
> *Former Officer in Charge of Community Policing, RCMP "F" Division*
>
> "The goal is to get kids some help. Nothing is more disheartening than parents asking for help and there not being any services for them."
>
> *Facilitator, Bert Fox Community High School*
>
> "To have kids return to the community as a teacher or a justice worker and be able to implement this program as well, and the community helping itself."
>
> *Facilitator, Pasqua First Nation High School*

Reported outcomes

Respondents were also asked to share their perceptions of any outcomes that they witnessed or perceived which they attributed at least in part to the presence of the program. It should be noted again that in the present evaluation it was not possible to verify these outcomes by other sources of evidence or link them directly to program activities. Therefore generalization from these results should be cautious. These reported outcomes may also not reflect the experiences of all those who take part in the program. It is also difficult in these circumstances to determine the longevity of these effects and if the perceived short-term effects will lead to longer-term sustained changes in the youth and their communities.

- **Reported outcomes for youth**

    Increased knowledge: The majority of the surveyed youth were able to report at least one element of the program content which they retained. While this is a modest outcome in terms of the overall change demonstrated, it does confirm that some youth were aware of and able to retain the program information.

> "[What did you learn from Seeing Oneself?] Positive and negative spiral and hot thoughts. "
>
> *Youth, Leading Thunderbird Lodge*
>
> "That my brain is not fully developed yet and I may get addicted."
>
> *Youth, Bert Fox Community High School*

> "I learned I have a long list of goals."
>
> *Youth, Leading Thunderbird Lodge*
>
> "That my feelings are connected to my behavior."
>
> *Youth, Bert Fox Community High School*
>
> "The spiritual teachings."
>
> *Youth, Leading Thunderbird Lodge*

Increased self-awareness: All of the facilitators and site administrators indicated that there were improvements in the participants' levels of self-awareness.

> "They can see why their behaviours are a certain way. The biggest change would be the insight into themselves … They started to understand themselves and saw those ways of changing. We have had a lot of people when they leave, their parents and guardians say they've seen a big change in them."
>
> *Facilitator, Leading Thunderbird Lodge*
>
> "Kids being able to see what it was within their own personalities, that they had more control over things than they initially thought they did. It made them stop and think which is hard for teenagers to do."
>
> *Facilitator, Bert Fox Community High School*
>
> "They were more aware of what was going on and how they were dealing with other things. They could see poor behavior in other students and call that out."
>
> *Facilitator, Pasqua First Nation High School*

Improved decision-making & coping: A number of respondents also reported positive changes in the participants' decision-making abilities and coping skills. These were not limited strictly to substance abuse-related decisions. Youth were reported as being better able to deal with issues such as suicide and sexuality, being more aware of their resources and able to communicate their needs better.

> "Every single one of them got better at advocating for themselves—being able to come in and ask for help, even if it's in academics or personal health, and they were able to ask for what they need and ask for that help from me. … Some of them have been able to use words instead of behavior to say what's wrong to the teachers or the EA or the principal, in addition to me. They know their resources in the building better."
>
> *Facilitator, Bert Fox Community High School*

> "A young man was talking about suicide and we rallied around him and we just, kinda, yeah. That came up just shortly after the program. It wasn't a result of the program but I think when we started talking to him, he did have extra tools on how to deal with that stuff."
>
> *Former principal, Pasqua First Nation High School*
>
> "One of them decided to become sexually active and then reflected that it was a bad decision and decided to wait for later and was able to work through that. They are making some decisions about school, goal setting, looking at life as a bigger picture."
>
> *Facilitator, Bert Fox Community High School*

One facilitator recounted the experience of a participant who, after the program, asked to be admitted into treatment for substance use. The facilitator described this as a success for the program, but it should be noted that ultimately the young man did not receive treatment because of the time it took to place him in treatment (a week). This points to an important contextual limitation of the program's ability to achieve its intended outcomes—while the program may increase youth's coping and decision-making skills, if the necessary infrastructure to support these skills is not present in their communities, the ultimate impact of the program may be diluted or unrealized.

> "One of the biggest successes was this 15 year old boy who three months after the fact, he said to a teacher, 'I need to go and talk to [the facilitator]' and he came and begged me to get him into treatment. That was empowering for him and a huge moment. The language that he was able to use, he was sick and tired of seeing where his family was going, and he wanted to be a better dad when the time came, and he was tired of letting things slide and smoking drugs all the time, and he literally begged to go into treatment. If he could have gotten in that day, he and his mum would have. It took about a week and by that time he had gotten involved into a hockey tournament that he needed to go to practices for, so he hasn't gone into treatment yet. It was not immediate enough for him."
>
> *Facilitator, Bert Fox Community High School*

Another facilitator commented on the fact that he could not with certainty attribute some of the changes he identified to the "Seeing Oneself" program itself.

> "They have a better understanding of the person or characteristics that they are. They have better ways of coping with things. It's hard to say specific to this program that it's the main reason they're doing better. We haven't really asked youth what part of the program helped them most."
>
> *Facilitator, Leading Thunderbird Lodge*

Reduced substance use: Reductions in substance use were reported at one site by both the facilitator and by the student participants who took part in the survey. It is important to note that there was no outright cessation of substance use behaviour among the youth, which may be expected with the harm reduction model of the program.

> "I don't come to school high as much."
>
> *Youth, Bert Fox Community High School*
>
> "I try to get high less and watch my friends who may be using too much."
>
> *Youth, Bert Fox Community High School*
>
> "I get high less during the school day."
>
> *Youth, Bert Fox Community High School*
>
> "They used to come to school every day and get stoned at school. After the program they weren't coming back high, which doesn't mean they weren't getting stoned at all."
>
> *Facilitator, Bert Fox Community High School*

More prosocial behaviour: There were also increases in prosocial behaviour reported across the sites, in terms of better attitudes and more respectful social behaviour. One facilitator specifically noted that the observed changes were above and beyond the effects of the regular programming the youth had received in the past.

> "The risk takers got more respectful. The negative thinkers started speaking up more, a little more vocal. … I think of the one young man who instead of just thinking about himself, toward the end of the school year was thinking about others and being more appreciative of others."
>
> *Former principal, Pasqua First Nation High School*
>
> "A few people's attendance improved. No one's got worse."
>
> *Facilitator, Bert Fox Community High School*
>
> "Some of them are talking about getting home and using right away, so you know the chance of them doing well. Then there are clients that will give you a hug and cry. And during the time when they have home visits, parents will notice their manners. We've seen this before, but this adds another dimension. They can deal with their behaviours better. These are new changes since the program has been brought in."
>
> *Facilitator, Leading Thunderbird Lodge*

Positive relationships with adult role models: Finally, a few respondents reported that the youth also benefited from developing more positive relationships with the program facilitators, though it is not clear if this is strictly due to the program content or an incidental benefit.

> "They were a lot more open with me. They weren't so standoffish. But that's going to happen anyways after you go into the school."
>
> *Facilitator, Pasqua First Nation High School*
>
> "For three girls, my relationship with them completely changed. I'm their go-to person now. There's a real bond now. It went beyond the drug use, it was their safety net when they chose to lose their virginity, it was a safe place that they could come."
>
> *Facilitator, Bert Fox Community High School*

Consistency with past reported outcomes

The outcomes both expected and reported from the Saskatchewan "Seeing Oneself" pilot were highly consistent with the outcomes that have been reported in the literature from past implementations of the program. For example, in a previous evaluation, there was similar anecdotal evidence for the fact that youth gained awareness and understanding of Aboriginal culture and were able to provide specific examples of their learning in the program (Van Wilgenburg, 2010, 2011). Several studies and evaluations reported reductions in problem drinking and drug use behaviours, some of which were sustained over time (Conrod et al., 2006, 2008, 2011; Mushquash et al., 2007; Van Wilgenburg, 2010, 2011). A program logic model created for a previous iteration of the program also included such predicted outcomes as relationships with positive role models, though it was not confirmed if this outcome was realized (Van Wilgenburg, 2012).

In New Brunswick, the "Seeing Oneself" program has been incorporated into a larger model of youth intervention and diversion which has been attributed as leading to reduced crime rates in that area (R. Shaw, personal communication, October 24, 2014). It should be noted that a formal evaluation of that model has not taken place and as such findings such as these should be interpreted cautiously and may not apply to Saskatchewan's implementation of the program.

Summary

Overall, the outcomes that were expected to occur in the pilot were realistic and in keeping with the types of outcomes described in the program literature. The power of the present evaluation to detect what program outcomes actually occurred was weak due to the reliance on

retrospective anecdotal data from program stakeholders. However, there is a reasonable basis to assume that at least some of the program's short-term outcomes were achieved for some of the participants. In particular, some of the youth were identified as demonstrating increased knowledge and awareness in relation to the program content, improved decision-making and coping skills, increased prosocial behaviour, and reduced substance abuse.

The extent to which these changes will be maintained over time is uncertain given the potential for other intervening factors. It is also unclear if these changes will translate into substantial effects for the surrounding communities in the form of reduced youth crime rates as this will depend greatly on the sustainability of the program over time and its ability to have long-term impacts on a sufficient number of youth. Answering these questions is beyond the scope of the present evaluation.

Theme 6: Sustainability

"Sustainability" refers to factors which have been identified as impacting the on-going operational status of the program, including what resources are necessary or beneficial to the running of the program as well as sources of support for these resources. Other findings under this theme included program interest and demand and long-term measurement and tracking of the program.

Primary data sources for this theme were interviews with site facilitators and administrators, the RCMP administrators, the program developer and evaluator, and individuals involved with separate implementations of the program, as well as a review of the program documentation and literature.

Program resources

Respondents were asked to identify what resources were necessary to the program as well as what resources would facilitate the program but were not strictly essential. Required resources included:

- **Program workbooks:** Each participating student requires their own workbook and the workbooks are not re-useable as they are designed to be interactive and personalizable.

- **Trained facilitators:** While the program is manualized, it requires a facilitator to help guide the participants through it. Currently each site has at least one trained and experienced facilitator, although staff turnover could result in the need to train additional facilitators.

- **Time and space:** For the program to operate, there must be sufficient time as well as access to an appropriate space, such as a classroom or an office. The issue of time is especially challenging when the program is being incorporated into a school curriculum or if the facilitators are delivering the program on top of rather than as part of their regular work activities. In one past implementation of the program, although 24 individuals received facilitator training, only four were able to deliver the program due to lack of support for their time (Van Wilgenburg, 2011). Time is also a factor for facilitator training as this requires leave from work to participate.

- **Funding:** This resource is related to the above resources because the workbooks themselves are an on-going expense and there is also a cost associated with training the facilitators (paid time off, paid substitutes for teachers who are being trained, the cost of the facilitator manuals, etc.).

- **Administrative support and program infrastructure:** While not necessarily heavily involved in the program itself, each site had administrative support to liaise with the RCMP, coordinate the program, arrange for training and for the program to be run at the site, etc. From the RCMP perspective, this also includes an RCMP program coordinator to continue promoting and supporting the program at an organizational level.

It should be noted that no respondent in Saskatchewan actively identified administrative support and infrastructure as an essential resource. However, a community partner involved in the current New Brunswick implementation of the program reported that although facilitators in their program all made a two-year commitment to delivering the program, in practice many of them found it difficult to sustain this commitment without support from a centralized coordinator (V. Wolfeagle, personal communication, November 6, 2014).

Resources which were not absolutely essential but were nonetheless important for the most effective implementation and sustainability of the program included:

- **Content delivery support:** Facilitators were provided with PowerPoint slides to aid in program delivery. This also covers bringing in elders and guest speakers, some of whom may require honorariums for their participation, which is another potential program cost.

- **'Train-the-trainer' training:** In addition to the facilitator training, there is an option for facilitators to be trained in how to train other facilitators, which can improve the long-term sustainability of the program by making facilitator training more accessible.

- **Promotion and awareness activities:** To increase community awareness of and buy-in to the program and to support program expansion.

- **Trainer support network:** One suggestion was made that facilitators may benefit from having access to each other through an online network where they can communicate strategies and support each other (N. Comeau, personal communication, October 8, 2014). A similar suggestion was made in regard to the Community Cadet Corps program (Jewell & Camman, 2014). Given the potential for a wide geographic dispersal of program sites across the province, providing this type of online networking support may be beneficial for more than one program.

Sources of support

In the Saskatchewan pilot of the program, the resources were provided as a joint effort between the RCMP and their community partners. According to interviews with both sets of stakeholders, the RCMP covered the costs of the workbooks and provided support through the RCMP program coordinator out of DOCAS while the individual sites covered the cost of facilitator training as well as provided the setting and the local administrative infrastructure. However, it was not apparent from any of the interviews or program documentation what the expectation was for how the program would be supported if the pilot were found to be successful and the program continued.

It was also unclear what the expected division of roles and responsibilities would be between the RCMP and the individual sites going forward, whether DOCAS would continue to be involved and to what extent, and if the community partners were aware of the RCMP's expectations in this regard. The ideal that it would be a "community-led and police-supported" program was shared in the interviews with the RCMP administrative contacts. However, as was found with the Community Cadet Corps program evaluation (Jewell & Camman, 2014), there was little clarity as to what this would look like in practice and what strategy was in place to facilitate community ownership of the program.

Similar challenges were reported in the New Brunswick "J" Division's implementation of the program as part of their larger Youth Intervention-Diversion model (R. Shaw, personal communication, October 24, 2014), in terms of their need to identify community partners who would be willing to take ownership of the program and provide the capacity to implement and track it. They addressed this challenge by involving civilian members in long-term stable positions in the community as community program officers, which minimized issues of turnover. These community program officers were also responsible for liaising with youth-serving agencies in the community who can provide the necessary infrastructure from which the program can be run. This is comparable to the recommendation made in the Community Cadet Corps

report to focus on building partnerships with existing local agencies to support the program (Jewell & Camman, 2014).

This leaves open the question of how to provide services in communities that do not have sufficient local infrastructure to support the program on their own. Some sites have also engaged additional funding sources outside of the community or the RCMP, including federal funding sources such as Health Canada (Van Wilgenburg, 2011; V. Wolfeagle, personal communication, November 6, 2014), although this funding has not necessarily been long-term.

Program demand

Related to sustainability is the question of whether there is on-going demand for the program. It was evident throughout the interview process that there was strong support for the program and considerable interest in having it continue at each of the pilot sites.

> I am hoping somebody takes ownership of it. I would have loved to have seen the school division do it, but it was too expensive. If the RCMP or Health would take this program on, get a couple of people trained that can get this program delivered, especially to rural communities, it's huge because the services lack so badly. …We knew the program was good three years ago, we just couldn't access it because it was nobody's program."
>
> *Facilitator, Bert Fox Community High School*
>
> "One of the kids was having issues in one of my classes, and I mentioned the [evaluation] interview and asked her if she thought the program should be continued, and she said, 'Yeah.' 'Why?' 'Because kids need help.' It was so blatant to her.
>
> *Facilitator, Bert Fox Community High School*
>
> I would like to bring it to my new school. I've already talked to a member at [new site] to get the program there.
>
> *Former principal, Pasqua First Nation High School*
>
> Every time I talk about the program I get goosebumps. It's a very good program. You just know the value of it. It can be something that has a life-changing impact on youth.
>
> *Program coordinator, RCMP "F" Division*

Measurement and tracking

One final consideration regarding program sustainability is measurement and tracking of program implementation standards and outcome indicators. The purpose of such tracking is to determine if the program is being implemented as intended and, if possible, if it is achieving the

desired outcomes. As noted several times in this report, the program developer of "Seeing Oneself", in partnership with another evaluator, has employed an on-going quality assurance process which assesses fidelity of the training and program implementation. This process involves some data collection which has been described in this report. However, the RCMP "F" Division has not initiated any such tracking of their own and has no assurances that meaningful and relevant data will be collected specific to the RCMP's purposes.

A similar experience occurred in the "J" Division implementation of the program (R. Shaw, personal communication, October 24, 2014), where the program has been incorporated into their larger Youth Diversion and Intervention model. Tracking procedures were not initially included in this process, which resulted in an inability to assess either the fidelity of the program implementation or the effectiveness of the program over the long-term. Attempts to implement tracking after the fact focused on identifying how many locations had the program and how many youth were being referred as a means of determining the program's scope. In terms of outcome, there was a decline in the overall youth crime rate which was attributed to the entire model. However, it should be noted that looking at aggregated rates across a broad geographic area in the absence of a planned evaluation framework is fairly weak evidence of a program effect due to the inability to rule out alternative explanations and competing factors (Patton, 2008; Rossi et al., 2004). It is also impossible to isolate the effect of any particular component of the model, such as "Seeing Oneself".

There are a number of challenges to sustained data tracking (Wholey et al., 2004). Although the pilot sites did provide performance monitoring reports, it can be difficult to persuade busy frontline staff to provide continuous detailed information on their activities over time, and there is always potential for human error in terms of the accuracy of such reporting. There must be some kind of sustained infrastructure to support the consolidation and interpretation of any data collected. The data themselves must represent meaningful indicators of relevant performance standards and outcomes, which means that relevant performance standards and desired outcomes be defined and agreed upon by stakeholders and communicated to the program sites. Process-related performance indicators (e.g., how many facilitators were trained, how many delivered the program, how many youth were involved) are typically easier to track and report than outcome indicators (e.g., how much less involvement in substances did youth have after receiving the program, how long lasting were these effects), many of which require more intensive follow-up.

At minimum, when planning future program pilots, the RCMP stakeholders must determine what, if any, data are required for internal decision-making purposes about whether and how to continue with the program, and plan the data tracking accordingly.

<u>Summary</u>

It is difficult to assess the long-term sustainability of the program in the absence of a specific plan for how the program is intended to be maintained over time. Program demand is currently high at the pilot sites, but the program requires certain on-going resources to function successfully. There was little planning evident for who is expected to provide these resources, either in terms of the RCMP or the community partners. Overall, the sustainability of the program will be determined by the ability and willingness of the program partners to invest in it.

CONCLUSIONS

The present report identified six major themes relevant to the assessment of the "Seeing Oneself" pilot in Saskatchewan. The first four themes represented four major aspects of the program implementation—site selection, facilitator selection and training, participant involvement, and program delivery—documenting what occurred in the pilot, and comparing this to the program standards and past examples of the program. The fifth theme involved an overview of the expected and observed program outcomes, comparing these to past reported outcomes related to the program. The final theme touched on issues of program sustainability, including what is required for the program to continue and addressing various considerations that will arise should the program continue.

To address the original evaluation questions specified in the introduction of this report:

1. **Was the program implemented in a manner consistent with the "Seeing Oneself" model as it has been developed in the literature?**

    Yes. As indicated in the "Fidelity" section of each of the first four themes, the program was implemented in a consistent manner to the "Seeing Oneself" program as described in the program documentation, in the associated literature and past evaluation reports, and in consultation with program experts, including the program developer.

2. **Was the program implemented in a manner appropriate to the selected sites and communities where it was piloted?**

    Yes. As discussed throughout the first four themes, the program was very well-received and perceived by all those interviewed as a successful pilot at each site with minimal adjustments required for continued implementation.

3. **What factors, if any, influence the sustainability and potential success of the program and may inform future implementations?**

    This question is more complex and cannot be answered based on a single small-scale pilot implementation of the program. What constitutes the "success" of the program from the RCMP's perspective is unclear. The program has been found in the literature to be associated with reductions in certain aspects of problem substance use among adolescents when tested in randomized control trials, with the longest follow-up period being two years (Conrod et al., 2006, 2008, 2011). In less controlled field implementations, the program has also been associated with at least short-term reductions in problem

behaviour, as well as learning and improved coping (Van Wilgenburg, 2010, 2011). The program has not yet been tested over a substantial length of time.

The likelihood that the identified program effects will be sustained over time and translate into gains large enough to be detectable in terms of reduced crime rates and overall rates of substance abuse among the youth population in Saskatchewan depends on multiple considerations. First, the program must be implemented consistently throughout the target areas, which requires the development of a sustainable plan to support program delivery, including the ability to ensure on-going program fidelity. The overview of the sixth theme identified the resources required to run the program effectively according to participating stakeholders. However, the primary issue impacting program sustainability is the lack of planning for where support for these resources will come from and what the long-term infrastructure for supporting the program will be.

Second, additional factors which may influence the desired long-term outcomes must also be taken into consideration. For example, a facilitator shared a story of a youth who, after participating in the program, asked to be entered into substance abuse treatment, which was considered a program success. However, because treatment services were not readily available, the youth did not ultimately enter treatment. This was not a failure of the program itself, but demonstrates how a lack of accessible services, as one external factor, can create a 'cap' on the program's positive effects.

It cannot be determined in the present evaluation what all of these external factors may be, the degree to which they are present in the target communities, and the extent to which they will impact the desired long-term outcomes of the program. These are issues which will require monitoring throughout the implementation of the program. The long-term presence of "Seeing Oneself" in communities alone may bring to light issues that would not otherwise have been identified.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As discussed at the beginning of this report, the intention of the present evaluation was not to provide a definitive recommendation on whether to continue the "Seeing Oneself" program or not. Rather it was to be as informative and descriptive as possible on what occurred in the pilot process and how this compared to how the program is intended and expected to operate, and to identify any potentially salient factors regarding the long-term success and sustainability of the program as implemented in Saskatchewan. It was intended these findings would inform the internal decision-making processes of the RCMP "F" Division regarding the program's future in this jurisdiction.

However, if there is interest in continuing to support the "Seeing Oneself" program in Saskatchewan, some recommendations can be made with regard to best practices for the implementation of a new program:

1. **Develop a long-term plan for how the program will be implemented and sustained.**

   Presently there exists no comprehensive plan for how the program will be rolled out to the province in a sustainable manner. This undermines the ability to ensure that the program is implemented according to appropriate standards and within reasonable expectations for what the available resources will be. The pilot process itself serves as a useful starting point for identifying what elements should be included in this plan (e.g., how will participating sites be selected, what are the expectations regarding the number of facilitators trained versus the number actually delivering the program, what if any outcome indicators should be tracked and reported).

   This plan should also include:

   a. **Well-defined roles and responsibilities for the RCMP and the community partners:** To ensure that there are no gaps or misunderstandings regarding which partner is responsible for which aspect of the program and to facilitate sustainable planning for all stakeholders. This will also support program continuity even when there is a turnover of administrative staff.

   b. **Explicit and realistic goals and objectives:** These goals and objectives should refer to both the process-related performance standards (i.e., how will the program be delivered) as well as expected outcome targets. This will facilitate program consistency over time as well as across sites. The expectations should be realistic given the resources available for the program

and should be based on plausible timelines. Appropriate and realistic means for tracking the achievement of these goals and objectives should be included as well.

2. **Communicate the plan with all relevant stakeholders.**

Community stakeholders should be aware of the larger expectations around the program as well as their own role in it. Ideally community partners will be included in the planning process itself to ensure that their perspectives and needs are represented, although depending on the scope of the implementation there may be logistical limits to the number of partners who can be included. Both administrators and frontline staff who facilitate the program should be aware of the expectations regarding the program and their respective roles and responsibilities.

3. **Involve evaluators in the planning and implementation process.**

The development of a comprehensive plan such as this is not a small task, and methodological experts should be consulted and included in the process. Evaluators can assist with the identification of realistic and meaningful goals and program standards as well as aid in the development of a system for long-term data tracking and program performance monitoring.

4. **Build relationships with invested partners that have strong leadership and sufficient capacity to support the program.**

Finally, if the long-term goal is that the RCMP will not be primarily responsible for sustaining and monitoring the program, then it will be important to begin identifying these partners and building relationships with them to support the program as early as possible. These partnerships may be with local community stakeholders, such as schools and tribal services. They may also be with other relevant government branches and departments, non-profit organizations, or other invested parties, in sectors such as health, education, and criminal justice.

It should be noted that these recommendations apply not only to the "Seeing Oneself" program but all new programming initiatives of a similar nature.

REFERENCES

Aboriginal Shield Program Resource Manual. (2013). Drugs and Organized Crime Awareness Services, RCMP.

Bert Fox Community High School. (2014). *About Our School*. Retrieved from http://www.pvsd.ca/school/bertfox/About/Pages/default.aspx

Boyatzis, R. E. (1998). *Transforming qualitative research: Thematic analysis and code development*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Braun, V. & Clark, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*(2), 77-101.

Comeau, M. N., Stewart, S. H., Mushquash, C., Wojcik, D., Bartlett, C., Marshall, M. et al. (2005). Community collaboration in developing a culturally-relevant alcohol abuse early intervention program for First Nation youth. *Ontario Association of Children's Aid Societies Journal, 49*, 39-46.

Conrod, P. J., Castellanos, N., & Mackie, C. (2008). Personality-targeted interventions delay the growth of adolescent drinking and binge drinking. *The Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 49*(2), 181-190. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2007.01826.x

Conrod, P. J., Castellanos-Ryan, N., & Mackie, C. (2011). Long-term effects of a personality-targeted intervention to reduce alcohol use in adolescents. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 79*(3), 296-306. doi: 10.1037/a0022997

Conrod, P. J., Stewart, S. H., Comeau, N., & Maclean, A. M. (2006). Efficacy of cognitive–behavioral interventions targeting personality risk factors for youth alcohol misuse. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 35*(4), 550-563.

Flick, U. (1998). *An introduction to qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Jewell, L. & Camman, C. (2014, January). *Final report: An evaluation of the Community Cadet Corps Program in Saskatchewan*. Prepared by the Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science and Justice Studies on behalf of the Royal Canadian Police "F" Division.

Leading Thunderbird Lodge. (2014). *Leading Thunderbird Lodge Youth Treatment Centre*. Retrieved from http://www.leadingthunderbirdlodge.ca/

Mushquash, C. J., Comeau, M. N., & Stewart, S. H. (2007). An alcohol abuse early intervention with Mi'kmaq adolescents. *First Peoples Child & Family Review, 3*(1), 17-26.

Pasqua First Nation. (2014). *Pasqua First Nation*. Retrieved from http://www.pasquafn.ca/home/

Patton, M. Q. (2008). *Utilization-focused evaluation* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Patton, M. Q. (2014). *Qualitative research and evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Philips, S. M. (2008, September). *Forging partnerships, opening doors: Community school case studies from Manitoba and Saskatchewan*. Prepared for the Society for the Advancement of Excellence in Education.

Royal Canadian Mounted Police. (2011). *Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE)*. Retrieved from http://www.rcmp-grc.gc.ca/docas-ssdco/prog-eng.htm

Van Wilgenburg, H. (2010). *Evaluation of Seeing Oneself Community Justice Initiative: Final report*. Prepared for The Strong Heart Teaching Lodge Inc.

Van Wilgenburg, H. (2011). *Evaluation of the Seeing Oneself Initiative in selected First Nations and Inuit Communities in Canada: Final report*. Prepared for The Strong Heart Teaching Lodge Inc.

Van Wilgenburg, H. A. (2012). *Evaluation of SEEING ONESELF® Initiative: Final Process Evaluation Report*. Winnipeg School Division. Commissioned by Strong Heart Teaching Lodge Inc. and submitted to National Crime Prevention Centre, Public Safety Canada, Ottawa, ON.

Wright, R. (2013). *"F" Division RCMP business case: Seeing Oneself*. Prepared for the "F" Division Executive Committee.

Woicik, P. A., Stewart, S. H., Pihl, R. O., & Conrod, P. J. (2009). The substance use risk profile scale: A scale measuring traits linked to reinforcement-specific substance use profiles. *Addictive Behaviors, 34*(12), 1042-1055.

APPENDIX: INTERVIEW AND SURVEY GUIDES

Key informant interviews: The interviews were semi-structured in nature and the specific questions asked depended on the individual being interviewed and their particular role in the program. The follow-up prompt questions were included and omitted as needed to elicit the desired information.

A. INDIVIDUAL/ORGANIZATIONAL BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT
1. Tell me a little bit about yourself to start. Can you fill me in on your job and what you do?
1a. From your organization's perspective, what is the intention of the program?
1b. Why did your organization agree to host the program?
2. What's your role in the Seeing Oneself program? How did you get involved in that? Why did you get involved?
3. What kind of training did you receive? What was the training like? (Location, time, content) What did you learn? Did you facilitate the program after receiving this training?
3a. IF A FACILITATOR: Was the training useful in delivering the actual program? How so? Is there anything you'd change about the training? Would you recommend it to people who will be delivering the program?
3b. IF NOT A FACILITATOR: Has the training been useful to you since you took it? How so? Is there anything you'd change about the training? Would you recommend it to people who are not delivering the program? Do you feel like you could deliver the program now?
3c. IF RECEIVED TRAIN-THE-TRAINER: Have you trained other facilitators? How did that go? Is there anything you'd change about the training? Has it been useful to you in other ways?

B. SITE-SPECIFIC PROGRAM DETAILS
4. How many times has the Seeing Oneself program run at your site?
5. How are kids selected for the program? How many kids are involved at a time? What's the age range? What's the gender distribution? What do these kids have in common with each other, if anything? How do you assign the workbooks?
6. Do they have to participate if they're selected? What's program drop-out like? If kids drop out, do you know why? How do you track attendance?
7. How does the program run? How many sessions does it take to complete?
8. Walk me through a typical session. When do you meet and for how long at a time? Where do you meet? Who provides the space? How many facilitators are involved? How do you split up between the different workbooks?
8a. Do you bring in any elements not included in the workbook/training you received? What kind of guidelines were you given for how to deliver the program? Were these useful? Was there anything you couldn't implement?
9. How do you introduce the program to the youth? How do you wrap it all up?

10. How do the youth seem to receive the program? What's their attitude toward the program like? What's their engagement like? Does this change over the course of the program? Does it change after the program?

11. What do you see as the goal of the program? How does it achieve that goal?

12. Did you see any changes in the youth while they were in the program? What kind? Did you see any changes in them after the program was done? Have they been sustained?

13. Is there anything you'd like to change about how you offer the program? Do you the program is reaching the kids who need it? Is anyone getting missed?

14. Do you have any success stories? Any particular learning moments or tough lessons?

15. What do you see as the biggest strength of the program? What's the biggest challenge?

C. BROADER PROGRAM CONTEXT/SUSTAINABILITY

16. Are you delivering other programs/services to the youth at the same time? Are you aware of other programs/services they're getting? How does these other services relate to the program you're providing?

17. What about the people who aren't in the program—are the people you work with aware of what you're doing? Is there awareness in the broader community? What's their response to the program? Are there youth who aren't involved in the program—what's their response?

18. Why was the program brought to your community/organization? What was the intention behind that? Did it meet that goal?

19. Would you like to see the program continue? Would you make any changes to it?

20. What kinds of resources do you need to keep the program running—i.e., financial, support, materials, space? What's absolutely essential (i.e., can't run without it)? What resources are needed to make the program run as well as possible (above and beyond just keeping it going)?

21. Is your program sustainable? Where do your resources come from? Is there anything you need that you have trouble getting?

D. OTHER QUESTIONS

22. What advice would you give to someone else who was interested in doing the program? How should they get started? What should they look out for? Tips for making the best of it?

23. What personal goals do you have for the program? What have you gotten out of your involvement with it?

24. Is there anything else important about the program that I haven't asked about yet?

25. Is there anyone else I should be speaking to?

Supplemental interviews: Respondents in the supplemental interviews were not given specific questions to answer, but rather were asked to comment on the six identified themes in relation to their knowledge of the "Seeing Oneself" program.

Youth surveys: The format of the surveys varied by site because of the differences in the presentation options. At Bert Fox Community High School, the facilitator administered the survey orally to the youth and collected their responses, so the format was limited to five open-ended questions. At Leading Thunderbird Lodge, youth accessed an anonymous online survey and the questions were a blend of rating scales and open-ended questions.

Bert Fox Community High School:
1. What surprised you most about the Seeing Oneself program?
2. What did you learn from the program?
3. What is the hardest thing about the program?
4. What are the ways you think you changed from doing the program?
5. What would you tell other people about the program?

Leading Thunderbird Lodge:
1. How much do you like or not like Seeing Oneself?
(Really didn't like = 1; Sort of didn't like = 2; Neither = 3; Sort of like = 4; Really like = 5)
2. What is one thing you like about Seeing Oneself?
3. What is one thing you don't like about Seeing / Oneself?
4. Is doing Seeing Oneself easy or hard? (Really easy = 1; Sort of easy = 2; Neither = 3; Sort of hard = 4; Really hard = 5)
5. What is the hardest thing about doing Seeing Oneself?
6. How much did you learn from doing Seeing Oneself? (1 = Nothing, 2 = A little; 3 =
7. What is one thing you learned from doing Seeing Oneself?
8. If someone asked you about Seeing Oneself, what would you tell them?