

2014-15 Restorative Action Program Annual Data Report

Carolyn Camman & J. Stephen Wormith

**Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science
and Justice Studies**

University of Saskatchewan



November, 2015

**2014-15 Restorative Action Program
Annual Data Report**

Prepared by:
Carolyn Camman, MA
J. Stephen Wormith, PhD

On behalf of the
Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science and Justice Studies

November, 2015

Executive Summary

This report presents the key findings from the third year of RAP's current program monitoring system. Data highlights are presented in four profiles, with key findings including:

A) Service Use Profile

- The number of students accessing RAP's services and the types of services offered by RAP workers have been largely consistent across the last three years of data collection
- RAP workers provided services to approximately 18% of students enrolled across all RAP schools
- One-on-one support was the most common type of service offered, with conflict mediation second

B) Student User Profile

- The profile of students using RAP has been highly consistent over the past three years
- As with previous years, students using RAP were most likely to be in Grades 9 or 10, slightly more likely to be female than male, and over half of them were first-time users

C) Service Partner Profile

- Self-referrals were the most common source of referrals for one-on-one cases while school administration provided the most referrals for conflict mediations
- RAP workers reported half as much collaboration this for both one-on-one cases and conflict mediations, likely due at least in part to staff turnover among RAP workers

D) Issue Profile

- Bullying was the most frequently reported key conflict indicator for both one-on-one cases and mediations
- Within bullying cases, verbal and relational bullying were the most commonly reported bullying tactics
- Peers were the most common conflict partner for one-on-one cases and mediations

As of this data collection period, no further major structural changes were identified as being required to improve the program monitoring system. However, while the present database infrastructure has been successfully streamlined and simplified, it will still require upgrading in the near future to ensure long-term sustainability, and in two years' time should be migrated to a stable centralized database application.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Review of Updates and Changes	2
2014-15 Program Data Highlights	3
A) Service Use Profile	4
B) Student User Profile	6
C) Service Partner Profile	8
D) Issue Profile	11
Summary of Results	16
Limitations and Challenges	18
References	20
Appendix A: 2014-15 Data Summary	21
Appendix B: 2014-15 Data Collection Forms	34

Introduction

This report presents the key findings from the third year of RAP's current program monitoring system. The program monitoring system itself was designed based on the results of an evaluability assessment conducted four years ago which found that there was a need for more well-defined and reliable statistics on RAP's operations (Camman & Wormith, 2011). The system was developed in consultation with RAP program administrators and staff and has undergone considerable refinement based on feedback from the first two data collection cycles (Camman & Wormith, 2013, 214).

RAP workers collect information on their services using several standardized forms:

- **Intake:** Basic demographic information (e.g., grade, gender, date of intake) for each student seen in the year.
- **One-on-one & conflict mediation:** Detailed information about the issue at hand and how it was resolved (e.g., who referred the student, what the conflict was about, what service partners were involved) for every one-on-one case and mediation.
- **Activity:** Detailed information on every group-oriented service (e.g., presentations, workshops, regular group activities, special events) provided.

The information collected on the forms is then entered into a computer database designed specifically for RAP. The hardcopy forms are stored securely and the databases themselves can only be accessed by the RAP worker assigned to that school. At the end of the school year, RAP workers submit de-identified datasets for consolidation and analysis by the evaluator. The RAP workers can also generate simple automated summary reports of their own data throughout the year for their own use.

A full summary of the data analysis is presented in Appendix A at the end of this report. This summary includes the total counts for each measured indicator as well as calculated percentages and averages where applicable. For the forms used by RAP workers to record their program data, see Appendix B.

Review of Updates and Changes

Key changes that were made following last year's assessment included:

- Inclusion of "home visit" option on one-on-one forms to allow for identification of one-on-one services that included a visit to a student's home
- Reduction of the number of conflict types from an exhaustive list to six key conflict indicators (bullying, criminal acts, physical violence, mental health issues, substance abuse, and suicidality/self-harm) to be reported on as required
- Removal of asset target categories from one-on-one, conflict mediation, and activities forms due to the lack of interpretable findings in these data
- Removal of the distinction between collaboration "after" and "during" service delivery based on feedback that this was not a meaningful distinction

The majority of changes made were in the interest of streamlining and simplifying the data collection process and reducing the burden of and potential for error in both data entry and data analysis with the goal of making the program monitoring system more sustainable while still providing actionable information on the most critical features of the program. Other small adjustments were made with the goal of increasing the RAP workers' capacity to report on and describe their services accurately, or to correct errors and improve the functioning of the database.

Following the 2014-15 school year, no new major structural changes to the program monitoring system were identified. Two small updates which will be made are those requested by RAP workers to help report their services more accurately:

- Creation of a "positive contact" option to identify when a contact with a student did not involve any kind of conflict
- Inclusion of "meeting" as a fifth activity type to address scenarios where RAP workers are spending considerable time in meetings with parents or school staff to discuss students' needs

Otherwise, there are expected to be no further major conceptual changes to how the program data are collected from this point forward, which will greatly facilitate accurate and meaningful comparisons of findings from year to year.

2014-15 Program Data Highlights

Highlights of the analysis are presented here in four categories:

- A) Service use profile:** Degree of student participation in RAP and volume of service delivery.
- B) Student user profile:** Characteristics of students accessing the one-on-one and mediation services.
- C) Service partner profile:** Nature and frequency of the involvement of service partners.
- D) Issue profile:** Nature and frequency of specific issues and conflicts addressed by RAP workers.

A) Service Use Profile

The service use profile refers to the overall usage of RAP services throughout the school year. The three primary RAP services are 1) one-on-one support, 2) conflict mediation, and 3) various activities, such as classroom presentations and workshops, school events, and regular programming offered within the school setting.

Participation in services such as one-on-one support and conflict mediation is tracked via the completion of intake forms, which also include information about students' characteristics, such as grade and demographics. In addition to one-on-one support and mediations, RAP workers may also complete intake forms for students who receive other services, such as providing attendance information to authorized external agencies or acting as a liaison. Intake forms are not required for students who participate in activities such as classroom presentations, school events, or group programming.

In 2014-15, RAP workers completed intakes forms for **1,068 students**. Of these students, 1001 received one-on-one support for one or more issues and 327 participated in one or more one conflict mediations. These numbers represent an increase from the previous two years (see Table 1), which is largely attributable to the fact that a new school (Holy Cross) was added to the roster of RAP schools in 2014. When this increase in the baseline student population is controlled for, increases in the number of students receiving services become negligible.

Table 1. Comparison of student service use across three years.

Total students receiving...	2014-15	2014-15 (adjusted)	2014-13	2012-13**
... any service*	1068	955	915	741
... one-on-one support	1001	890	900	721
... conflict mediation	327	276	246	300

*Excluding activities such as classroom presentations, school events, special programming, etc., where intake forms are not required.

**Pilot year data were incomplete due to technical difficulties, resulting in possibly underestimates.

Though there was no direct access to school enrolment data, most RAP workers were able to provide figures for each of their schools based on official numbers. The accuracy of these data could not be independently verified and one school's data could not be included. However, enrolment at the remaining seven schools was reported to be 6,029 students in total, which means that these RAP workers completed intake forms for approximately 18% of the student population, comparable to the 15% figure reported in 2012-13 (enrolment data for the 2013-14 school year was not collected).

In terms of the services themselves, the **most frequent service offered by RAP workers was one-on-one support**, consistent with past years (see Table 2). Conflict mediations and presentations were also relatively frequent, consistent with past years.

Table 2. Comparison of service delivery across three years.

Total instances of...	2014-15	2014-15 (adjusted)	2014-13	2012-13*
... one-on-one support	1735	1555	1719	1407
... conflict mediation	222	193	143	184
... presentations	123	114	83	77
... workshops	23	22	20	25
... regular programming	45	45	48	42
... special events	40	40	66	23
... other activities	28	28	-**	17

* Pilot year data were incomplete due to technical difficulties.

** "Other" activities were not included as a category option in 2013-14.

Overall, service delivery trends are fairly consistent across the three years of data collection. There is a trend for an increasing number of presentations, but otherwise **service delivery levels have remained steady** or have fluctuated moderately in either direction. Also, as with previous years, the trend has been for the majority of youth to be engaged in a single one-on-one case or conflict mediation, with a small proportion requiring multiple services or on-going support throughout the school year.

RAP workers were also asked to report how many follow-up contacts are made for each of their one-on-one cases. The nature of follow-up contacts can range from brief hallway check-ins to lengthy sit-down sessions. Overall, the total number of reported follow-up contacts for this school year was 2,475, with 50% of cases involving at least one follow-up. This represents a small proportionate increase from last year, where follow-up contacts were reported for 46% of one-on-one cases (1,890 contacts total).

B) Student User Profile

The stated intention of RAP is to be used by a wide range of students for a wide range of issues (Camman & Wormith, 2011). In general, program data have confirmed that the demographic profile of RAP's student users is fairly broad. Some trends have emerged in terms of which students are most likely to require support from RAP workers, and the present year's findings are consistent with those of the previous two years' data collection.

Overall, **RAP users are most likely to be female, in Grades 9 or 10, and a first-time user of the program** (see Table 3). RAP also provides services to a relatively consistent proportion of students who are either new Canadians (defined as having resided in Canada for 4 years or less) or who are First Nations, Inuit, or Métis, though, as with past years, it is not possible without external reference data to confirm if these students are being seen in numbers proportionate to their representation within the schools overall.

Table 3. Comparison of student demographic profile across three years.

Student Characteristics		2014-15	2014-13	2012-13
Gender	Female	53%	52%	55%
	Male	46%	47%	44%
	Other gender	1%	1%	0.3%
Grade	Grade 9	30%	32%	36%
	Grade 10	29%	28%	27%
	Grade 11	21%	19%	21%
	Grade 12	18%	19%	16%
	Elementary	1%	-	-
	No Grade	0.3%	1%	-
	First-Time RAP User	57%	52%	-
User with Regular Check-ins	16%	13%	-	
In Non-Mainstream Class (e.g., Bridges)	4%	5%	6%	
New Canadian	8%	10%	7%	
First Nations/Inuit/Métis	26%	33%	30%	

Overall trends in the **student profiles have been strongly consistent across all tracked indicators** over the past three data collection periods.

One notable finding not apparent in the aggregate data presented above is the relationship between the gender of the RAP worker and the gender of the student users. Although on the whole there has only been a slight tendency for female students to access the program more than male students, when analyzed by individual school, the actual proportions can vary somewhat more considerably, with either male or female students being represented in the 55-65% range compared to students of the other gender (excluding the very small proportion of students who identify as neither male nor female). The trend that has been observed in the two previous data collection periods is for schools with male RAP workers to tend to have higher proportions of male students accessing RAP, and similarly for female students at schools with female RAP workers.

In the past, it was unclear if this was coincidental or the result of some other difference between sites (Camman & Wormith, 2014). However, in the current school year, two schools which previously were supported by a male RAP worker are now supported by a female RAP worker. In the resulting data, the proportion of male-to-female student users has shifted at those schools as well, from a slight bias toward male students to a slight bias toward female students. These findings suggest that **the gender of the RAP worker is a small but significant factor in determining the gender of students accessing the program.**

It remains unclear whether this is due more to the students' own preferences, the actions of the RAP workers themselves, or some other combination of factors. The disparity itself is not excessive, with the maximum disparity at an individual school being 64% of users having the same gender as their RAP worker, and other schools as low as 53%. Overall, this type of gender disparity may not be completely avoidable, especially if students are typically more comfortable seeking support with personal issues from someone of the same gender. However, this variability in the indicator should continue to be monitored in case of further disparities. RAP workers may also attempt to increase their engagement with students of the opposite gender.

C) Service Partner Profile

RAP workers offer many of their services in partnership with other staff and service providers in the school. There are three major ways in which service partners contribute to RAP's operation: 1) providing referrals of students to RAP workers, 2) collaborating directly with RAP workers in providing services to students, and 3) receiving referrals from RAP workers to provide services beyond RAP's scope.

As with previous years, **providing referrals and direct collaboration are the most common type of service partner involvement in RAP** (see Table 1), whether as part of one-on-one support or conflict mediation. Providing referrals to RAP was especially vital, with 93% of one-on-one cases and 86% of conflict mediations arising as a result of a referral. Similarly, 78% of activities were initiated by someone other than the RAP worker.

Table 4. Distribution of service partner involvement by role, service and year.

Service Partner Role		2014-15	2014-13	2012-13*
Referral source	One-on-one	93%	86%	91%
	Mediation	86%	95%	97%
	Activity*	78%	67%	-
Collaborator	One-on-one	28%	47%	-
	Mediation	29%	57%	-
	Activity	53%	52%	-
Referred to	One-on-ones-	7%	7%	-
	Mediation	1%	0%	-
	Activity	-	-	-

* Activities have "initiators", rather than referral sources. Activities also do not result in referrals.

Although only two years of data were available on the latter two indicators, one identifiable change was a substantial drop in the frequency with which RAP workers reported collaborating with service partners in delivery of one-on-one support and conflict mediations. Closer analysis of the school-by-school data revealed that this was partly attributable to RAP staff turnover. The schools with the lowest reported levels of collaboration (in some cases as low as 1% of all cases) were also those which had new RAP workers as of this year. Because these workers were new to their roles and to their schools, they likely did not have the same established relationships as other RAP workers to draw upon in delivering the program, reducing their opportunities for collaboration. This situation will likely not persist as they become more established in their schools.

It should be noted, however, that reported collaborations were also lower by as much as half at some schools which did not experience RAP staff turnover this year, and the reasons for this are not clear. It is also possible that the previous year's data were not an accurate benchmark and that these indicators will fluctuate over time. Further monitoring of these indicators is required.

There are a large number of potential service partner categories, with roles ranging from teachers and administration to specialized staff such as home-school coordinators and school resource officers to community members, parents, and students themselves. Results for all service partner categories are included in the appendix at the end of this report. Despite this diversity, however, results from the last three years of data collection have been highly consistent in terms of who are the most frequent contributors to RAP and in what ways.

For example, referrals to the program have consistently been dominated by self-referrals, at least in the case of one-on-one support (see Table 5). For mediations, referrals are more likely to come from school administration than from self-referrals, though the percentage of administrative referrals has been decreasing steadily over the past three years for reasons that have yet to be determined.

Table 5. Comparison of top referral sources by service partner, service, and year.

Rank	2014-15		2014-13		2012-13	
	<i>One-on-One</i>					
1	Self	39%	Self	36%	Self	34%
2	Administration	19%	Administration	17%	Administration	23%
3	Teacher	13%	Teacher	14%	Teacher	12%
	<i>Mediation</i>					
1	Administration	27%	Administration	37%	Administration	43%
2	Self	23%	Self	24%	Self	22%
3	Teacher	19%	Teacher	15%	Teacher	19%
	<i>Activities*</i>					
1	Teacher	38%	Teacher	37%	-	-
2	RAP Worker	22%	RAP Worker	33%	-	-
3	School Division	9%	Administration	8%	-	-

*Activities have "initiators", rather than referral sources.

It should also be noted that peer referrals, another source of student-based referrals, also account for a substantial percentage of the referrals overall. In 2014-15, peer-referrals made up 9% of both one-on-one and mediation referrals. Finally, while activities do not have referral sources, they can be initiated by someone other than a RAP worker themselves, and typically that person is a teacher.

Collaboration, or direct involvement in helping the RAP worker deliver their services, has consistently involved school administration as the primary service partner, with teachers and student services also making a substantial contribution for both one-on-one services and conflict mediation (see Table 6). Collaboration in the delivery of activities has been more variable, though teachers, student services, and other RAP workers are the most likely collaborators in varying proportions.

Table 6. Comparison of collaborators by service partner, service, and year.

Rank	2014-15		2014-13		2012-13
	<i>One-on-One</i>				
1	Administration	33%	Administration	35%	-
2	Teacher	18%	Teacher	19%	-
3	Student services	17%	Student services	19%	-
	<i>Mediation</i>				
1	Administration	43%	Administration	52%	-
2	Teacher	24%	Teacher	20%	-
3	Student services	9%	Student services	10%	-
	<i>Activities</i>				
1	Teacher	19%	Other RAP worker	26%	-
2	Student services	16%	Teacher	23%	-
3	Other RAP worker	13%	Student services	11%	-

RAP workers also provide referrals to other services where necessary. This occurred in 7% of the one-on-one cases this past year and 1% of conflict mediations (last year the figures were 7% and 0%, respectively). As with last year, the most common referrals were to addiction and mental health services (31% of all referrals) for one-on-one cases. Only 3 referrals total were made as a result of a conflict mediation service, and those were to either the school administration or to a parent or guardian.

C) Service Partner Profile

RAP workers assist students in addressing a wide range of issues in their lives. In past data collection periods, no fewer than 26 different categories of interpersonal conflict and personal troubles were distinguished, ranging from break-ups and not getting along to physical violence and harassment to emotional struggles and poor life choices.

In order to simplify the program monitoring process and ensure the collection of meaningful and actionable data, substantial changes were made in this year's data collection plan. RAP workers were no longer required to report in detail on the nature of the conflict for every single issue they addressed because the feedback so far had been that the complexity of the issues faced did not lend themselves to this kind of simplistic categorization. Instead, six key conflict indicators were identified as being the types of issues of greatest interest to the RAP program administrators and RAP workers were asked to report whenever one (or more) of these issues was involved in a one-on-one case or conflict mediation.

The key conflict indicators are:

- Bullying
- Physical violence
- Substance abuse
- Criminal acts
- Mental health issues
- Suicidality/self-harm

In addition to these conflict indicators, RAP workers were also asked to identify the other parties in the conflict and also, in the case of one-on-one support, what role the individual who has approached the RAP worker has in the issue (i.e., did they instigate the conflict, are they the target, both, a bystander, or none of the above).

When making comparisons of the key conflict indicators over time, it is important to consider that there was substantial variation in how RAP workers were asked to report these data. In particular, in the 2013-14 school year, RAP workers were asked to select only the conflict type that best fit the issue at hand, whereas in the first and third data collection periods, they were able to select as many conflict types as they felt applied (though in the most recent period, they were only given the selection of six key indicators, as described).

Therefore, it is unsurprising that data from the 2013-14 period reflect lower counts of occurrences of these types of conflict. This does not mean that RAP workers addressed these issues any less in this period. In fact, the similarity of results between the first and third data collection periods, which had more similar reporting methods, suggests a reasonable degree of consistency in how often RAP workers are encountering these issues (see Table 7). Unfortunately, some data are missing because some conflict categories were not included in the pilot year.

Overall, **bullying is the most frequently encountered of the key conflict types**, for both mediations and one-on-one cases. The three indicators which involve traditional interpersonal conflict (bullying, criminal acts, and physical violence) are also more likely to be addressed with conflict mediation than issues that are more personal and individual (i.e., mental health issues, substance abuse, and suicidality or self-harm), which is an appropriate use of these services.

Table 7. Comparison of key conflict indicators by service and year.

Key Conflict Indicator		2014-15	2014-13	2012-13
Bullying	One-on-one	22%	13%	22%
	Mediation	36%	13%	29%
Criminal acts	One-on-one	6%	3%	-
	Mediation	36%	13%	29%
Physical violence	One-on-one	8%	8%	13%
	Mediation	15%	17%	24%
Mental health issues	One-on-one	14%	5%	-
	Mediation	5%	1%	-
Substance abuse	One-on-one	9%	4%	6%
	Mediation	2%	0%	-
Suicidality/self-harm	One-on-one	4%	4%	3%
	Mediation	1%	1%	0%

It should be noted that just over half of one-on-one cases (53%) and mediations (57%) involved at least one reported key conflict indicator. Only 7% of either involved multiple conflict indicators.

"Bullying" was defined for the RAP workers as a 'pattern of behaviour intended to exclude, humiliate, shame, intimidate, or produce fear/unhappiness' (Camman & Wormith, 2013). This is consistent with the definitions used in the broader bullying literature, as determined by a recent literature review conducted on behalf of RAP (Camman & Wormith, 2015). RAP workers were asked to report the specific types of bullying tactics that were involved in any case where bullying was identified. Specifically, they reported if the case involved cyber bullying (i.e., the use of the internet and phone communication, including emails, social media, and texting), physical bullying (i.e., actual or threatened physical violence), relational bullying (i.e., the use of social pressure or exclusion, including

scapegoating, mobbing, and ostracism), and verbal bullying (i.e., gossiping, teasing, insults, threats, and other means of communicating bullying without physical violence).

RAP workers were able to select as many different types of bullying tactics that applied, and it was found that just under half of one-on-one bullying cases (49%) involved multiple tactics, an increase from 39% of cases last year. Similarly, 60% of mediation cases with bullying were reported as including multiple tactics, compared to 37% of last year's mediations with bullying.

The specific distribution of reported tactics is found in Table 8 below. **Relational and verbal bullying tactics were the most frequently reported** for both one-on-one cases and mediations. This represents an increase in the proportion of reported relational bullying from last year, though the rates of other reported tactics were relatively steady.

Table 8. Comparison of bullying tactics by service and year.

Key Conflict Indicator		2014-15	2014-13
Cyber	One-on-one	41%	42%
	Mediation	31%	37%
Physical	One-on-one	13%	17%
	Mediation	15%	16%
Relational	One-on-one	56%	37%
	Mediation	67%	37%
Verbal	One-on-one	48%	54%
	Mediation	63%	42%

There is also a reasonable degree of consistency in who students report being in conflict with. In every data collection period so far, **the most frequently reported conflict partners are peers** for both one-on-one cases and conflict mediations especially (see Table 9). Conflicts with the "self" (i.e., personal difficulties that do not involve another party) are also common for one-on-one cases.

One change from the current school year is in the increase in reported conflicts with the "environment" for one-on-one cases. Conflict with the "environment" is defined as when a student experiences pervasive general conflict with people in their surroundings rather than a conflict with a specific individual over a specific issue. For mediations, the pattern is less clear outside of the strong representation of peer conflict, but teachers, dating partners, and family are all other significant conflict partners.

Table 9. Comparison of most frequent conflict partners by service and year.

Rank	2014-15		2014-13		2012-13	
	<i>One-on-One</i>					
1	Peer	43%	Peer	44%	Peer	53%
2	Self	20%	Self	35%	Self	19%
3	Environment	15%	Family	7%	Family	13%
	<i>Mediation</i>					
1	Peer	76%	Peer	85%	Peer	86%
2	Teacher	11%	Dating partner ¹	6%	Teacher	5%
3	Family	5%	Teacher	4%	Dating partner	4%

Finally, for one-on-one cases only, RAP workers reported the 'role' that the student they were supporting played in the conflict at hand. Students could be classified exclusively as either being the initiator of the conflict, the target of the conflict, both an instigator and a target, a bystander to the situation, or "not applicable" in cases where such roles were not relevant. Figures for this indicator are presented below in Table 10, including a specific break-down for bullying and physical violence cases, where conflict roles are especially meaningful.

When assessing the roles across all cases, there was a slight shift from last year to this year in whether RAP workers were engaging with students who were predominantly targets versus initiators. As of this year, RAP workers were slightly more likely to be working with instigators (12% versus 9% targets) whereas last year, students were slightly more likely to be targets (13% versus 5% initiators; see Table 10). Otherwise, **the most frequently reported conflict role was "not applicable"** for both years, at least when looking at all cases, followed by instances where the student being supported was both a target and an instigator of the conflict.

The most substantial change for bullying cases specifically, was a large increase in the proportion students reported to be both initiators and targets of bullying (51%, up from 31%). For cases involving physical violence, the increase was in the proportion of cases where it was reported that conflict roles were not applicable (14%, up from 1%), and

¹ In a previous report (Camman & Wormith, 2013), this figure was incorrectly attributed to "Administration" in the body of the report. The correct conflict partner category is reported here and in the appendix of the original report.

the decrease in bystanders (4%, down from 12%). It is not clear what has driven these changes. Particularly concerning is the high of use of "not applicable" for physical violence, which intuitively would be assumed to have at least one instigator or target. It is possible that this reflects a deviation in how this indicator is being interpreted and reported by some RAP workers. The issue will be investigated and adjustments will be made to the data entry system if necessary.

Table 10. Comparison of conflict roles by conflict type and year.

Student Characteristics		2014-15	2014-13
All cases	Initiator	12%	5%
	Target	9%	13%
	Both	37%	30%
	Bystander	4%	10%
	Not applicable	38%	42%
Bullying cases	Initiator	20%	25%
	Target	20%	35%
	Both	51%	31%
	Bystander	5%	9%
	Not applicable	4%	1%
Violence cases	Initiator	13%	21%
	Target	12%	15%
	Both	57%	51%
	Bystander	4%	12%
	Not applicable	14%	1%

Summary of Results

Overall, the vast majority of indicators showed considerable stability and consistency over the past three years of data collection, despite changes in how indicators were defined and data collected, RAP staff, and the addition of a new RAP school in 2014. This is a positive result because in the absence of major changes to the program itself or the school environments in which the program operates, the expectation is that there will be minimal variation in the indicators from year to year. The findings so far suggest that there is a reasonable level of reliability in how data are reported on RAP's program operations.

In terms of specific findings:

A) Service use profile:

- The number of students accessing RAP's services and the types of services offered by RAP workers have been largely consistent outside of the normal increases associated with the addition of an eighth school
- One-on-one support was the most common type of service offered, with conflict mediation second
- RAP workers provided services to approximately 18% of students enrolled across all RAP schools
- Among activities, school and classroom presentations were the most common

B) Student user profile:

- The profile of students using RAP has been highly consistent over the past three years
- As with previous years, students using RAP were most likely to be in Grades 9 or 10, slightly more likely to be female than male, and over half of them were first-time users
- While overall the gender profile of RAP users has been largely balanced between male and female students, it was confirmed this year that this is partly due to the genders of the RAP workers themselves and that at the individual school level, there is a slight bias for RAP workers to see more students who have their same gender

C) Service partner profile:

- Referrals to RAP continue to be the most significant manner in which service partners contribute to RAP's operation
- Self-referrals have consistently been the most common source of referrals for one-on-one cases. School administration have provided the most referrals for conflict mediations, but this proportion has been steadily decreasing for the last three years
- RAP workers reported half as much collaboration this year as last year for both one-on-one cases and conflict mediations. This was partly attributed to the turnover in RAP staff and the addition of two new RAP workers across three schools. It is expected that collaboration will increase as these RAP workers build relationships within the schools
- School administration, teachers, and student services were the most frequent collaborators for one-on-one support and mediations. Teachers, students services, and other RAP workers were the most frequent collaborators for activities

D) Issue profile:

- Of the six key conflict indicators, bullying was the most frequently reported for either one-on-one cases or mediations. Criminal acts was also relatively frequently reported for mediations specifically
- Within bullying cases, verbal and relational bullying tactics were the most commonly reported and physical bullying was the least frequently reported
- For both one-on-one cases and conflict mediations, the most common conflict partner was a peer, especially in mediations
- Excluding cases where conflict roles were not applicable, the most common role for a student to play in a conflict was "both" initiator and target, and this was also true when looking exclusively at cases involving either bullying or physical violence

Limitations and Challenges

As noted in a previous report, despite all efforts to improve the program monitoring system, there are practical limitations on how much data can be collected and how accurately it can be interpreted (Camman & Wormith, 2014). As discussed in the introduction of this report, several aspects of the data collection which were found to be unwieldy and unlikely to produce useable information were eliminated from the current data collection cycle. Unfortunately, this means that certain aspects of the program's intended operation are not being monitored, including whether and how RAP workers are incorporating asset development in their services. It has been determined that this aspect of the program cannot be effectively measured through routine data collection and should be assessed through other means, such as the impending qualitative outcome study currently being planned.

As of this year, the program monitoring system has been largely refined and major adjustments are no longer necessary, which will improve the interpretability of the data collected and validity of comparisons across years. Nonetheless, there continue to be some unavoidable challenges which must be considered when interpreting the RAP program data:

- **Technical errors:** Data may be corrupted or entered incorrectly due to faults in the design of the system itself. To address this, RAP workers are encouraged to create back-ups and to retain hardcopies of their forms. They are also provided with year-round technical support and a help manual and receive training and guidance in how to use the database. Mid-year data quality reviews are conducted annually. Maintenance of the database and correction of any faults is also conducted annually and error-preventing mechanisms are incorporated into the database design at every opportunity.
- **User variation:** RAP workers may interpret the various aspects of their services or the program indicators differently and report these differently within the system. They may also differ in how they actually offer their services due to their own interpretations of the program, personal strengths and interests, and the different contexts in which they operate. RAP workers are provided with a manual of common definitions to help standardize their reporting. They are also encouraged to communicate with each other and with the RAP administration about how they are conducting their services and reporting on them. While program data are reported in the aggregate, when analyzing results, attention is also paid to variation across schools, which informs the interpretation.

- **Lack of clarifying context:** There is a limit to how informative purely quantitative program indicator data can be in the absence of a deeper understanding of the context in which the data were generated and reported. For example, it was identified in this report that the gender of the RAP worker appears to be a small but significant influence on the gender of students accessing RAP. To understand both why this occurs and what, if any, impact it has on the program itself would require further discussion with program stakeholders. The purpose of program data is to track trends, establish baselines, and alert the program administrators to areas potentially requiring attention. Complementing program data with more intensive outcome evaluation, both qualitative and quantitative, will help clarify the significance of some of these findings.

A final issue requiring attention is the **sustainability** of the current data collection system. The present system has been in place for three years and as of this year has reached its final stage of refinement in terms of how the indicators are defined and what data are being collected. However, the technical infrastructure of the database itself, where data are collected in separate identical database applications at individual schools and then manually recombined and analyzed, not only across schools but across years, is not sustainable in the long-term. Every school added and every data collection period that accumulates increases the complexity of managing this distributed system.

Within two years, the program monitoring system should be migrated to a centralized database application housed on a secure server. The inclusion of relevant security protocols would ensure that users could only access data to which they are authorized to see (e.g., each RAP worker can only see their own school's data, the data analyst can see all the indicator data but no identifying information, etc.). This would greatly facilitate the ease with which data are collected and analyzed and would in the long run be more reliable and less costly and time-consuming in terms of maintenance.

References

- Camman, C. & Wormith, J. S. (2011). *An evaluability assessment of the Restorative Action Program (RAP)*. Report prepared for the Restorative Action Program by the Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science and Justice Studies in partnership with the Applied Social Psychology program, University of Saskatchewan.
- Camman, C. & Wormith, J. S. (2013). *Development of a program monitoring system for the Restorative Action Program*. Report prepared for the Restorative Action Program by the Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science and Justice Studies.
- Camman, C. & Wormith, J. S. (2014). *Implementation assessment and outcome evaluation planning for the Restorative Action Program (RAP)*. Report prepared for the Restorative Action Program by the Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science and Justice Studies.
- Camman, C. & Wormith, J. S. (2015). *Literature review to support the Restorative Action Program outcome evaluation*. Report prepared for the Restorative Action Program by the Centre for Forensic Behavioural Science and Justice Studies

Appendix A: 2014-15 Data Summary

Glossary of Terms

Total count. Exact count of units (i.e., students, one-on-one cases, mediations, activities), aggregated across all of schools in which RAP was active, broken down by characteristic.

% of total. The percentage of the overall total count that each characteristic represents (e.g., 53% of students involved in RAP were female).

Min per school/Max per school. These columns show the highest and the lowest instance of each characteristic that was reported by school. For example, across all schools, 30% of students were in Grade 9, ranging from a low of 18% at one school to a high of 44% at another school. These statistics are calculated using the total counts by individual school, which are not reported here to maintain school confidentiality.

Students. Individual students for whom the RAP worker completed an intake form in order to provide a service such as one-on-one support or a mediation. Does not include students whose only contact with RAP was through organized activities such as classroom presentations or school events.

One-on-one cases. One-on-one support tracked by case, or distinct issues, incidents, or needs brought to them by students. Each student might be involved in more than one case and cases themselves might involve more than one contact (RAP workers separately tracked the number of follow-up contacts per case).

Follow-up contacts. Total number of times that the RAP worker had contact with the student about the same one-on-one case following the initial contact. Contacts themselves are variable and can range from further sit-down meetings in the RAP worker's office to hallway check-ins. These do not include mediations or non-case related contacts.

Conflict mediations. Structured sessions where the RAP worker leads the participants through a conflict resolution process. They involve 1-3 individual sessions but are discrete events focused on addressing a particular conflict issue.

Activities. Additional activities which are not focused on working with a particular student or small group of students in conflict. Typically preventative, prosocial, and information-oriented activities, including giving presentations and workshops on conflict-related topics; one-time events like special trips, forums, or school activity days; and regular organized programming, like student council meetings.

Partners. Individuals and organizations, within and outside of the school, who support RAP's work through providing referrals, participating directly in service delivery, or providing additional services through referrals from RAP workers.

Other terms are defined as necessary in the endnotes of each table.

Student Data Summary

Student Characteristics	Total count	% of total	Min per school	Max per school
Total students	1068	100%	-	-
Gender				
Female	571	53%	42%	64%
Male	490	46%	35%	58%
Other gender	7	1%	0%	2%
Grade				
Elementary	9	1%	0%	10%
Grade 09	325	30%	18%	44%
Grade 10	311	29%	18%	39%
Grade 11	229	21%	11%	29%
Grade 12	191	18%	10%	26%
No Grade	3	0.3%	0%	1%
Age (in years)				
Minimum	12	-	12	14
Maximum	20	-	18	20
Average	16	-	15	16
Intake date (by month)				
August	1	0.1%	0%	1%
September	162	15%	0%	36%
October	171	16%	8%	24%
November	108	10%	4%	25%
December	86	8%	2%	20%
January	99	9%	2%	23%
February	99	9%	4%	17%
March	109	10%	7%	18%
April	77	7%	4%	10%
May	78	7%	4%	11%
June	78	7%	0%	15%
Other details				
First-time RAP user	606	57%	17%	99%
Has regularly-scheduled check-ins with RAP worker	173	16%	0%	51%
Enrolled in non-mainstream academic program	46	4%	0%	16%
Is a new Canadian ⁱ	87	8%	0%	20%
Is First Nations, Inuit, and/or Métis	275	26%	0%	68%
Use of external service agenciesⁱⁱ				
Students using any external service agencies	139	13%	0%	30%
Students using multiple external service agencies	27	3%	0%	10%
Addiction/mental health	63	6%	0%	11%
Family services	37	3%	0%	14%
Health/medical services	4	0.4%	0%	1%
Immigration services	7	1%	0%	2%
Justice services	48	4%	0%	17%
Other	10	1%	0%	3%
RAP worker filled external agency information request ⁱⁱⁱ	34	3%	0%	17%

ⁱ Born outside of Canada and lived in Canada for less than 4 years.

ⁱⁱ These data are limited because RAP workers only reported this when it was voluntarily disclosed and if the service use was not relevant to the issue at hand, it may not have been discussed by the student. "External service agency" is defined as any service-providing organization external to the school, including government, non-profit, and service sector organizations.

ⁱⁱⁱ This was a service limited to two schools where the RAP workers are authorized to release certain student information to outside agencies upon request (e.g., attendance record to police).

One-on-One Data Summary

One-On-One Characteristics	Total count	% of total	Min per school	Max per school
Total one-on-one cases	1735	100%	-	-
Participant details				
Students with one or more one-on-one case	1001	94%	76%	100%
Students with multiple cases	339	32%	10%	47%
Average cases per student	1.6	-	1.1	2.5
Maximum cases per student	21	-	4	21
Case details				
Cases with any additional contact (i.e., follow-up)	864	50%	9%	100%
Cases with multiple additional contacts	582	34%	2%	93%
Average additional contacts per case	1.4	-	0.1	3.1
Maximum additional contacts per case	21	-	2	21
Prevention-focused	476	27%	1%	70%
Reconnection-focused	368	21%	1%	74%
RAP worker acted as liaison ¹	211	12%	0%	61%
Involved home visit	30	2%	0%	6%
Mediation planned to follow	312	18%	7%	40%
Conflict unresolved	8	0.5%	0%	1%
First session date (by month)				
September	179	10%	0%	21%
October	230	13%	4%	18%
November	168	10%	5%	16%
December	156	9%	6%	21%
January	162	9%	1%	18%
February	182	10%	6%	17%
March	193	11%	7%	18%
April	151	9%	5%	12%
May	186	11%	7%	16%
June	128	7%	0%	16%
Referral source				
Administration	324	19%	9%	31%
Community member	3	0.2%	0%	1%
Community-school coordinator	10	1%	0%	4%
Home-school coordinator	4	0.2%	0%	1%
Other RAP worker	14	1%	0%	2%
Parent/guardian	47	3%	0%	7%
Peer	149	9%	1%	17%
School support staff	25	1%	0%	6%
School-based program	1	0.1%	0%	1%
Self	678	39%	19%	52%
SRO/CRO	6	0.3%	0%	2%
Student services	90	5%	3%	11%
Teacher	229	13%	10%	22%
Addiction/mental health services	5	0.3%	0%	3%
Family services	2	0.1%	0%	1%
Health/medical services	0	0%	-	-
Immigration services	0	0%	-	-

One-On-One Characteristics	Total count	% of total	Min per school	Max per school
Justice services	15	1%	0%	5%
Other	17	1%	0%	2%
None	117	7%	0%	27%
Key conflict indicatorsⁱⁱ				
Cases with any key conflict indicator	911	53%	29%	62%
Cases with multiple key conflict indicators	130	7%	0%	14%
Average conflict indicators per case	0.6	-	0.3	0.8
Maximum conflict indicators per case	4	-	1	4
Bullying	376	22%	10%	43%
Criminal acts	98	6%	0%	9%
Physical violence	142	8%	0%	13%
Mental health	240	14%	2%	30%
Substance abuse	153	9%	0%	23%
Suicidality/self-harm	68	4%	0%	10%
Bullying detailsⁱⁱⁱ				
Total bullying cases	376	100%	-	-
Bullying cases involving multiple bullying tactics	911	53%	29%	62%
Average number of tactics per bullying case	1.6	-	1.0	2.0
Cyber tactics	153	41%	14%	81%
Physical tactics	48	13%	0%	24%
Relational tactics	212	56%	22%	89%
Verbal tactics	180	48%	21%	79%
Conflict role				
Initiator	215	12%	1%	23%
Target	151	9%	2%	17%
Both	644	37%	10%	67%
Bystander	64	4%	0%	7%
Not applicable	661	38%	17%	87%
Primary conflict partner				
Administration	7	0.4%	0%	2%
Dating partner	109	6%	0%	11%
Environment	268	15%	1%	35%
Family	172	10%	5%	15%
Other school staff	8	0.5%	0%	1%
Peer	741	43%	18%	70%
Self	342	20%	7%	45%
Teacher	88	5%	0%	8%
Secondary conflict partner				
Cases with one or more secondary conflict partners	352	20%	0%	73%
Cases with multiple secondary conflict partners	73	4%	0%	17%
Administration	3	0.2%	0%	2%
Dating partner	26	1%	0%	4%
Environment	149	9%	0%	45%
Family	56	3%	0%	12%
Other school staff	2	0.1%	0%	1%
Peer	96	6%	0%	20%
Self	100	6%	0%	29%

One-On-One Characteristics	Total count	% of total	Min per school	Max per school
Teacher	24	1%	0%	10%
Service partner involvement				
Cases involving service partners	552	32%	1%	72%
Cases involving collaborators	479	28%	1%	67%
Average collaborations per case	0.4		0.0	1.1
Cases resulting in referrals	128	7%	0.5%	14%
Average referrals per case	0.1		0.0	0.1
Collaborations^{iv}				
Total collaborations	699	100%	-	-
Administration	228	33%	0%	42%
Community member	1	0.1%	0%	0.4%
Community-school coordinator	5	1%	0%	2%
Home-school coordinator	2	0.3%	0%	7%
Other RAP worker	19	3%	0%	19%
Parent/guardian	87	12%	0%	33%
School support staff	3	0.4%	0%	4%
School-based program	2	0.3%	0%	1%
SRO/CRO	25	4%	0%	11%
Student services	128	18%	3%	100%
Teacher	116	17%	0%	30%
Addiction/mental health services	26	4%	0%	6%
Family services	10	1%	0%	7%
Health/medical services	3	0.4%	0%	1%
Immigration services	0	0%	-	-
Justice services	21	3%	0%	7%
Other	23	3%	0%	6%
Referrals made^v				
Total referrals made	131	100%	-	-
Administration	18	14%	0%	100%
Community member	0	0%	-	-
Community-school coordinator	0	0%	-	-
Home-school coordinator	0	0%	-	-
Other RAP worker	1	1%	0%	10%
Parent/guardian	4	3%	0%	7%
School support staff	0	0%	-	-
School-based program	15	11%	0%	23%
SRO/CRO	12	9%	0%	30%
Student services	19	15%	0%	100%
Teacher	2	2%	0%	100%
Addiction/mental health services	40	31%	0%	70%
Family services	7	5%	0%	20%
Health/medical services	1	1%	0%	3%
Immigration services	3	2%	0%	12%
Justice services	0	0%	-	-
Other	9	7%	0%	15%

-
- ⁱ Refers to RAP worker acting as a liaison between the student and another service provider.
 - ⁱⁱ Beginning this year, RAP workers were asked to only report if a case/mediation involved a key type of conflict (i.e., bullying, criminal acts, physical violence, mental health issues, substance abuse, and self-harm/suicidality), rather than describe the nature of the conflict for every incident. Each case/mediation could involve more than one key conflict indicator, so percentages do not add up to 100.
 - ⁱⁱⁱ RAP workers were able to select multiple tactics per bullying case, so percentages do not add up to 100.
 - ^{iv} Percentages refer to proportion of total collaborations. Each case can involve multiple collaborators.
 - ^v Percentages refer to proportion of total collaborations. Each case can result in multiple referrals.

Mediation Data Summary

Mediation Characteristics	Total count	% of total	Min per school	Max per school
Total mediations	222	100%	-	-
Average sessions per mediation	1.4	-	1.0	2.6
Average participants per mediation	2.3	-	2.0	3.0
Total mediations with non-student participants ⁱ	47	21%	6%	63%
Administration	14	6%	0%	31%
Community member	7	3%	0%	11%
Other school staff	1	0.5%	0%	4%
Parent	14	6%	0%	17%
Teacher	23	10%	0%	29%
Not specified	1	0.5%	0%	3%
Total mediations with conflict unresolved	4	2%	0%	5%
Participant details				
Students with one or more mediations	327	31%	19%	70%
Students with multiple mediations	64	6%	1%	22%
Average mediations per student	1.3	-	1.1	1.7
Maximum mediations per student	9	-	2	9
Session participation details				
Total instances of participation by students	431	-	-	-
Average steps completed per student participant ⁱⁱ	2.7	-	1.9	3.0
Total instances of pre-conferences	402	93%	56%	100%
Total instances of agreements reached	395	92%	65%	100%
Total instances of follow-through	371	86%	69%	100%
First session date (by month)				
September	13	6%	0%	27%
October	22	10%	0%	28%
November	27	12%	5%	29%
December	24	11%	4%	15%
January	19	9%	0%	18%
February	21	9%	3%	22%
March	30	14%	6%	21%
April	19	9%	0%	25%
May	26	12%	5%	20%
June	21	9%	0%	23%
Referral source				
Administration	59	27%	10%	41%
Community member	0	0%	-	-
Community-school coordinator	1	0.5%	0%	2%
Home-school coordinator	0	0%	-	-
Other RAP worker	1	0.5%	0%	3%
Parent/guardian	6	3%	0%	11%
Peer	19	9%	0%	15%
School support staff	0	0%	-	-
Self	52	23%	6%	56%
SRO/CRO	1	0.5%	0%	3%
Student services	9	4%	0%	18%

Mediation Characteristics	Total count	% of total	Min per school	Max per school
Teacher	42	19%	12%	28%
Addiction/mental health services	0	0%	-	-
Family services	0	0%	-	-
Health/medical services	0	0%	-	-
Immigration services	0	0%	-	-
Justice services	0	0%	-	-
Other	2	1%	0%	5%
None	30	14%	0%	35%
Key conflict indicatorsⁱⁱⁱ				
Mediations with any key conflict indicator	126	57%	34%	77%
Mediations with multiple key conflict indicators	16	7%	0%	17%
Average conflict indicators per case	0.7	-	0.3	1.0
Maximum conflict indicators per case	4	-	1	4
Bullying	81	36%	15%	65%
Criminal acts	11	5%	0%	17%
Physical violence	34	15%	3%	35%
Mental health	11	5%	0%	9%
Substance abuse	5	2%	0%	11%
Suicidality/self-harm	3	1%	0%	5%
Bullying details^{iv}				
Total mediations involving bullying	81	100%	-	-
Bullying cases involving multiple bullying tactics	49	60%	0%	100%
Average number of tactics per bullying case	1.8	-	1.0	2.7
Cyber tactics	25	31%	0%	100%
Physical tactics	12	15%	0%	31%
Relational tactics	54	67%	21%	100%
Verbal tactics	51	63%	20%	100%
Primary conflict partner				
Administration	0	0%	-	-
Dating partner	9	4%	0%	15%
Environment	3	1%	0%	5%
Family	10	5%	0%	8%
Other school staff	0	0%	-	-
Peer	169	76%	49%	88%
Self	6	3%	0%	17%
Teacher	25	11%	0%	26%
Secondary conflict partner^v				
Mediations with any secondary conflict partner	27	12%	0%	40%
Mediations with multiple secondary conflict partners	3	1%	0%	10%
Administration	1	0.5%	0%	3%
Dating partner	0	0%	-	-
Environment	8	4%	0%	25%
Family	1	0.5%	0%	3%
Other school staff	0	0%	-	-
Peer	9	4%	0%	20%
Self	11	5%	0%	25%

Mediation Characteristics	Total count	% of total	Min per school	Max per school
Teacher	0	0%	0%	0%
Service partner involvement				
Mediations involving service partners	68	31%	16%	85%
Mediations involving collaborators	65	29%	14%	85%
Average collaborations per mediation	0.3	-	0.2	1.1
Mediations resulting in referrals	3	1%	0%	9%
Average referrals per mediation	0.0	-	0.0	0.1
Collaborations^v				
Total collaborations	76	100%	-	-
Administration	33	43%	0%	64%
Community member	0	0%	-	-
Community-school coordinator	1	1%	0%	7%
Home-school coordinator	0	0%	-	-
Other RAP worker	2	3%	0%	20%
Parent/guardian	5	7%	0%	40%
School support staff	1	1%	0%	17%
School-based program	0	0%	-	-
SRO/CRO	5	7%	0%	50%
Student services	7	9%	0%	50%
Teacher	18	24%	0%	47%
Addiction/mental health services	0	0%	-	-
Family services	2	3%	0%	13%
Health/medical services	0	0%	-	-
Immigration services	0	0%	-	-
Justice services	1	1%	0%	20%
Other	1	1%	0%	20%
Referrals made^{vi}				
Total referrals made	3	100%	-	-
Administration	1	33%	0%	100%
Community member	0	0%	-	-
Community-school coordinator	0	0%	-	-
Home-school coordinator	0	0%	-	-
Other RAP worker	0	0%	-	-
Parent/guardian	2	67%	0%	100%
School support staff	0	0%	-	-
School-based program	0	0%	-	-
SRO/CRO	0	0%	-	-
Student services	0	0%	-	-
Teacher	0	0%	-	-
Addiction/mental health services	0	0%	-	-
Family services	0	0%	-	-
Health/medical services	0	0%	-	-
Immigration services	0	0%	-	-
Justice services	0	0%	-	-
Other	0	0%	-	-

-
- ⁱ Non-students included parents, teachers, school administration, and community members.
- ⁱⁱ "Steps" refers to the three steps of the conflict mediation process, including pre-conference, reaching an agreement, and following through on the agreed-upon actions.
- ⁱⁱⁱ Beginning this year, RAP workers were asked to only report if a mediation involved a key type of conflict (i.e., bullying, criminal acts, physical violence, mental health issues, substance abuse, and self-harm/suicidality), rather than describe the nature of the conflict for every incident. Each mediation could involve more than one key conflict indicator, so percentages do not add up to 100.
- ^{iv} RAP workers were able to select multiple tactics per bullying case, so percentages do not add up to 100.
- ^v Percentages refer to proportion of total collaborations. Each mediation can involve multiple collaborators.
- ^{vi} Percentages refer to proportion of total collaborations. Each mediation can result in multiple referrals.

Activity Data Summary

Activity Characteristics	Total count	% of total	Min per school	Max per school
Total activities	259	100%	-	-
Activity type				
Presentation	123	47%	10%	93%
Regular program	45	17%	0%	47%
Special event	40	15%	0%	39%
Workshop	23	9%	0%	40%
Other	28	11%	0%	56%
Activity date (by month)				
September	35	14%	0%	51%
October	35	14%	0%	30%
November	22	8%	3%	15%
December	29	11%	3%	22%
January	9	3%	0%	10%
February	14	5%	0%	17%
March	38	15%	0%	39%
April	21	8%	0%	19%
May	30	12%	0%	28%
June	26	10%	0%	22%
Activity goal				
Build assets	147	57%	22%	85%
Put assets into action	25	10%	0%	30%
Build relationships	35	14%	0%	30%
Raise program awareness	52	20%	0%	57%
Audience typeⁱ				
Students	219	85%	50%	96%
Staff	164	63%	10%	96%
Parents	28	11%	4%	20%
Community members	56	22%	0%	49%
Other	18	7%	0%	14%
Audience gender				
Female-only	36	14%	0%	29%
Male-only	3	1%	0%	4%
Mixed gender	220	85%	71%	100%
Audience grade				
Elementary	30	12%	0%	33%
Grade 9 only	57	22%	0%	47%
Grade 10 only	23	9%	0%	26%
Grade 11 only	13	5%	0%	30%
Grade 12 only	9	3%	0%	10%
Lower grades (9,10) only	10	4%	0%	15%
Upper grades (11,12) only	38	15%	4%	50%
All/mixed grades	45	17%	0%	51%
No grade	34	13%	0%	26%

Activity Characteristics	Total count	% of total	Min per school	Max per school
Location				
Home school	158	61%	25%	96%
Different school	42	16%	0%	69%
Partner's venue	11	4%	0%	14%
Public facility/area	45	17%	0%	36%
Other	3	1%	0%	4%
Initiator				
Administration	14	5%	0%	50%
Community-School Coordinator	18	7%	0%	15%
Elder	0	0%	-	-
External Service Agency	12	5%	0%	19%
RAP Worker	58	22%	0%	57%
Rotarian	3	1%	0%	3%
School Division	23	9%	0%	44%
SRO/CRO	13	5%	0%	17%
Student Services	6	2%	0%	9%
Students	4	2%	0%	4%
Teacher	99	38%	6%	85%
Other	9	3%	0%	11%
Initiated in response to identified need	37	14%	0%	40%
Collaborationsⁱⁱ				
Activities involving collaborators	138	53%	0%	100%
Average collaborations per activity	1.0	-	0.0	2.8
Total collaborations	267	100%	-	-
Administration	33	12%	0%	32%
Community-School Coordinator	24	9%	0%	13%
Elder	1	0%	0%	2%
External Service Agency	14	5%	0%	17%
Home-school coordinator	4	1%	0%	3%
RAP Worker	36	13%	0%	29%
Rotarian	1	0.4%	0%	6%
School Division	14	5%	0%	8%
SRO/CRO	23	9%	0%	43%
Student Services	42	16%	0%	25%
Students	14	5%	0%	21%
Teacher	52	19%	0%	100%
Other	9	3%	0%	14%

ⁱ RAP workers could select more than one audience type per activity, so percentages do not add to 100.


ⁱⁱ Each case can involve multiple collaborators, so percentages do not add to 100.

Appendix B: 2014-15 Data Collection Forms

First Name:

Last Name:

Date:

 Intake Form	
STUDENT INFORMATION (check all that apply)	
Gender: M F O	Grade: 9 10 11 12 N/A Age:
<input type="checkbox"/> First-time RAP user	<input type="checkbox"/> Has regular RAP check-ins
<input type="checkbox"/> In non-mainstream class	
<input type="checkbox"/> Is a New Canadian (Canadian resident for 4 years or less)	<input type="checkbox"/> Is First Nations, Inuit, or Métis
EXTERNAL AGENCY SERVICE PROVIDERS (check all that the student uses):	
<input type="checkbox"/> Addictions/Mental Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Health/Medical Services
<input type="checkbox"/> Family Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Immigration Services
<input type="checkbox"/> Justice Services	
<input type="checkbox"/> Other:	
<input type="checkbox"/> Check if you have filled a special information request from an external agency for this student	
NOTES	
WORKER:	SCHOOL:

First Name:

Last Name:

Date:



One-on-One Form

SESSION OVERVIEW (check ONLY if applicable)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Liaised between student and other service provider | <input type="checkbox"/> Conducted a home visit |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Prevention-focused (warning signs present, but no specific incident has occurred) | <input type="checkbox"/> Reconnection-focused (helping the student return to school after extended absence) |

REFERRED BY (indicate ONE primary referral source):

CONFLICT PARTNER (only ONE can be entered as the PRIMARY conflict partner—others will be entered as secondary):

- | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Administration | <input type="checkbox"/> Dating Partner | <input type="checkbox"/> Environment (school or community at large) | <input type="checkbox"/> Family |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Peer | <input type="checkbox"/> Self | <input type="checkbox"/> Teacher | <input type="checkbox"/> Other School Staff |

Check ANY of the following which was a MAJOR COMPONENT of the issue or, if NONE applied, then check: N/A

- | | | |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bullying* | <input type="checkbox"/> Criminal Acts (e.g., theft, vandalism) | <input type="checkbox"/> Mental Health Concerns |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Physical Violence | <input type="checkbox"/> Substance Abuse | <input type="checkbox"/> Suicidality/Self-Harm |

*For BULLYING ONLY, check ALL that apply: Cyber Physical Relational Verbal

CONFLICT ROLE (select ONE if applicable): N/A Initiator Target Both Bystander

PROGRAM PARTNER ROLE circle ALL that apply: C = collaborated R = made referral to

- | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Administration | <input type="checkbox"/> Other RAP Worker | <input type="checkbox"/> SRO/CRO | <input type="checkbox"/> Family Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community Member | <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/Guardian | <input type="checkbox"/> Student Services | <input type="checkbox"/> Health/Medical Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Community-School Coordinator | <input type="checkbox"/> School Support Staff | <input type="checkbox"/> Teacher | <input type="checkbox"/> Immigration Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Home-School Coordinator | <input type="checkbox"/> School-Based Program | <input type="checkbox"/> Addiction/Mental Health Serv. | <input type="checkbox"/> Justice Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other: | | | |

Not Resolved Mediation Planned

SESSION NOTES **Follow-Up Contacts**

--	--

WORKER: _____ SCHOOL: _____

Session 1 Date:

Session 2 Date:

Session 3 Date:



Conflict Mediation Form

of participants: _____

PARTICIPANT OVERVIEW	PC	AG	FT	PC	AG	FT
1)	Y N	Y N	Y N	4)	Y N	Y N
2)	Y N	Y N	Y N	5)	Y N	Y N
3)	Y N	Y N	Y N	6)	Y N	Y N

SESSION OVERVIEW

REFERRED BY (indicate ONE primary referral source):

CONFLICT PARTNER (only ONE can be entered as the PRIMARY conflict partner—others will be entered as secondary):

- Administration Dating Partner Environment (school or community at large) Family
- Peer Self Teacher Other School Staff

Check ANY of the following which was a MAJOR COMPONENT of the issue or, if NONE applied, then check: N/A

- Bullying* Criminal Acts (e.g., theft, vandalism) Mental Health Concerns
- Physical Violence Substance Abuse Suicidality/Self-Harm

*For BULLYING ONLY, check ALL that apply: Cyber Physical Relational Verbal

PROGRAM PARTNER ROLE circle ALL that apply: C = collaborated R = made referral to

- C R Administration C R Other RAP Worker C R SRO/CRO C R Family Services
- C R Community Member C R Parent/Guardian C R Student Services C R Health/Medical Services
- C R Community-School Coordinator C R School Support Staff C R Teacher C R Immigration Services
- C R Home-School Coordinator C R School-Based Program C R Addiction/Mental Health Serv. C R Justice Services
- C R Other:

Not Resolved

SESSION NOTES

WORKER:

SCHOOL:

Number of Participants:

Date:



Activity Form

ACTIVITY OVERVIEW

ACTIVITY TYPE (select ONE):

- Presentation (informational, non-interactive) Workshop (informational, interactive)
 Regular group activity (e.g., Girls Group, youth council meetings) Special event (e.g., field trip, schoolwide event)
 Other activity. Please describe:

Event/Program NAME or Presentation/Workshop TOPIC:

ACTIVITY GOAL (select ONE primary goal):

- Build Assets Put Assets into Action Build Relationships Raise Program Awareness
 Check if this activity was initiated in response to an identified classroom need

PARTICIPANT OVERVIEW

TYPE (select ALL that apply)	GENDER (select ONE)	GRADE (select ONE)		
<input type="checkbox"/> Students <input type="checkbox"/> Community <input type="checkbox"/> School Staff <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <input type="checkbox"/> Parents	<input type="checkbox"/> Mixed gender <input type="checkbox"/> Primarily female <input type="checkbox"/> Primarily male	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade 9 <input type="checkbox"/> Grade 10 <input type="checkbox"/> Lower (9,10)	<input type="checkbox"/> Grade 12 <input type="checkbox"/> Grade 11 <input type="checkbox"/> Upper (11,12)	<input type="checkbox"/> Elementary <input type="checkbox"/> All/Mixed Grades <input type="checkbox"/> No Assigned Grade

PROGRAM PARTNER ROLE

INITIATOR (select ONE primary initiator)

- Administration External Service Agency Rotarian Student Services
 Community-School Coordinator Home-School Coordinator School Division Students
 Elder RAP Worker SRO/CRO Teacher
 Other:

COLLABORATORS (select ALL that apply)

- Administration External Service Agency Rotarian Student Services
 Community-School Coordinator Home-School Coordinator School Division Students
 Elder RAP Worker SRO/CRO Teacher
 Other:

LOCATION (select ONE primary location of activity):

- Home School Different School Partner's Venue Public Facility Other:

ACTIVITY NOTES

WORKER:

SCHOOL: