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1. Overview

The Ministry engaged Directions and Evidence Policy Research Group, LLP, to evaluate the impact of innovative programming on student achievement and well-being for Ontario students in the care of, or receiving services from, children’s aid societies (referenced herein as students in care). This evaluation examines the implementation, impact, and effectiveness of Ministry-supported programs and will contribute to the development and refinement of a provincial strategy to support students in care.

Directions conducted site visits to 11 programs to conduct interviews with board-level staff, focus groups with staff and community partners, and focus groups with participating students. Directions also conducted interviews with Ministry staff to gain context for the development, implementation, and outcomes of the program. This document reports on the key themes emerging from the interviews and focus groups conducted.

2. Methods

2.1. Selection of school boards

Directions conducted site visits to 11 boards to speak to school board staff, school and program staff, community partners, and students about their experiences within the programs. The Ministry recommended 11 programs for site visits to maximize variation in the following characteristics: English and French, public and Catholic, geographic region, large/small school board, urban/rural boards, secondary school implementation, First Nations Métis Inuit (FNMI) representation, and at least 2 years of implementation.

The 11 boards visited had the following characteristics

- 10 English boards, 1 French board
- 6 public boards, 5 Catholic boards
- 1 board in Barrie Region, 3 boards in London Region, 3 boards in Ottawa Region, 3 boards in Sudbury-North Bay Region, 1 board in Toronto and Area Region
- large, medium and small boards in urban settings or a mix of urban and rural settings
- FNMI representation in several programs
- Secondary school implementation and at least 2 years of implementation
Directions obtained ethics approvals from school boards as required before conducting the program evaluations. Directions also obtained consent to participate for all participants before conducting any interviews or focus groups, and obtained assent to participate from students or other respondents as applicable.

For each selected program, Directions planned the following activities:

- Board-level interview with the person most knowledgeable about the program
- Focus group with relevant board and school staff and community partners who support the program
- Focus group with student participants in the program

2.2. Interviews and focus groups

2.2.1. Protocols for interviews and focus groups

All interviews and focus groups were conducted by experienced facilitators possessing in-depth knowledge of the education system in Ontario. For each of the Ministry-level interviews, board-level interviews, program-level focus groups, and student-level focus groups or interviews, the facilitators were guided by semi-structured protocols designed to address the evaluation questions for each group; these protocols were approved by the Ministry project team before implementation. The protocols are presented in Appendix A: Interview and Focus Group Protocols.

Participation in interviews or focus groups was voluntary. Only with the explicit and documented permission of all participants were interviews and focus groups digitally recorded for analysis. Participants had the option to request that their interview or focus group not be recorded, in which case the facilitator would make notes with the participant’s consent (this option was used in one program). After each interview and focus group session, facilitators completed summary notes that were used in the analysis. Interviews and focus groups were transcribed for analysis; in the transcriptions, personally identifying information was not recorded. Consent forms for the interviews and focus groups are presented in Appendix B: Consent forms for Interviews and Focus Groups.

2.2.2. Ministry-level interview

To provide greater context on the development of the Ministry pilot program initiative, the process of selecting programs for funding and renewal, and the implementation of the initiative, Directions conducted five semi-structured interviews with Ministry staff who were currently working on the initiative, or who had worked on the initiative in the past.
Because there have been different staff associated with the initiative over the years, gathering information from past and present staff was expected to provide a more comprehensive view of the process and changes that the initiative has experienced. The interviews were conducted in English or French as appropriate and took approximately 45 to 60 minutes each.

2.2.3. Board-level interview

Within each board selected for the site visits, Directions conducted a semi-structured interview at the board level with the person(s) most knowledgeable about the program. Participants in the board-level interviews included board student success leads, representatives from children’s aid societies, and superintendents. The interview was used to gain an understanding of issues such as board-level strategy, objectives, implementation of program criteria, implementation support, successes, challenges, and potential improvements. The semi-structured interviews were conducted by phone in English or French as appropriate and took 45 to 60 minutes each.

2.2.4. Program-level focus groups

Within each board selected for the site visits, Directions conducted one to two focus groups\(^1\) with the most relevant school board staff, school staff and community partners who support the program. Participants in the program-level focus groups represented various roles supporting the programs: program teacher, principal, vice principal, board Student Success lead, Student Success teacher, board coordinator, staff from the local children’s aid societies (e.g., case workers, supervisor, educational liaison), re-engagement teacher, special education teacher, social worker, group home supervisor, attendance counsellor, educational assistant, regular classroom teacher, community partners (e.g., executive director of community organization where program was located, instructor). The focus groups were used to gain a program-level understanding of issues such as program processes, activities, resources, outcomes, successes, challenges, partnerships with children’s aid societies and other organizations, and suggestions for improvement. The face-to-face focus groups consisting of 2 to 13 individuals\(^2\) were conducted in English or French as appropriate at a location recommended by the program lead and took approximately 60 to 90 minutes each. A few board leads were interviewed separately at their request by telephone.

---

\(^1\) One focus group was requested, but based on participant availability and the structure of programs (e.g., one board had two programs), in some cases two focus groups were conducted.

\(^2\) Participation of 6-8 individuals was requested; but program contacts were free to invite as many participants as they thought would be able to contribute meaningfully to the discussion.
2.2.5. Student-level focus groups

Within each board selected for the site visits, Directions requested one focus group with students who were currently participating in the program. Directions also consulted with a board- or school-level contact most familiar with the program to identify whether some students were more comfortable discussing their experience in the programs in an individual or small-group setting, which was accommodated where indicated. The focus groups and interviews were used to elicit students’ perspectives on their experience of a program, successes, challenges, and suggestions for improvement. Face-to-face focus groups consisting of 2 to 7 students were conducted in English or French as appropriate at a location recommended by the program lead and took approximately 60 minutes each, although a few were much shorter. In 4 boards, individual interviews were conducted (in addition to or in place of focus groups) either because the students requested this format or because only one student consented to participate in the focus group. In one of these boards, students participated in an interview along with a parent. Student participants were in Grades 9 through 12.

2.2.6. Limitations to interview and focus group data

For the Ministry interviews, there have also been a number of staffing changes associated with the innovative programs for students in the care of, or receiving services, from children’s aid societies. There is no Ministry staff member who has been associated with program since its inception and thus able to provide a perspective of how the initiative has evolved since the beginning. However, Directions was able to interview both past and present program staff to gain a more comprehensive view of the initiative from the Ministry’s standpoint.

For the board and program level interviews and focus groups, the data collected in the interviews and focus groups are only a snapshot of the implementation, successes, and challenges of the program from the perspectives of those who were interviewed. Many programs have evolved from their original plan over their two to three years of implementation, and as program staff and administration have changed throughout the years, individuals with perspectives on the early implementation of the program may no longer have been with the program. Some respondents may have only been familiar with the current implementation of the program.

Because students participating in the focus groups and interviews were only those participating in the current implementation of the program in their board, they were

---

3 For one board with an itinerant teacher model, two focus groups were conducted at two separate schools within the board.
4 Participation of 6-8 students was requested.
unable to represent the breadth of experience of students across the years. The experiences of other students who were not actively participating the program for a variety of other reasons (e.g., non-attenders, in probation, significant behavioural issues, in addictions rehabilitation) were not represented.

3. Ministry Context

The following section represents information provided in the Ministry staff interviews, supplemented by background documentation referred to by staff.

3.1.1. Program background

Strategies and delivery models for students in care were first generated through a competitive process in 2013-14. Starting in 2014, Ontario’s Poverty Reduction Strategy provided the Ministry of Education an additional $2.1 million annually for three years (2014-2017) to further support the innovative program pilots, which provide learning opportunities, supports and interventions to improve the educational achievement of Children and Youth in Care (CYIC)5, and endeavour to close the achievement gap between them and children and youth who were not in care.

The Innovative Programs for Students in the Care of, or Receiving Services from, Children’s Aid Societies are also aligned with the goal of Ensuring Equity: All children and students will be inspired to reach their full potential, with access to rich learning experiences that begin at birth and continue into adulthood, set out in Achieving Excellence: A Renewed Vision for Education in Ontario (2014).6 The plan of action for ensuring equity includes a commitment to “increase academic support and provide engaging programs for youth in care” (p. 14).

In designing the call for proposals for the Innovative Programs for Students in the Care of, or Receiving Services from, Children’s Aid Societies, Ministry staff recognized that the research evidence base for programs and approaches to support the academic achievement of students in care was limited. The call for and adjudication of proposals in 2013-14 emphasized what was understood to be effective, including hands-on-learning, cross-curricular linkages, experiential learning, and the involvement of a caring

---

5 In Ontario, a significant population of children and youth in Ontario are in the care of or receiving services from Children’s Aid Societies (referenced in this report as students in care). In 2013-14, there were 23,241 children and youth in care during the year and 47,890 ongoing protection cases. Source: OACAS (2014)

adult who would support the students in care. Beyond these criteria, the Ministry wanted to explore several different models in programming to support students in care while also supporting demographic diversity (e.g., location, urban/rural, linguistic, cultural) in programming. Ministry staff recognized that cooperation between children’s aid societies and school boards was key to the success of any programming to support students in care. School boards did not necessarily have a means to identify which students in their schools were in the care of, or receiving services from, children’s aid societies, as this information is held by the children’s aid societies. The Ministry understood that both boards and children’s aid societies could benefit from a greater understanding of the role and challenges of one another. In 2013-14, the Joint Protocol for Student Achievement was not yet established, but cooperation between boards and children’s aid societies was still understood as a priority in establishing successful programming.

Programs were to be funded if they had clear, specific plans that were designed to focus on outcomes for students in care. Programs were not funded for reasons such as having an existing source of funding (e.g., dual-credits, cooperative education), vaguely specified plans, or lack of partnerships. In the first year of programming, the Ministry also focused on funding programs that took place within a congregated classroom.

In the first year of applications for programming (2013-14), the Ministry proposal evaluation rubric assessed:

- Intended Outcomes
- Description of the Pilot
  - Implementation plan
  - Staffing details
  - Supports for students
  - Improved outcomes for pilot students
- Structure of the Pilot
  - Credit bundle
  - Timetabling
  - Activities
  - Instructional approaches
- Composition of the Pilot Advisory Team
- Key Partners
- Students in the Pilot
  - Plan
  - Number
  - Status
- Data Collection Plan
The 2013-14 rubric assigned up to 158 points in the proposal scoring. Table 1 below summarizes the funding decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Type</th>
<th>Recommended and funded</th>
<th>Recommended and not funded</th>
<th>Not recommended</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary School Pilots</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the second year of programming (2014-15), the Ministry renewed programs from the first year for boards that were willing and able to continue (e.g., had enough students to participate in the program) and also invited new proposals for (1) pilots to run in the second semester (February – June 2015) and (2) summer programming pilots for secondary and/or elementary students to be offered in 2015.

A notable change in the second year call for proposals was the addition of well-being to the outcomes for programs for students in care (the first call focused on improving educational outcomes, whereas the second call focused on improving educational outcomes and well-being). This addition brought the call for proposals in line with the recently released Achieving Excellence: A Renewed Vision for Education in Ontario (2014) that included an fourth goal for education, Promoting well-being: All children and students will develop enhanced mental and physical health, a positive sense of self and belonging, and the skills to make positive choices. Ministry staff noted that while well-being had been part of the pilots in the first year of programming, it was now explicitly stated in the calls for proposals as an outcome.

The addition of the summer programming, particularly for elementary students, was in recognition of the fact that younger students in care also needed support for achievement and well-being, as well as Ministry staff’s awareness of the literature suggesting that congregating elementary students in care was not beneficial for this younger age group. Thus, the summer programs were an opportunity to address this

---

7 While most boards only had one proposal that was recommended and funded, some boards made two proposals that were recommended and funded.
gap in support for elementary students in care. Because elementary students did not earn credits, “improved literacy and numeracy learning outcomes” was added as the academic achievement focus for elementary students.

In the second year of programming, changes were also made to the expectations for the pilots. For one, “collaboration with community partners to support the academic success and well-being of students in the pilot” was added as an expectation. Partnerships with community organizations were seen as a way to offer more experiential learning opportunities to students and establish connections between students and services available to them in the community.

In 2014-15, the evaluation rubric for new proposals was modified to assess:

- Program Components
- Intended Outcomes
- Pilot Advisory Team
- Budget

The 2014-15 rubric assigned up to 35 points in the proposal scoring. Funding decisions for new programs are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. 2014-15 Proposal Evaluation Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal Type</th>
<th>Approved</th>
<th>Declined</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Second Semester - Secondary School</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer - Elementary</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer - Secondary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer - Combined Elementary/Secondary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summer Sub-total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>58</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School board data collection requirements were also reduced in the second year of programming in response to feedback about data reporting requirements. The amount of reporting that was initially required was too great and was also difficult for program staff to manage (e.g., lack of clarity about how to complete Excel templates). Student attendance, in particular, was extremely difficult to track and was therefore dropped from the reporting in the second year. Conversations with staff during the site visits suggested that student attendance is not a case of simple absence versus presence. Some students attended irregularly at the beginning, or part-time, with the agreement of

---

8 November, 20, 2014 Memorandum to Directors of Education from Ministry of Education re: Pilots to improve educational outcomes for students in care of Children’s Aid Societies
staff and administration. Part-day attendance was also a factor. Challenges in students’ lives (e.g., housing crises, mobility between schools) also made it difficult to track and monitor the attendance of some students.

For 2015-16, boards with existing programs that were confident that they would be able to enrol a minimum of 10 students in the care of, or receiving services, from a children’s aid society were invited to submit a proposed for existing program renewal. New program proposals were not invited at this time.

3.1.2. Joint Protocol for Student Achievement

The Joint Protocol for Student Achievement template (JPSA, released February 2015) was developed in part to address the issue of information sharing between school boards and children’s aid societies. In particular, the JPSA template was developed to facilitate collaboration between partnering children’s aid societies and school boards in their efforts to enable Kindergarten to Grade 12 students who are in the care of, or receiving services from, children’s aid societies to benefit from the learning opportunities and supports available in schools and to achieve academic success. JPSA elements are: information sharing, administrative processes, planning for student achievement, dispute resolution, and monitoring and evaluation of the protocol. The JPSA template defines procedures to support students while respecting student confidentiality and is designed to support the development of local protocols between school boards and children’s aid societies.

As described in the section Partnerships (p. 17), the introduction of the JPSA made a significant impact on the relationships between boards and children’s aid societies when it was introduced in 2015, halfway through the second year of programming.

4. Evolution of Programs

The following findings are based on the information shared within the interviews and focus groups in the 11 boards selected for site visits.

4.1.1. Program planning

In general, school boards responded to the Ministry calls for proposals with an initially top-down approach, as board- and school-level staff (e.g., superintendent, Student Success lead, principal, Student Success teacher, guidance head) prepared program proposals, sometimes in conjunction with children’s aid society staff, based on their understanding of the needs of students in care. A few programs visited were based
upon existing programs that were designed to re-engage at-risk youth. Very few programs reported seeking student or parent/guardian input in the initial design of programs. However, as programs became more established and staff came to recognize the idiosyncratic nature of the challenges students faced and to understand what worked and did not work, student needs and input became an important part of program design. In one program, students decided which credits they would take as a group based on the collective type of credits needed.

4.1.2. Goals

In designing the programs, school boards initially aligned their goals with those in the Ministry calls for proposals, focusing on supporting educational outcomes and well-being, providing experiential learning, and providing a caring environment. Program design was primarily reflective of the need to support individualized opportunities for academic progress (e.g., credit accumulation, graduation) as well as provide socioemotional support to students for challenges such as mental health and substance use.

Early in program implementation, it became apparent at many sites that supporting student well-being preceded goals of student achievement. Many students were quite disengaged from school and learning, with some programs specifically targeting non-attenders, and had numerous well-being challenges (e.g., hunger, mental health and addictions issues, socioemotional problems). Thus, staff had to work with students to achieve a sense of trust and safety before working on academic goals. Many respondents emphasized the fact that credit accumulation and graduation for these students was secondary to mental and physical well-being. For many students, addressing their mental and physical needs was an essential prelude to addressing their academic needs. Even as these needs were addressed and achievement became more a focus, there was still a need for ongoing support for the continuing, non-academic stressors in students’ lives. Thus, social and emotional supports for students were essential ingredients in supporting students’ academic achievement.

4.1.3. Participants and recruitment

The Ministry’s call for proposals for secondary school programming indicated that programs should be focused upon students in the care of, or receiving services from, children’s aid societies, and students who are enrolled in secondary school but are disengaged as a result of high levels of absenteeism, low levels of educational outcomes, and/or not on track to graduate.
Programs followed the Ministry guidelines, with several programs particularly focused upon students who were non-attending or in group homes, those with particular interests (e.g., art) that would be aligned with the program activities, and/or those with particular characteristics that would benefit from more specialized supports (e.g., a program for girls that would also address the socioemotional problems they faced).

A few programs noted that there was a benefit to having cohorts in a program that were a mixture of students currently involved with children’s aid societies and those that were otherwise at risk. Staff perceived that students in care would then not feel surrounded by the children’s aid system and that the mixed cohort also reduced the stigma of attending the program. Staff in some programs noted that the programs would also be beneficial to at-risk students because many other students (e.g., former students in care; Indigenous youth; street-involved youth; Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Trans, or Questioning youth) face challenges similar to those faced by students in care and could benefit from a safe space and additional socioemotional supports. Thus, as these programs had evolved, they had opened up their recruitment to more at-risk students.

Several programs noted that within the at-risk student group that was recruited to the program, several students were formerly in the care of, or receiving services from children’s aid societies.

Initial recruitment for the programs was largely conducted by or in conjunction with children’s aid society staff. In some programs, recruitment was also done by individuals in other roles such as group home workers, principals, and guidance counsellors. Recruitment was initially a challenge (see section on Recruitment, p. 28), particularly where relationships with children’s aid societies were not well developed, but became easier throughout the life of each program as the relationships with children’s aid societies improved. As program successes became known in the wider community, recruitment to some programs was done through word-of-mouth, particularly by students who had experienced success in the program. Some programs even had waiting lists of students who wanted to participate. In a few programs, students were given a chance to meet with the program team (program staff and children’s aid society worker) at the site to see if the program would be a good fit for the student.

4.1.4. Program structure

The programs visited represented a mix of models in terms of their general structure. There were two programs that provided itinerant support to students within their home schools through a teacher or social worker, as well as additional staff supports (e.g., school social worker, special education teacher). The remainder of the programs
involved partial or full-day programming, either on the site of the student’s home school or offsite in a congregated classroom.

Amongst the programs visited, a few changed their structure significantly over the life of the program. In one program, students initially participated in the program half-day in an offsite location and spent the rest of the day in their home school. However, the transition between locations was found to be difficult for students because it was disruptive to home school participation and because students wanted to have one teacher and one location. In subsequent years of the program, students stayed in the program site (students ended up transferring to the program location) so that they did not have to change locations midday.

In another program using an itinerant model, initially one full-time social worker was responsible for 100 different schools, but in subsequent years, the lead social worker worked with each of the school-based social workers so that the lead social worker could focus on organizing trips for students, staff training, meetings, helping students transition between schools, and data reporting.

At least one program that was located within a larger school context found that the initial approach of tying students to specific credit-granting classes within the students in care program did not work; students wanted the flexibility to take different classes based on their needs and also be mixed in classes with students who were not in care, as this was less stigmatizing to the students. The solution was to continue to offer credit courses within the program, but provide increased flexibility to individual students.

To address issues with participation, one program tried moving to a quadmester approach for courses, but found that this was even worse because student participation was too greatly affected by poor attendance.

4.1.5. Program activities and supports

The programs provided a variety of activities and supports to students, representing the range reported in the program narrative reports submitted each year (see Appendix A for summary). Programs provided academic activities; pathways exploration and preparation; life skills development; socioemotional, mental health, and addictions supports; transportation; food; and opportunities for physical activity. Students had access to a caring adult (usually a dedicated teacher), as well as support from other staff such as an educational assistant, social worker, child and youth worker, mental health nurse, guidance counsellor, and/or re-engagement teacher. Community organizations also provided services for students, such as employment-related
experience, socioemotional training, and drug rehabilitation. Cultural supports, such as visits from First Nations elders, were also provided in some programs.

Several programs found that initially they did not have enough staff support for the primary caring adult, so they added additional staff (e.g., educational assistant, social worker, child and youth worker) to support the needs of the students. Many board and program staff respondents emphasized that the more staff support there was to meet the students’ varied needs, the better, because it was difficult for one individual to provide the breadth and depth of support required by students. The needs of each cohort within a program were different from year to year. As a consequence, some programs tailored their supports for each cohort based on the students that were participating and their specific needs (e.g., increased focus on mental health support one year, increased focus on addictions support another year).

4.1.6. Partnerships

In recognition of the importance that collaboration with children’s aid societies plays in supporting students in care, one of the Ministry’s goals in funding programs was to support opportunities for the education sector and children’s aid societies to work together to identify and support students in care and share relevant information.

Within the 11 boards visited, the relationships with children’s aid societies varied in strength. Initially, some boards already had a good rapport with the relevant children’s aid societies and the program gave them an opportunity to build upon that relationship. In other boards, the relationships were not well-established and had to be built up over time. As some boards were relying heavily on children’s aid societies to recruit students to the program, weak relationships posed a barrier to recruiting students in care and providing for the management of their cases. There was also a sense from some program staff that the children’s aid societies did not understand educational processes. For instance, children’s aid society staff did not understand initially that schools typically do not have information on who students in care are or what challenges they face; that if students do not attend school, they are not on the school register and the school does not receiving provincial funding for that student; that teachers do not normally receive training on issues specific to students in care. At the same time, program staff were not necessarily acquainted with children’s aid society processes. For instance, children’s aid societies place a priority on protecting the privacy and confidentiality of children and youth, and are very careful about the disclosure of student information; this lead to initial challenges for boards and schools working with children’s aid societies to recruit students for the programs and attempting to understand the circumstances faced by participating students. However, for the most part, with time and effort, boards and
schools built stronger relationships with their local children’s aid societies and these issues were resolved.

Where stronger relationships were built between school boards and children’s aid societies, the benefits included more effective recruitment and referrals of students, as well as involvement of the children’s aid society in monitoring students’ progress. For instance, some programs involved children’s aid society workers in regular team meetings about student progress, thus keeping teachers connected to a student’s children’s aid society worker to monitor and discuss how to best serve the student. At least one board made annual presentations to local children’s aid society staff to inform them about the program being offered and its potential benefits to students in care. Where children’s aid societies were actively involved with the boards, they collaborated with the program staff to support different student needs (e.g., finding tutors and mentors for students, helping with basic needs), arrange activities for students (e.g., summer camps), and coordinate communications and permissions with parents/guardians.

Several boards noted that the establishment of the Joint Protocol for Student Achievement in 2015 helped strengthen their relationship with children’s aid societies, even in cases where there was already a relationship established. One board commented that the Joint Protocol for Student Achievement codified the work that they had already been doing to build a relationship with their local children’s aid society.

In addition to the need to build relationships between school boards and children’s aid societies, program staff also noted in some cases that students and parents/guardians held strongly negative views about children’s aid societies and their role in the students’ lives. Thus, some programs responded by making concerted efforts to involve children’s aid society workers in meetings with students, parents/guardians, and program staff, and/or holding information sessions where children’s aid society staff had an opportunity to explain their role and answer questions from students.

In terms of other partnerships with community organizations, most programs did not have a solid network of pre-existing relationships. As programs were established and evolved, boards built new relationships with community organizations to provide guest speakers, services, and experiential learning opportunities to students, as well as to help students gain awareness of what community organizations were available to support them.
Crown Ward Education Championship Teams (partnerships among local school boards, children’s aid societies, community partners) also helped facilitate communication between members.

4.1.7. Funding

The 11 boards used the Ministry funds primarily to support the costs of staff (e.g., primary teacher or social worker, support staff), experiential learning costs (e.g., field trips, certifications), space rental and furnishings, supplies (e.g., technology, classroom resources), food, and transportation. Board- and school-level staff indicated that the funding had been critical to their ability to implement the programs, as most boards did not have their own resources to cover most of the program costs. Respondents felt that the availability of the Ministry funding demonstrated the importance of providing programming specific to students in care and in many cases allowed them to try a different approach than what had been attempted before.

The year-to-year nature and timing of the Ministry’s funding announcements and funding approval process were frequently cited as sources of instability for the programs. Programs felt inhibited in their ability to plan ahead and ensure staffing stability. Given the time and investment it took each program to build trust with students and partner organizations, and given the vulnerability of students in care and the benefits that they experienced from staff stability and programming, the instability of the funding was seen as a destabilizing factor for the relationships that had already been built. Program staff were significantly concerned about the ability to sustain programming without ongoing funding.

5. Experiences and Successes

Students and staff both felt strongly about the positive benefits of the programs. Students were extremely appreciative of the help they received from program teachers, educational assistants, child and youth workers, and other staff. Many staff expressed surprise at how well students did, and how successful their program was with students where other approaches had failed.

5.1. Students

Students are getting credits and have some structure to their lives and their day. They have a real sense of belonging. They have a future story or are beginning to develop a future story. They have built relationships with adults, which is one of the biggest barriers in their lives. They don’t trust adults and they don’t trust
the system. They've been rejected everywhere they've gone. Even their own families have rejected them so… And it's really interesting because they will always push barriers and it's almost to test you, “do you still care about me?” (Board staff)

5.1.1. Engagement and attitudes towards learning and school

I was amazed by how much I enjoy coming here. I get up in the morning and actually want to go to school. (Student)

I really hated high school and I really struggled with going, related to the school and also mental health. But coming into this program, it’s enjoyable, it’s fun, I get to do art which I love and it’s also a very safe space for everybody. (Student)

Students reported that participating in the programs had changed their pre-existing attitudes and relationship toward education and their own abilities, such that they now had very positive attitudes towards school and felt very engaged in their own learning. Students went from feeling that school was not appropriate for them, with some not even attending school, to reporting that they liked or loved coming to school, which some called a fun and an exciting experience in which they were no longer afraid to engage. In some programs, students did not leave school at the end of the day, feeling that the program was a place where they belonged. They also expressed a sense of hope, that they could learn, graduate, and succeed in life. One student said that participation in the program enabled her to see a future, and that her view of school changed from “a place you had to go” to “a place to learn that was important to achieving [her] future”. Students also felt that they had a voice in their own programming, which contributed to their sense of engagement. Staff experiences echoed the strong sense of engagement that students had in the program.

5.1.2. Attendance

Attendance improved for many students, and for almost all of the students who participated in the focus groups. Students were also appreciative of the flexibility of being able attend when they could. Several staff commented that they were surprised by the level of student attendance, which exceeded their own initial expectations.

5.1.3. Importance of caring adults and peers

Being in this community, it's almost like it's a family. (Student)

It's more of a family than a school. (Student)
Students formed strong attachments to their teacher or caring adult in both the itinerant and non-itinerant models. One student reported that he/she had “never had someone stick by me like that before…without her help I wouldn’t be graduating.” This sentiment reflects the sense of advocacy and support that students felt from the caring adult. Staff reported that the trust that was formed was especially remarkable given that many students had previously lacked positive, trustworthy relationships with adults in their lives. In congregated classrooms, students reported a sense of belonging to a family and a community, feeling liked, welcomed, and happy that they were surrounded by caring individuals. Some students wanted their parents/guardians to meet their teachers. Teachers themselves were sometimes surprised by the strength and depth of caring and attachment that they felt for their students.

Students also formed strong attachments and friendships with their peers, who could serve as a source of mentorship to “teach you the ropes” and serve as positive influences. In one program with mixed grade levels, staff observed that:

…the students form their own organic learning community, where senior students or more academic students will take on a leadership or mentorship role and younger students will then look up to those students. (Program staff)

5.1.4. Safe environment

…coming here into an environment that was safe for me to be me, safe for me to present as myself and be, hey, this is me and still get an education and still be accepted and cared for. (Student)

Within the context of developing strong attachments to the caring adults and peers in the program, students across many programs reported that they felt safe within the program setting. Students felt safety because they would not be judged, bullied or stigmatized. Many had a strong sense of being understood, respected, and supported, and also felt that they could express their feelings within this safe environment.

5.1.5. Socioemotional development, mental health, substance use, and life skills

Students reported a greater feeling of self-worth, self-confidence, and self-motivation. They felt that their program helped them build skills in a variety of socioemotional domains such as relationship management, problem-solving, communication, and self-advocacy. Staff observed improved behaviour, maturity, and autonomy in students. Both students and staff reported a reduction in students’ anxiety, depression, and
substance use. In addition, students learned life and self-management skills (e.g.,
financial literacy, independent living skills); this was particularly important for students
who lived on their own. Students even indicated that their own family trusted them more.

Where an understanding of children’s aid societies was promoted through an
information session or regular check-in meetings with a society worker as part of the
team, students reported a greater understanding of the role of children’s aid societies.

5.1.6. Academic achievement within flexible, less-structured setting

Students and staff reported success with credit accumulation, academic achievement,
and progress toward graduation within the different programs. Students appreciated the
one-on-one support with their learning, the flexibility of the teacher to work with their
own learning styles, and the hands-on learning approach. A high percentage of
participating students were identified as having various learning needs and had
individualized learning plans. One student stated that the teacher “will find a method for
me to learn if the current one isn’t working.” Students also felt that they were not being
pushed through the system, appreciative of the ability to earn credits at their own pace.
In some programs, students went from not attending school to gaining credits and being
on track to graduation.

Many students did not feel like they were in a structured, regular school (reported by
those who were in an alternative setting). This feeling of less structure was encouraged
in some sites with features such as the design of the space (e.g., comfortable couches),
the lack of school bells, and more lenient rules (e.g., no punishment for swearing).
Students also found a small class setting calmer and easier to focus within, while at the
same time giving them the space to express their emotions.

5.1.7. Pathways planning

Reflecting a sense of hope, several students felt like they had a road to the future, able
to see graduation, plan for post-secondary education, or plan a pathway toward career
and employment. Students felt supported in planning for post-secondary education and
navigating application processes. They also felt they had gained employability skills for
the future.

5.1.8. School and community connections

Within some programs, students also formed connections to the larger school (if the
program was situated within a larger school setting). Students participating in an
itinerant model were fully integrated with the school. On the other hand, students who were congregated offsite from their home school had little or no connection with their home school. In one board, the program would connect students to their home school through visits from the guidance counsellor to do credit counselling, but in general the links were not strong. In another board, an early implementation model involved having students congregated offsite in the program for a half day and then in their home school for the remainder of the day, but this made it difficult for students to connect to their home school. Some students and staff stated that it was preferable to have one site all day so that the students would not be tempted to leave after the congregated morning program.

Within programs situated in a larger school, students had mixed reports of feeling supported or not supported by teachers in the rest of the school.

In terms of community connections, students reported positive connections to community agencies and the services they provide.

Where programs involved parents/guardians through regular contact (e.g., daily, weekly), staff reported that parents and guardians were more engaged and supportive of students.

5.1.9. Other benefits

Students were appreciative of the food provided. Many programs involved the students in food purchase and breakfast/lunch preparation as opportunity to earn credits and gain valuable life skills. Students also appreciated cultural supports such as visits from First Nations elders and the opportunity to participate in First Nations ceremonies. Field trips were reported by many students to be valuable. Frequently these took the form of recreational or socializing activities, or acquainted students with community resources. At the same time, in other programs, students were not ready for a large number of field trips, so the desired activities depended on the unique needs of each student group.

5.1.10. Timing and duration of benefits

Program staff reported that students began to benefit from program participation anywhere from immediately to over the course of a year or two. The timing depended much on the students' needs when they entered the program, as well as the type of benefit being considered. Some improvement in social skills and self-esteem was reported within a month, but, in general, because of the time that it takes for students and teachers to create a trusting bond, the benefits emerged over a longer period.
Some students suggested the program should be at least a year long for benefits to become evident and endure. For students that were particularly disengaged, benefits took longer to observe, and not all students experienced success. Many of the students began the program with very few credits and it would take time to complete the ones needed.

Several students and staff expressed the desire to see the programs continue over more than one year and that the program be a permanent part of school funding.

Both students and staff expressed the belief that the benefits from the programs would be lifelong. While not enough time has passed to observe the long-term benefits of the programs, students and staff felt that the benefits would endure because students had developed non-academic skills in areas such as socioemotional development, life, and employment, as well as a sense of hope for the future.

5.1.11. Do the programs reach all students involved?

Staff observed student success to varying degrees. Given the diversity of student circumstances, success was defined individually for each student. The successes varied from one student to the next (e.g., attendance, improved self-confidence, improved life skills, reduced anxiety, credit accumulation, graduation).

The programs did not benefit all students in care that it tried to reach. Some students were not emotionally ready to participate. Some students had significant challenges that impaired their ability to participate in the programs such as struggling with addictions, living on the street, ongoing encounters with the law, being on probation, or living in correctional facilities. Students who moved from foster home to foster home also had difficulty participating in some programs, although some programs reported that if these students continued to attend if their children’s aid society workers could ensure that their foster home continued to be located within the school site boundary area.

Because individual student needs differed, some programs could not accommodate all of the needs. For instance, while the small setting of many programs worked well for many students, some students needed an even smaller setting. If a program had a particular topical focus (e.g., arts), it did not successfully engage students who did not have that interest, although some programs were sufficiently flexible to provide alternatives.
Concern was expressed by program and children’s aid society staff that the program
may not be appropriate for students who manifested behavioural difficulties or who were
violent. A concern was also expressed about whether it was appropriate to integrate
older students that had been “hardened” in the group homes with younger ones that had
just arrived. The composition of the congregated classes, however, did work well when
there was open communication between the students’ case worker, the parents and
foster parents and the school staff.

5.2. Teachers

Teachers reported a significant impact upon their practice as a result of being involved
with students in care. Several teachers felt that they were now better teachers, with
greater of awareness and empathy for the needs and challenges of students in care.
Teachers also learned to adjust their assessment strategies to be more holistic, as well
as understand how to integrate several subjects and grade levels within one class.

5.2.1. Professional development

To prepare teachers, other staff, and administration for working with students in care,
some boards provided initial and/or ongoing training in issues such as abandonment,
commitment, mental health and addictions, social skills development, providing stability,
proving a safe and caring environment, sensitivity training, and working with trauma.
Some professional development was also provided to staff to help them with issues that
would arise for them personally such as stress management and compassion fatigue.

Within some boards, curriculum consultants supported teachers in learning how to
provide experiential learning, or student success leaders worked with teachers on how
to rethink teaching and deconstruct curricular expectations to evaluate students in a
non-traditional manner.

5.2.2. Multifaceted and flexible roles

Teachers found that their role in students’ lives was multifaceted. In addition to teaching
credit courses, they helped students with management of social and emotional issues
(e.g., building confidence, teaching communication skills), and supported students in life
management (e.g., dealing with housing and finances). As the foundation for this
support, they had to build trust with each student and act as the caring adult. Teachers
needed to balance student needs and the curriculum expectations while simultaneously
supporting both the well-being and the academic achievement of students.
Within programs, teachers were given flexibility from their school boards in deciding how they worked with students. Teachers did not have to abide by traditional rules in the classroom such as taking disciplinary actions for swearing or breaking a dress code. Furthermore, teachers had the flexibility to teach, work with curricular expectations, and conduct assessment in different ways according to the needs of the students.

5.2.3. Increased understanding and compassion

Several staff reported that they did not have awareness of students in care in their education system before the programs existed. Teachers came to understand the challenging life experiences of students in care, including issues of mental health, addictions, and homelessness. Staff also had to be sensitive to the different cultural backgrounds of the students, and not impose their own values on the students.

In order to support student well-being and achievement, teachers first had to build a trusting relationship with each student. Many students expected rejection from adults, requiring that teachers learn to be patient with students pushing their boundaries. Teachers allowed students to express their needs and emotions and listened to students without making judgements. Through the programs, teachers and staff built warmth, sympathy, empathy, compassion, and patience for students in care, understanding that the care and well-being component would precede academic success.

Students also reflected that teachers came to understand their lives and also treated them better. In their roles, teachers developed strong and deep bonds to students, which could be quite rewarding as teachers felt they were making a difference in student’s lives.

5.2.4. Impact on teaching and assessment practice

Several teachers reported that they learned how to do their job differently, learning different ways to evaluate and assess students. Teachers also learned different ways to structure the classroom. They came to understand the importance of hands-on and student-lead learning to support students in care, as well as the importance of individualized lessons and curriculum adapted to student needs. Some students expressed appreciation for the sense that they were being assessed holistically.

5.2.5. Reliance on support

Teachers found that they could not support the students on their own given the breadth and depth of student needs. They learned to rely on other staff at the program, school,
and board level to support and complement them in their roles. Having a second adult in the program was identified as extremely helpful, particularly when managing a student who might be in crisis while keeping the program going for others. As such, teachers and principals repeatedly emphasized that the identification of additional staff such as a child and youth worker and an educational assistant was a key component for teacher success and retention. Teachers grew to value connections to community partners and children’s aid society workers, as they provided other avenues of support for the students in care.

5.3. School and school board

The programs' impact on students' home schools was mixed from program to program. For programs that were situated such that students also had contact with their home school, some programs provided training to non-program staff in the school about the unique needs of students in care in the hopes of fostering greater understanding of these students' needs, as well as introducing them to the program for students in care. In some cases, program staff reported that greater empathy for students in care was built within the rest of the staff, creating greater belief in the possibility of success for these students. Some programs also reported that the demonstrated success of students helped increase administration’s support for the program.

In other cases, program staff reported that other teachers in the school were not aware of the program. In a few cases, program staff perceived that the rest of the school staff tended to view the program and its students as “other students” rather than also being “their students”, pointing to the need for wider support and understanding for the students in care and their needs from teachers and staff outside the program.

In general, efforts were not concentrated on preparing the home school for the programs or creating connections for program participants with their home school. Some staff felt that there was room for improvement in fostering relationships between the program and students' home schools. In programs within offsite congregated classrooms, many students reported having had negative experiences with the home school and were grateful for the fresh start offsite.

At the board level, some respondents pointed to their program as a flagship for their board, raising the profile for an alternative platform for learning for students in care. As well, in some cases the programs increased relationships between boards and improved inter-board coordination to support students who moved frequently between boards due to instability in their family or housing situations.
A significant benefit for many boards was an improved relationship with their local children’s aid societies, which was also facilitated by the introduction of the Joint Protocol for Student Achievement (see section on Partnerships, p. 17, for further description).

6. Challenges

Programs experienced numerous challenges on their way to success for students in care.

6.1.1. Recruitment

Recruitment of students to the programs was a continuing challenge, one that was related to the quality of each board’s relationship with their local children’s aid societies. Though the adoption of the Joint Protocol for Student Achievement in 2015 was helpful for recruitment, program staff noted that it only applied to students in the care of, or receiving services, from children’s aid societies. Although programs were required to have a minimum of 10 students in care, some programs struggled with reaching this minimum and recruited other students considered at-risk to supplement the student numbers. Some schools referred students who had previously been in care to enhance the program student numbers.

6.1.2. Relationship with children’s aid societies

As described in the preceding section and in the section on Partnerships, p. 17, if good working relationships were not established with local children’s aid societies, boards had difficulty both recruiting students and coordinating with the children’s aid societies to monitor and support students. It took time for boards and children’s aid societies to build a reciprocal understanding of one another’s processes to support students, an understanding that was facilitated by use of the Joint Protocol for Student Achievement.

In the French board visited, not all children’s aid societies were bilingual, which was an additional barrier to forming strong relationships between the French board and the English children’s aid societies.

Students and parents/guardians also had issues with trusting children’s aid societies. If programs worked to facilitate the relationship between students, parents/guardians, and children’s aid societies through information sessions and joint case meetings, this improved the student and parent/guardian perceptions of children’s aid societies, and
sometimes resulted in increased referrals from students to other students to join the program.

6.1.3. Records and information transfer

Because some students in care experienced housing instability and would change boards, transfer of their records to a new board was often delayed. As a consequence, program staff would not have access to student records in a timely fashion, or incomplete records were transferred as some student information was deemed to be property of the board and not transferrable. For instance, one board reported that another sending board did not provide psychological assessments along with student records, claiming that the assessments were the intellectual property of the sending board. This required reassessment and delayed the process of finding appropriate programs and courses for students.

While information transfer from children’s aid societies was initially problematic in some boards, better transitions were facilitated for the students as relationships were built between schools and children’s aid societies.

6.1.4. Attendance and transportation

Student attendance, while a significant success in many programs, was still an ongoing challenge for programs. Poor attendance would in turn reduce students’ engagement with the program. Programs implemented various supports to ensure that students attended school, including having attendance counsellors, providing wake-up calls and messages for students, and providing transportation for students.

Transportation from the student’s home or home school was seen as a critical part of supporting attendance. Boards arranged for bus tickets, taxis, and drivers (sometimes the teacher), finding that different methods of transportation worked for different students and locations. For instance, bus service was infrequent, inconvenient, or unavailable in some locations; some students were anxious about taking the bus; or other students would get on the bus but not get off at school. In at least two boards, arrangements were eventually made to coordinate with the students’ reserve in order to provide transportation to the program.

6.1.5. Program monitoring

Program and school board staff found that simple monitoring measures such as daily attendance and credit accumulation did not capture the whole story for students. Depending on the circumstances for each student, attending once a week, three times a
week, or for a partial day could be a significant success, particularly for those students who were not attending school at all before the program.

### 6.1.6. Program and staffing instability

Boards expressed uncertainty in their ability to continue offering their programs because their ability to offer them was tied to the availability of funding. As discussed in the section on Funding, p. 19, the Ministry funds were seen as a critical resource for offering the programs. The timing of funding announcements was often too late for boards to ensure stability in programming, which was destabilizing for the students who were attached to the program and its staff.

Teacher characteristics (e.g., flexible, compassionate, strong teaching and assessment) were seen as critical to program success. However, boards were often hampered in their ability to retain staff due to the timing of the funding announcements. For instance, a teacher would take another assignment that was offered because it was uncertain if the program funding would come through at the time that most staffing decisions were being made in a board. The majority of programs visited did not have stability of staffing throughout the programs. Staffing disruptions were largely related uncertainty around program funding, although there were other factors cited such as illness and maternity leave.

Because many students had difficulty trusting adults and took time to create trusting bonds with staff, staff turnover would cause a negative reaction in students and would also require that the bonds be recreated with someone new. Given the level of instability in the lives of students in care, instability in staffing was highly undesirable. At the same time, both staff and students commented that, if staff were too rigid in their approach, they were also a bad fit for the students; staff had to be nurturing and caring.

### 6.1.7. Staffing choice

At least one board indicated that collective agreements that emphasized seniority and had elaborate surplus teacher placement processes could make it challenging to hire or assign a staff member (e.g., teacher, educational assistant) with the right characteristics to work with students in care.

### 6.1.8. Multiple and diverse student needs

Staff spoke of students’ academic gaps, but these were seen as secondary to students’ well-being needs. Students in the programs had complex challenges such as
addictions, mental health issues including anxiety and depression, behavioural issues (e.g., oppositional, defiant), trauma (e.g., abuse, sexual assault), dysfunctional families, transience (e.g., changing foster homes, becoming homeless), poverty, encounters with law enforcement, being in correctional facilities, and involvement with children’s aid societies. Students also had socioemotional challenges, with poor relationship and communication skills, low self-esteem, low motivation, and little to no support from their home environment to succeed. Many of them had difficulty trusting adults and authority figures based on their experiences in the past. Some students would come to school sleep-deprived and hungry, and without basic care they could not concentrate on school activities. Student challenges could be ongoing and often unpredictable, impacting students’ well-being and ability to engage in the programs. What happened the night before at home would affect a student’s ability to engage today. Staff also had to be able to respond in a flexible and caring manner to support the students facing these challenges, either by providing the support themselves or knowing which other supports (e.g., additional staff, community supports, children’s aid society) to call upon.

6.1.9. Transitions

Transitions of various kinds were challenging for students. A program that initially had students transition between offsite programming and regular school found that students had difficulty engaging in regular school and preferred not to have such a jarring transition midday. Transitions in students’ home lives (e.g., change in foster home) posed challenges for students’ ability to engage at school. As some students approached the end of their time in care, they would act out as they felt unprepared to no longer be supported by the care system.

6.1.10. Demands upon teachers

While teachers found their experiences in the program to be valuable to their practice as a teacher and for understanding of the needs of students in care, there were also enormous demands placed upon the teachers in supporting the students. Teachers felt they had to negotiate a complex system of supports and provide emotional support in addition to academic support. Some teachers were not initially prepared to support students’ diverse and complex non-academic needs. They found themselves tested by students pushing their boundaries of trust to see if the teacher would still remain by their side. They had to learn how to listen, understand, and respond to student behaviours and outbursts. Teachers had to be flexible with students, both in welcoming the students without judgement and in their approach to teaching and assessment. Often, teacher and staff relationships with students did not end with the school day (e.g.,
supporting a student who has no place to sleep) and could be overwhelming for the teacher who had to determine where boundaries should be drawn.

To support teachers, some boards provided professional development relevant to working with students in care and/or hiring additional staff to support the teacher. Some programs also brought on additional staff (e.g., social worker, retired teachers employed as tutors, educational assistants, child and youth workers) to support the teacher in the classroom. Boards built upon partnerships with community organizations to support some student needs (e.g., socioemotional skill development, employment preparation) and interests.

6.1.11. Stigma from students and staff

The stigma of participating in a program for students in care was not mentioned in every program visited, but it was still a factor in some programs. If a program was seen by students as being exclusively for Crown Wards, some students felt stigmatized. Mixing students in the care of, or receiving services from, children’s aid societies with other at-risk students in a congregated program was seen as a possible solution to reduce stigma. Other sites indicated that students were free from stigma because they were in an offsite program and had no contact with students or teachers from their home school.

At the same time, in some programs, students appeared to respond well to the open acknowledgement inside the students in care program of their connection to children’s aid society services. As well, within an itinerant model, students appreciated the discretion used by the itinerant teacher when pulling them out of regular classes for appointments.

Staff noted that programs that were onsite in a home school did not always have wide acceptance from non-program staff, who sometimes perceived that students in the program were treated differently (e.g., disciplined more leniently). Where there was active communication between school administration, students-in-care program staff and non-students-in-care teachers and staff about the purpose and reasons for specific supports and approaches for students in care, there was wider acceptance of the program.

A worker from one children’s aid society felt that in the board, alternative programs including the students in care program were seen by the schools as “places to send kids that didn’t fit”, implying that the school felt relieved of its responsibility for the students by sending them to alternative programs.
6.1.12. One size does not fit all

Program staff quickly learned to consult students and take into account specific student needs. What would work for one individual or group might not work for another. For instance, one program found students’ difficulties in trusting adults were great enough within the cohort that it was not advisable to bring in guest speakers, who were seen as unfamiliar adults. Other groups of students were enthusiastic about and appreciative of guest speakers. In some cohorts, students were appreciative of a wide variety of field trips, but in another, students needed more structure so fewer field trips were planned. Some students felt the classes were too small, whereas others could have benefitted from an even smaller environment. In one program, students wanted more whole-class teaching, but in other programs, students appreciated the individualized, one-on-one support. Thus, what some students welcomed and were ready for, others were not.

7. Best Practices Recommended By School Board Staff, Program Staff, And Students

School board staff, program and school staff, and students provided a number of recommendations on what they saw as being the most beneficial components of the programs that lead to positive outcomes.

7.1.1. Congregated or integrated settings and location

The majority of sites visited involved some congregation of students within a classroom, either offsite or onsite in the home school. Two sites had an itinerant support model. One site had evolved to a model where students were integrated into an alternative school setting. Advantages were observed in each setting by respondents, but most respondents did not have an opportunity to compare the relative benefits and drawbacks of each approach and could not make a recommendation for one approach or another.

In congregated models, respondents repeatedly emphasized that students felt like they were in a safe space, and that they formed strong bonds with staff and fellow students, likening them to family bonds. Furthermore, in programs where students were congregated offsite from their home school, respondents felt being offsite allowed students to avoid the influence (e.g., drugs, truancy) of negative peers and bullying, and avoid exposure to teachers who were not sensitive to the vulnerable nature of these students and did not understand the nature and impact of students’ home situations. Many of the students who were congregated offsite expressed their appreciation in
having the setting away from a regular high school and recommended having such programs in a dedicated space. Some program respondents felt that, for students who did not feel safe in a regular program, an offsite location was preferable. If programs were offsite, care had to be taken in choosing a location that was accessible to students because transportation was a challenge for many students.

In the itinerant models, it was clear that the students felt supported and formed attachments to the caring adult assigned to them. Students had a sense of consistency and individual support. At the same time, staff and students did not speak of the sense of safety, family, and community that was strongly expressed by students in a congregated classroom. Moreover, in the strictly itinerant models, staff suggested that students should have access to a quiet space in their school, as they did not have access to a space that felt like their own the way that students in a congregated model did.

Where students received itinerant support or had partial or full integration in their home school, respondents felt it was beneficial to integrate students into regular classes because then students would not experience the stigma of being in a separate setting for students in care. In these models, there was the added benefit of a stronger impact on the non-program teaching staff (e.g., greater understanding of the issues faced by students in care).

7.1.2. Less structured, welcoming setting

In programs where students were congregated, respondents believed that students benefitted from an alternative setting that was not structured like a regular school. Staff were more tolerant of student behaviour (e.g., students not punished for swearing, students not suspended or expelled except for serious infractions). In these settings, students appreciated feeling like they were not in a regular school, as they were no longer exposed to the physical setup of a regular classroom, rigid timetables, and class bells. Students also valued the sense of an open door policy, such that they were welcomed back into the classroom even after an absence. The felt that they were in a non-judgemental, non-threatening atmosphere where they were not asked why they were struggling, but simply supported.
7.1.3. Continuous intake

Some program staff recommended continuous intake of students into the program, as students might move in and out of school due to their life circumstances and should not have to wait until a new semester or year to benefit from programming supports.\(^9\)

7.1.4. Design and modify programs based on student need

Program staff and students reinforced the need to take into account the varied needs of students. A “cookie cutter” approach would not work for students in care, and staff emphasized that each program, even from cohort to cohort, had to be designed for the students that the program had and not for a theoretical group. Student input was also an important part of creating programming and supports that would meet students’ needs. Without student input and buy-in, programs were unlikely to succeed.

7.1.5. Individualized programming, support, and pacing with an emphasis on experiential learning

Students appreciated having individualized support and instruction. Respondents recommended that students have flexible course selection and be able to work at their own pace. Students in care had different interests and needs, both academically and socioemotionally, so programs needed to have the flexibility to provide the credit opportunities and socioemotional supports that were appropriate. Hands-on and experiential learning towards credit opportunities was also highly valued by staff and students.

7.1.6. Allow for a continuum of success

Programs needed to recognize a continuum of success for students and define what that would look like on an individual student basis. An initial focus might be on attendance, improved health, and improved well-being, whereas a later focus could be on credit accumulation and graduation. In many programs, all efforts toward achieving a credit were celebrated – a quarter, a half, to a full credit was noted to build the students’ confidence. As emphasized in many programs, student well-being was seen as a precursor to student achievement.

\(^9\) In some narrative program reports, it was noted that when new students were introduced to an existing cohort, either through continuous intake or in a subsequent semester, the new students found it difficult to engage in the program and with other students. Moreover, if students were not getting along within a cohort, the conflicts created engagement and attendance challenges.
7.1.7. Purposeful staffing of caring adult roles

Board and program staff, as well as students, emphasized over and over again that the right staff members for the programs were critical to its success. Teachers had to be patient, warm, and compassionate, as well as competent and flexible in their teaching. They had to be able to build a trusting relationship with students first and foremost. One staff member said that “the stronger the connection is, the more success we see in every child.” Because teachers were working with students with diverse learning needs and in some cases with multiple grades, teachers needed a solid understanding of curriculum expectations, instruction, and assessment in order to understand how to adapt these elements to meet the needs of each student. They also had to understand different student learning needs and allow for student-lead learning.

A few program respondents noted that this role was not for inexperienced teachers, surplus teachers, or those who preferred a more rigid approach to teaching. Having a relevant background, such as foster parent training and intervention training, was also seen as valuable for program staff.

A low ratio of students to staff was also seen as a necessary element because of the level of attention and support that students required. To allow for a smaller program, some school boards made adjustments to the school wide teacher-student ratio to accommodate the program for students in care.

7.1.8. Staff autonomy

Because teachers and staff had to be able to work flexibly with student needs and instruction, they required the autonomy to individualize programming for students.

7.1.9. Multiple staff supports for multiple student needs

Students needed multiple supports for multiple and diverse needs, including socioemotional challenges, mental health issues, addictions, and homelessness. Because of the breadth and depth of student needs, it was too taxing on one individual to provide support to all the students in a program. Programs needed to provide support to the primary caring adult through additional staff such as an educational assistant, social worker, mental health worker, addictions worker, child and youth worker, or attendance counsellor. Support from the school administration and board staff was also quite beneficial when it was available. Involving parents/guardians in understanding the program and monitoring student progress was also valuable, as parents/guardians might then act as further sources of support for student success.
Because of staff turnover, it was important to have more than one person familiar with the program and the students in care in case a staff member left the program for any reason. Continuity and consistency of the adults mattered a great deal to the students in care.

7.1.10. Professional learning for staff

Both staff and students felt that program staff, as well as regular program staff, benefitted from professional learning that helped them understand the different issues faced by students in care, as well as the means to support students in handling these issues. Program staff also benefitted from professional learning that helped them handle the emotional demands of working with such vulnerable students.

7.1.11. Community supports

Community partnerships were seen as a source of support for students, providing programming opportunities such as field trips, guest speakers, pathways exploration opportunities, employability skills, and socioemotional supports. However, some respondents indicated that care should be taken to choose dedicated community partners that believed in alternative forms of education. Taking a formal partnership approach, such as was facilitated by the Joint Protocol for Student Achievement, was recommended as beneficial to building strong partnerships.

7.1.12. Building positive relationships with children’s aid societies

A positive working relationship between school boards and children’s aid societies was important to make referrals of students to the programs, as well as monitor and support students on an ongoing basis throughout the program. The availability and uptake of the Joint Protocol for Student Achievement had a positive impact on school board relationships with children’s aid societies. One children’s aid society supervisor stated that every board should have a meeting at the beginning of the year with boards and one at the end. This way, new staff could be informed on the protocols and recommendations for improvement could be shared.

7.1.13. Program stability

Programs needed to be stable in their existence and staffing. Most boards did not have the funding to sustain these programs on their own, so year-to-year special funding threatened their ability to continue to offer the programs. Staffing turnover also had a negative impact on students, as many students in care had difficulty forming trusting
bonds with adults and a change in staff would disrupt the relationships already built. Staff expressed a desire for longer-term funding that was sufficient to support the programs, with one staff member estimating that each cohort should be supported for the 4-5 years it would take to see them through to graduation.

7.1.14. Ongoing monitoring

In addition to the Ministry reporting requirements, several programs developed a program-level monitoring plan. Programs needed a monitoring plan, with formal and informal feedback, to assess student progress regularly (from daily check-ins with students to more formal team meetings a few times a semester) and evaluate whether the supports were appropriate or sufficient for the students as well as staff in the program. This was important as these were new programs, and the teachers had little in the way of points of reference to judge progress. Some programs also noted that a whole team approach (e.g., meetings that might include the student, teacher, other support staff, children’s aid society workers, group home staff, and/or parents/guardians) was useful for monitoring student progress and for assessing what supports were successful and what additional supports might be needed. As well, at the program-level, regular meetings with board staff, school staff, program staff, and community partners were recommended to discuss plans, issues and successes. Connections to other programs for students in care were also recommended to share information on challenges and best practices.

7.1.15. Food

Food was an essential element of most programs. Almost all programs provided food (e.g., breakfast, lunch dinner, snacks) for students and found that this was necessary to support student well-being, as many students had food instability and were unable to focus upon learning if they were hungry. In many programs, a Food and Nutrition credit was embedded in the planning and preparation of meals. When staff shared meals with the students, it reinforced a caring setting and created a sense of community.

7.1.16. Transportation

Providing transportation in the form of bus tickets, taxi, or drivers (in some cases program staff) was an essential component of addressing attendance challenges. Depending on characteristics unique to each program and students (e.g., availability and coverage of public transit, student housing situation), programs did not all settle on supporting the same methods of transportation.
8. Appendix D1: Interview and Focus Group Protocols

The following guides were used as semi-structured protocols for the School Board Level:

- Ministry-level interview
- School board-level interview
- Program-level focus groups
- Student-level focus groups

The questions were used as a general guide, with opportunities for the interview and focus group facilitators to further explore themes and topics that arose during discussions.

8.1. Guiding Questions for Interviews with Ministry Staff

8.1.1. English

1. Could you describe your role in the program? What was your involvement?
2. What was the motivation behind the development of the program? What was the evidence that something needed to be done?
3. What were the objectives of the program? How does this align with the Ministry goals?
4. What alternatives to this program were considered for addressing outcomes for students in care? What is it about the program that led to it being recommended over other alternatives that were considered?
5. Can you describe range of proposals/interventions that were to be tried? What considerations went into decisions by EDU to select projects? For those that were not selected, what was the reason?
6. Is it possible to describe the basic types of innovations and programming? How would you describe the types of activities and strategies across the pilot programs? What made them unique?
7. How was the amount of funding for each pilot determined?
8. What do you think are the most successful components of this initiative in leading to positive outcomes? Least successful? Is there a working definition of what success for this initiative is or of what represents success? How do you know these components are connected to positive outcomes?
9. What considerations went into decisions by EDU to renew projects? For those that were not renewed, what was the reason?
10. What led to decisions to expand to other schools and boards? Success, or interest in participating, or a desire for geographic or other diversity?
11. Were there any projects that dropped out of the program? What were the reasons?
12. What obstacles did you have to overcome in establishing this initiative? What did you do to overcome each obstacle?
13. What changes have been made to the initiative since it first began? Why? Did these changes have a positive impact on the goals of the initiative?
14. What are the challenges of the initiative? How were they overcome?
15. What was unexpected or surprising about the initiative? Were there unintended outcomes?
8.1.2. Français

1. Pouvez-vous décrire votre rôle dans ce programme? En quoi consistait votre participation?
2. Quelle était la motivation à développer le programme? Quels indicateurs ont déterminé le besoin d'agir?
3. Quels étaient les objectifs du programme? Comment ceux-ci s’alignent-ils sur les buts du Ministère?
4. Quelles possibilités autres que ce programme ont été considérées dans le but d'aborder le rendement des élèves étant à charge? Quels éléments du programme ont fait en sorte que celui-ci soit recommandé plus que les autres solutions considérées?
5. Pouvez-vous décrire une variété de propositions ou d’interventions qui seront mises à l’essai? Quels éléments EDU a-t-il pris en considération pour la sélection de ses projets? Pour quelles raisons certains projets ont-ils été mis de côté?
6. Est-il possible de décrire les principaux types d’innovations et de programmation? Comment décririez-vous les types d’activités et les stratégies des différents projets pilotes? En quoi étaient-elles uniques?
7. Comment le montant de financement de chaque projet pilote a-t-il été déterminé?
8. Quels sont, selon vous, les meilleures composantes de l’initiative qui ont donné des rendements positifs? Les moins bonnes? Existe-t-il une définition pratique de la réussite en ce que concerne cette initiative ou de ce qui est considéré une réussite? Comment savez-vous que ces éléments sont reliés à ces résultats positifs?
9. Qu’a pris en considération EDU pour prendre la décision de renouveler les projets? Quelle fut la raison de ne pas renouveler certains projets, le cas échéant?
10. Comment la décision de présenter les programmes dans d'autres écoles ou conseils scolaire a-t-elle été prise? Par la réussite ou l'intérêt à participer, ou le désir d'obtenir la diversité géographique ou toute autre facteur?
11. Y a-t-il eu des projets qui se sont retirés du programme? Pour quelles raisons?
12. Quels obstacles avez-vous dû surmonter lors de l’établissement de cette initiative? Qu’avez-vous fait pour surmonter chaque obstacle?
14. Quels sont les défis de cette initiative? Comment ont-ils été relevés?
15. Y a-t-il eu des imprévus ou des surprises entourant cette initiative? Quels ont été certains résultats imprévus?

8.2. Guiding Questions for Interviews with School Board Informants

8.2.1. English

1. What was the motivation behind the development of the program? Who started the program? What was the evidence that something needed to be done?
2. What were the objectives of the program? How does this align with the Ministry goals?
3. What alternatives to this program were considered for addressing outcomes for students in care? What is it about the program that led to it being recommended over other alternatives that were considered?
4. How did you become involved in this program? Can you describe your role?
5. How does the program work in your board? Describe activities and resources.
6. What steps or process did you follow in establishing this initiative at the school/board? What was the role of the CAS’s?
7. Who are the main participants? Were these the same as the intended participants?
8. What are the supports that the board and school used for implementing the program? Were there additional supports that would have been helpful?
9. What relationships, infrastructure, and supports were already in place before the project began?
10. How were students, staff, community partners, etc. brought on board?
11. What obstacles did you have to overcome in establishing this program? What did you do to overcome each obstacle?
12. What role did the program funding play?
13. What are the benefits that participants receive?
14. When do the benefits become evident? After one semester, one year, etc.? How were the summer programs beneficial?
15. How enduring are the benefits?
16. To what extent are students in care connected to the rest of the school?
17. How was the host school prepared for this pilot project? Was there initial preparation for the administration, teachers not teaching in the program and other support workers?
18. What is the role of the teacher(s) in supporting the programs? What competencies/attitudes were considered necessary; what initial preparation or support did teachers receive; was teacher participation continuous; was the teacher role in practice aligned with what was intended?
19. How has the program impacted/influenced teacher practices? How do you know the impact was related to the program?
20. How much have the programs been supported by the home school and local community?
21. How much have the programs been supported by the CAS’s?
22. What do you think are the most successful components of the program in leading to positive outcomes? Least successful? How do you know these components are connected to these positive outcomes?
23. What changes have been made to the program since it first began? Why?
24. Did these changes have a positive impact on the goals of the program?
25. What are the challenges of the program? How are they overcome?
26. Do you have advice for other schools/board wanting to start similar projects? What would you do differently given the opportunity to start again?
27. What was unexpected or surprising about the program? Were there unintended outcomes?

8.2.2. Français

1. Qu’est-ce qui a motivé l’élaboration du programme? Qui a lancé le programme? Quels indicateurs ont déterminé le besoin d’agir?
2. Quels étaient les objectifs du programme? Comment ceux-ci s’alignent-ils sur les buts du Ministère?
3. Quelles possibilités autres que ce programme ont été considérées dans le but d’aborder le rendement des élèves étant à charge ou recevant des services? Quels éléments du programme ont fait en sorte que celui-ci soit recommandé plus que les autres solutions considérées?
4. Comment en êtes-vous venu à participer à ce programme? Pouvez-vous décrire votre rôle?
5. Comment le programme fonctionne-t-il au sein de votre conseil? Décrivez les activités et les ressources.
6. Quelles étapes ou procédures avez-vous suivies pour établir cette initiative dans votre école /conseil? Quel a été le rôle des SAE?
7. Qui sont les principaux participants? Sont-ils les mêmes que les participants prévus?
8. Quels supports le conseil et l’école ont-ils utilisés pour la mise en œuvre du programme? Y a-t-il des supports supplémentaires qui auraient pu être utiles?
9. Quels liens, infrastructures et supports existaient déjà avant que le projet soit lancé?
10. Comment les élèves, le personnel, les partenaires communautaires et autres ont-ils été ralliés au programme?
11. Quels obstacles avez-vous dû surmonter afin d’établir ce programme? Qu’avez-vous fait pour surmonter chacun des obstacles?
12. Quel rôle le financement du programme a-t-il joué?
13. Quels avantages les participants en reçoivent-ils?
14. Quand les avantages deviennent-ils évidents? Après un semestre, une année, etc.? Comment les programmes d’été ont-ils été avantageux?
15. À quel point les avantages sont durables?
16. À quel point les élèves à charge sont-ils en lien avec toutes les autres personnes dans l’école?
17. Quelle préparation l’école d’accueil a-t-elle reçue pour ce projet pilote? Y a-t-il eu une préparation initiale à l’intention de l’administration, du personnel enseignant non impliqué dans le programme et d’autre personnel de soutien?
18. Quel est le rôle du personnel enseignant quant à l’appui des programmes? Quelles compétences/attitudes sont considérées nécessaires? Quelle préparation ou soutien initial les enseignants ont-ils reçu? La participation des enseignants était-elle continue? En pratique, le rôle des enseignants a-t-il été ce qui avait été prévu?
19. Quelle incidence/influence le programme a-t-il eu sur les pratiques pédagogiques? Comment savez-vous que l’incidence est reliée au programme?
20. À quel point les programmes ont-ils été appuyés par la collectivité d’enseignement à domicile et la communauté locale?
21. Quel degré de soutien les programmes ont-ils reçu des SAE?
22. Selon vous, quels sont les éléments du programme les plus propices à produire des résultats positifs? Les moins propices? Comment savez-vous que ces éléments sont reliés à ces résultats positifs?
23. Quels changements ont été apportés au programme depuis ses débuts? Pourquoi?
24. Ces changements ont-ils eu une incidence positive sur les objectifs du programme?
25. Quels sont les défis du programme? Comment ont-ils été surmontés?
26. Avez-vous des conseils pour d’autres écoles ou conseil souhaitant établir des projets semblables? Si vous aviez la chance de recommencer, que feriez-vous de différent?
27. Le programme a-t-il donné lieu à des imprévus ou des surprises? Quels ont été des résultats imprévus?

8.3. Guiding Questions for Focus Groups with Staff and Community

8.3.1. English

1. How did you become involved in this program? Can you describe your role?
2. Who started the project and what prompted them to do so?
3. What issues were the programs designed to address? What were the objectives of the program?
4. How does the program work in your board/school? Describe activities and resources.
5. Who are the main participants? Were these the same as the intended participants?
6. What steps or process did you follow in establishing this initiative at the school/board?
7. What are the supports that the board and school used for implementing the program? Were there additional supports that would have been helpful?
8. What relationships, infrastructure, and supports were already in place before the project began?
9. How were students, staff, community partners, etc. brought on board?
10. What obstacles did you have to overcome in establishing this initiative? What did you do to overcome each obstacle?
11. What role did the program funding play?
12. What are the benefits that participants receive?
13. When do the benefits become evident? After one semester, one year, etc.?
14. How were the summer programs beneficial?
15. How enduring are the benefits?
16. Was the program successful for all students involved? For which students was the program most successful? Are there some students who do not benefit from participation in this program? Why not?
17. To what extent are students in care connected to the rest of the school?
18. What is the role of the teacher(s) in supporting the programs? What competencies/attitudes were considered necessary; what initial preparation or support did teachers receive; was teacher participation continuous; was the teacher role in practice aligned with what was intended?
19. How has the program impacted/influenced teacher practices? How do you know the impact was related to the program?
20. How much have the programs been supported by the home school and local community?
21. How much have the programs been supported by the CAS’s?
22. What do you think are the most successful components of the program in leading to positive outcomes? Least successful? How do you know these components are connected to these positive outcomes?
23. What changes have been made to the program since it first began? Why? Did these changes have a positive impact on the goals of the program?
24. What are the challenges of the program? How are they overcome?
25. What were the challenges specific to student engagement and student participation in the program?
26. What were some challenges expressed by students participating in the program?
27. Do you have advice for other schools/board wanting to start similar projects? What would you do differently given the opportunity to start again?
28. What was unexpected or surprising about the program? Were there unintended outcomes?

8.3.2. Français

1. Comment en êtes-vous venu à participer à ce programme? Pouvez-vous décrire votre rôle?
2. Qui a lancé le projet et quelle fut la motivation de le faire?
3. Quels enjeux la conception du programme devait-elle aborder? Quels étaient les objectifs du programme?
5. Qui sont les principaux participants? Sont-ils les mêmes que les participants prévus?
6. Quelles étapes ou procédures avez-vous suivies pour établir cette initiative dans votre école /conseil?
7. Quels supports le conseil et l’école ont-ils utilisés pour la mise en œuvre du programme? Des supports supplémentaires auraient-ils été utiles?
8. Quels liens, infrastructures et supports existaient déjà avant que le projet soit lancé?
9. Comment les élèves, le personnel, les partenaires communautaires et autres ont-ils été ralliés au programme?
10. Quels obstacles avez-vous dû surmonter afin d’établir ce programme? Qu’avez-vous fait pour surmonter chacun des obstacles?
11. Quel rôle le financement du programme a-t-il joué? 
12. Quels avantages les participants en reçoivent-ils? 
13. Quand les avantages deviennent-ils évidents? Après un semestre, une année, etc.? 
14. Comment les programmes d’été ont-ils été avantageux? 
15. À quel point les avantages sont durables? 
16. Le programme a-t-il pu profiter à tous les élèves participants? À quels élèves le programme a-t-il le mieux réussi? Y a-t-il des élèves qui ne reçoivent aucun avantage de ce programme? Pourquoi? 
17. À quel point les élèves à charge sont-ils en lien avec toutes les autres personnes dans l’école? 
18. Quel est le rôle du personnel enseignant dans l’appui de ces programmes? Quelles compétences/attitudes sont considérées nécessaires? Quelle préparation ou soutien initial les enseignants ont-ils reçu? La participation des enseignants était-elle continue? En pratique, le rôle des enseignants a-t-il été ce qui avait été prévu? 
19. Quelle incidence/influence le programme a-t-il eue sur les pratiques pédagogiques? Comment savez-vous que l’incidence est reliée au programme? 
20. À quel point les programmes ont-ils été appuyés par la collectivité d’enseignement à domicile et la communauté locale? 
21. Quel degré de soutien les programmes ont-ils reçu des SAE? 
22. Selon vous, quels sont les éléments du programme les plus propices à produire des résultats positifs? Les moins propices? Comment savez-vous que ces éléments sont reliés à ces résultats positifs? 
24. Quels sont les défis du programme? Comment ont-ils été surmontés? 
25. Quels ont été les défis particuliers concernant la participation et l’engagement des élèves face au programme? 
26. Quels sont certains défis exprimés par les élèves qui participent au programme? 
27. Avez-vous des conseils pour d’autres écoles ou conseil souhaitant établir des projets semblables? Si vous aviez la chance de recommencer, que feriez-vous différemment? 
28. Le programme a-t-il donné lieu à des imprévus ou des surprises? Quels ont été des résultats imprévus?

**8.4. Guiding Questions for Students**

**8.4.1. English**

1. Tell me about this program. How does it work? 
2. How did you become involved in this program? 
3. How are you involved in this program? Can you describe your experience? 
4. What do you think has been the most successful about this program? Why? What did you like the least about the program? 
5. What impact has this project had on you personally? What did you learn from the program? How has this program changed you? Did participation in the program help you in your school work outside of the program? 
6. Do you see benefits to others in this program (classmates, teachers)? What are these benefits? Do you see benefits for those at the school who are not involved with the program? 
7. Would you recommend this program to other students? Why or why not? Are there aspects of the program that could be changed to improve it?
8. How do teachers and other staff support you in your program? What made the biggest difference to you?
9. Do you feel connected to the rest of the school? How? Did participation in the program effect how connected you feel to the rest of the school?
10. What do you think has been most successful about this program?
11. What are the challenges of the program? How are they overcome?
12. How would you improve this program? What advice would you give to the school staff and the board?

8.4.2. Français

1. Parle-moi de ce programme. Comment ça fonctionne?
2. Comment es-tu venu à participer au programme?
3. Comment es-tu impliqué dans ce programme? Peux-tu décrire ton expérience?
4. Selon toi, quel a été le plus grand succès de ce programme? Pourquoi? Qu’est-ce qui t’a le moins plu de ce programme?
5. Quel effet ce projet a-t-il eu sur toi personnellement? Qu’as-tu appris du programme? Comment ce programme t’a-t-il changé? Ta participation au programme t’a-t-elle aidé dans tes travaux scolaires à l’extérieur du programme?
6. Vois-tu des avantages pour les autres dans ce programme (tes compagnons de classe, tes enseignants)? Quels sont ces avantages? Vois-tu des avantages pour les personnes de l’école qui ne sont pas impliquées dans le programme?
7. Recommanderais-tu le programme à d’autres élèves? Pourquoi ou pourquoi pas? Y a-t-il des aspects du programme qui pourraient être changés pour l’améliorer?
8. Comment les enseignants et les autres membres du personnel t’appuient-ils dans ton programme? Qu’est-ce qui a fait la plus grande différence pour toi?
9. Te sens-tu en lien avec le reste de ton école? Comment? Ta participation au programme a-t-elle influencé ta « connexion » avec le reste de l’école?
10. Selon toi, quel est le plus grand succès de ce programme?
11. Quels sont les défis de ce programme? Comment sont-ils surmontés?
12. Comment améliorerais-tu ce programme? Quels conseils donnerais-tu au personnel de l’école et au conseil scolaire?
9. Appendix D2: Consent forms for Interviews and Focus Groups

The following presents the template for the consent forms that were used in each site visit. Some forms were modified slightly to fit school board requirements for informed consent.

9.1. Ministry of Education Personnel Invitation

9.1.1. English

Innovative Programs for Students in the Care of, or Receiving Services from, Children’s Aid Societies – Interview

Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group is conducting a program evaluation of the Ministry of Education’s innovative programs for students in the care of, or receiving services from, Children’s Aid Societies. The evaluation is an opportunity for our team and the Ministry of Education to learn more about how the program was initiated and implemented, and to learn about the experiences and outcomes for students, staff, and community partners.

You are being invited to participate in a one-on-one interview with a Directions researcher to gain insight into the implementation, impact, and effectiveness of the program.

We do not foresee any risk from participation in the interview. Participation is voluntary and you may withdraw at any time. A Directions researcher will conduct the interview and make an audio recording of the conversation for the purpose of the evaluation. No participants from the interviews will be identifiable in Directions’ final report to the Ministry of Education without explicit permission from the participant in writing. Six months following submission of the final report, the files from the interview will be destroyed.

Any questions about the interview process can be directed to ______________________ by email or by telephone at ______________________. Please include “Ministry Interview for Innovative Programs for Students in the Care of, or Receiving Services from, Children’s Aid Societies” in the subject line of the email.

Sincerely,

_____________________________

Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group

www.directions-eprg.ca
Innovative Programs for Students in the Care of, or Receiving Services from, Children’s Aid Societies – Interview

Consent for Ministry of Education Personnel Participation

I understand that the interview in which I will participate will be audio-recorded for the purpose of the evaluation of innovative programs for students in care. No information collected from the interview will be used in a way that could identify a participant by name without explicit written consent. All files related to the interview will be destroyed within six months of the final report being submitted to the Ministry of Education.

☐ I agree to participate in an interview for the Innovative Programs for Students in the Care of, or Receiving Services from, Children’s Aid Societies site visit.

☐ I do not agree to participate an interview for the Innovative Programs for Students in the Care of, or Receiving Services from, Children’s Aid Societies site visit.

Participant Name: ________________________________

Participant Signature: __________________________

Date: ________________________________

Email address: ________________________________
9.1.2. Français

Programmes novateurs pour élèves pris en charge par une, ou qui reçoivent des services d’une, société d’aide à l’enfance - Entrevue

Le Groupe Directions recherche et analyse des politiques réalise une évaluation du projet pilote financé par le ministère de l’Éducation axé sur les programmes novateurs pour élèves pris en charge par une, ou qui reçoivent des services d’une, société d’aide à l’enfance. L’évaluation offre à notre équipe et au ministère de l’Éducation la possibilité d’apprendre comment le programme a été amorcé et mis en œuvre, et de connaître les expériences vécues et les résultats obtenus parmi les élèves, les membres du personnel et les partenaires communautaires.

Nous vous invitons à participer à une entrevue au sujet de la mise en œuvre, l’incidence et l’efficacité du programme.

Nous ne prévoyons aucun risque associé à votre participation. Votre participation est volontaire et vous pouvez décider de vous retirer en tout temps. L’entrevue sera menée par un chercheur ou une chercheuse du Groupe Directions qui effectuera un enregistrement audio de l’entrevue. Sauf avec leur consentement écrit explicite, les personnes interviewées ne seront pas identifiable dans le rapport final que Le Groupe Directions présentera au ministère de l’Éducation. Après un délai de six mois à compter de la présentation du rapport final, les fichiers d’enregistrement seront détruits.

Pour toute question concernant le processus d’entrevue, veuillez contacter par courriel ou par téléphone . Veuillez inscrire dans la ligne du sujet « Entrevue du ministère sur les Programmes novateurs pour élèves pris en charge par une, ou qui reçoivent des services d’une, société d’aide à l’enfance. »

Je vous remercie sincèrement pour votre attention.

Le Groupe Directions recherche et analyse des politiques

www.directions-eprg.ca
Programmes novateurs pour élèves pris en charge par une, ou qui reçoivent des services d’une, société d’aide à l’enfance - Entrevue

Consentement pour la participation à une entrevue du personnel du ministère de l'éducation

Je comprends que l’entrevue sera enregistrée aux fins de l’évaluation des programmes novateurs pour élèves pris en charge. Aucune information récoltée lors de l’entrevue ne sera utilisée pour identifier personnellement les personnes interviewées, sauf avec leur consentement écrit explicite. Tous les dossiers liés à l’entrevue seront détruits dans les six mois suivant la présentation du rapport final au ministère de l’Éducation.

☐ J’accepte de prendre part à une entrevue au sujet des programmes novateurs pour élèves pris en charge par une, ou qui reçoivent des services d’une, société d’aide à l’enfance.

☐ Je n’accepte pas de prendre part à une entrevue au sujet des programmes novateurs pour élèves pris en charge par une, ou qui reçoivent des services d’une, société d’aide à l’enfance.

Nom du participant: ____________________________________________________________

Signature du participant: ______________________________________________________

Date: _________________________________________________________________________

Adresse de courriel: __________________________________________________________
9.2. School Board Key Informant Invitation

9.2.1. English

Innovative Programs for Students in the Care of, or Receiving Services from, Children’s Aid Societies – Interview for [Program Name]

Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group is conducting site visits to some schools involved in the Ministry of Education’s funding to run pilot programs focused on innovative programs for students in the care of, or receiving services from, Children’s Aid Societies. The site visit is an opportunity for our team and the Ministry of Education to learn more about how your project was initiated and implemented, and to learn about the experiences and outcomes for students, staff, and community partners. The [school board] has given permission for [school] to participate in a site visit, as well as interview board members involved in the initiative.

You are being invited to participate in a one-on-one interview (45-60 minutes), with a Directions researcher to gain insight into the implementation, impact, and effectiveness of the program.

We do not foresee any risk from participation in the interview. Participation is voluntary and you may withdraw at any time. A Directions researcher will conduct the interview and make an audio recording of the conversation for the purpose of the evaluation. No participants from the interviews will be identifiable in Directions’ final report to the Ministry of Education without explicit permission from the participant in writing. Six months following submission of the final report, the files from the interview will be destroyed.

Any questions about the site visit or interview process can be directed to

by email or by telephone at _______________________. Please include “[Program Name]” and the name of your school board in the subject line of the email.

Sincerely,

Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group

www.directions-eprg.ca
Innovative Programs for Students in the Care of, or Receiving Services from, Children’s Aid Societies – Interview

Consent for School Board Key Informant Participation

I understand that the interview in which I will participate will be audio-recorded for the purpose of the evaluation of the innovative programs for students in care. No information collected from the interview will be used in a way that could identify a participant by name without explicit written consent. All files related to the interview will be destroyed within six months of the final report being submitted to the Ministry of Education.

☐ I agree to participate in the school board interview for the Innovative Programs for Students in the Care of, or Receiving Services from, Children’s Aid Societies site visit.

☐ I do not agree to participate in the school board interview for the Innovative Programs for Students in the Care of, or Receiving Services from, Children’s Aid Societies site visit.

School Board: __________________________________________

Participant Name: _______________________________________ 

Participant Signature: ____________________________________ 

Date: __________________________________________________ 

Email address: __________________________________________
9.2.2. Français

Programmes novateurs pour élèves pris en charge par une, ou qui reçoivent des services d'une, société d'aide à l'enfance - Entrevue avec [Titre du programme]

Le Groupe Directions recherche et analyse des politiques fait des visites sur place chez certaines écoles impliquées dans le projet pilote financé par le ministère de l'Éducation axé sur les programmes novateurs pour élèves pris en charge par une, ou qui reçoivent des services d'une, société d'aide à l'enfance. La visite sur place offre à notre équipe et au ministère de l'Éducation la possibilité d'apprendre comment votre projet a été amorcé et mis en œuvre, et de connaître les expériences vécues et les résultats obtenus parmi les élèves, les membres du personnel et les partenaires communautaires. Le [conseil scolaire] a autorisé [school] de recevoir une visite sur place, et a autorisé les membres du conseil scolaires impliqués dans le programme de participer à des entrevues.

Nous vous invitons à participer à une entrevue au sujet de la mise en œuvre, l'incidence et l'efficacité du programme [titre du programme].

Nous ne prévoyons aucun risque associé à votre participation. Votre participation est volontaire et vous pouvez décider de vous retirer en tout temps. L'entrevue sera menée par un chercheur ou une chercheuse du Groupe Directions qui effectuera un enregistrement audio de l'entrevue. Sauf avec leur consentement écrit explicite, les personnes interviewées ne seront pas identifiable dans le rapport final que Le Groupe Directions présentera au ministère de l'Éducation. Après un délai de six mois à compter de la présentation du rapport final, les fichiers d'enregistrement seront détruits.

Pour toute question concernant la visite sur place ou le processus d'entrevue, veuillez contacter ________________ par courriel ou par téléphone ________________. Veuillez inscrire dans la ligne du sujet “[Titre du programme]” et le nom de votre conseil scolaire.

Je vous remercie sincèrement pour votre attention.

Le Groupe Directions recherche et analyse des politiques
www.directions-eprg.ca
Programmes novateurs pour élèves pris en charge par une, ou qui reçoivent des services d’une, société d’aide à l’enfance - Entrevue

Consentement pour la participation à une entrevue des informateurs clés aux conseils scolaires

Je comprends que l’entrevue sera enregistrée aux fins de l'évaluation des programmes novateurs pour élèves pris en charge. Aucune information récoltée lors de l’entrevue ne sera utilisée pour identifier personnellement les personnes interviewées, sauf avec leur consentement écrit explicite. Tous les dossiers liés à l’entrevue seront détruits dans les six mois suivant la présentation du rapport final au ministère de l’Éducation.

☐ J’accepte de prendre part à une entrevue au sujet des programmes novateurs pour élèves pris en charge par une, ou qui reçoivent des services d’une, société d’aide à l’enfance.

☐ Je n’accepte pas de prendre part à une entrevue au sujet des programmes novateurs pour élèves pris en charge par une, ou qui reçoivent des services d’une, société d’aide à l’enfance.

Conseil Scolaire: ______________________________________________________

Nom du participant: ____________________________________________________

Signature du participant: ________________________________________________

Date: __________________________________________________________________

Adresse de courriel: ______________________________________________________
9.3. Staff / Community Partner Invitation

9.3.1. English

Innovative Programs for Students in the Care of, or Receiving Services from, Children’s Aid Societies – Site Visit to [Program Name]

Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group is conducting site visits to some schools involved in the Ministry of Education’s funding to run pilot programs focussed on innovative programs for students in the care of, or receiving services from, Children’s Aid Societies. The site visit is an opportunity for our team and the Ministry of Education to learn more about how your project was initiated and implemented, and to learn about the experiences and outcomes for students, staff, and community partners. The [school board] has given permission for [school] to participate in a site visit.

The site visit will involve the following components:

1. A focus group with staff and community partners (where appropriate) (60-90 minutes)
2. A focus group with students who have been involved in the project (60-90 minutes)

We do not foresee any risk from participation in the staff/community partner focus group. Participation is voluntary and you may withdraw at any time. A Directions researcher will facilitate the discussion and make an audio recording of the conversation for their use. No participants from the focus groups will be identifiable in Directions’ final report to the Ministry of Education without explicit permission from the participant in writing. Six months following submission of the final report, the files from the focus group will be destroyed.

Any questions about the site visit or focus group process can be directed to __________ by email or by telephone at __________________. Please include “[Program Name] project” and the name of the school in the subject line of the email.

Sincerely,

Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group
www.directions-eprg.ca
Innovative Programs for Students in the Care of, or Receiving Services from, Children's Aid Societies – Site Visit

Consent for Staff / Community Partner Participation

I understand that the focus group in which I will participate will be audio-recorded for the purpose of the evaluation of innovative programs for students in care. No information collected from the focus group will be used in a way that could identify a participant by name without explicit written consent. All files related to the focus group will be destroyed within six months of the final report being submitted to the Ministry of Education.

☐ I agree to participate in the staff/community partner focus group for the Innovative Programs for Students in the Care of, or Receiving Services from, Children’s Aid Societies site visit.

☐ I do not agree to participate in the staff/community partner focus group for the Innovative Programs for Students in the Care of, or Receiving Services from, Children’s Aid Societies site visit.

School: ______________________________________________________

Participant Name: ____________________________________________

Participant Signature: _________________________________________

Date: _________________________________________________________

Email address: ________________________________________________
9.3.2. Français

Programmes novateurs pour élèves pris en charge par une, ou qui reçoivent des services d’une, société d’aide à l’enfance – Visite sur place chez [Titre du programme]

Le Groupe Directions recherche et analyse des politiques fait des visites sur place chez certaines écoles impliquées dans le projet pilote financé par le ministère de l’Éducation axé sur les programmes novateurs pour élèves pris en charge par une, ou qui reçoivent des services d’une, société d’aide à l’enfance. La visite sur place offre à notre équipe et au ministère de l’Éducation la possibilité d’apprendre comment votre projet a été amorcé et mis en œuvre, et de connaître les expériences vécues et les résultats obtenus parmi les élèves, les membres du personnel et les partenaires communautaires. Le [conseil scolaire] a autorisé [school] de recevoir une visite sur place.

La visite sur place comprendra :

1. Un groupe de discussion regroupant des membres du personnel scolaire et des partenaires communautaires (le cas échéant) (1 heure).

2. Un groupe de discussion regroupant des élèves qui ont pris part au programme (1 heure).

Nous ne prévoyons aucun risque associé à votre participation. Votre participation est volontaire et vous pouvez décider de vous retirer en tout temps. Le groupe de discussion sera animé par un chercheur ou une chercheuse du Groupe Directions qui effectuera un enregistrement audio de l’entrevue. Sauf avec leur consentement écrit explicite, les participants aux groupes de discussion ne seront pas identifiable dans le rapport final que Le Groupe Directions présentera au ministère de l’Éducation. Après un délai de six mois à compter de la présentation du rapport final, les fichiers d’enregistrement seront détruits.

Pour toute question concernant la visite sur place ou les groupes de discussions, veuillez contacter ____________________ par courriel ou par téléphone ____________________.
Veuillez inscrire dans la ligne du sujet “[Titre du programme]” et le nom de votre conseil scolaire.

Je vous remercie sincèrement pour votre attention.

________________________
Le Groupe Directions recherche et analyse des politiques
www.directions-eprg.ca
Programmes novateurs pour élèves pris en charge par une, ou qui reçoivent des services d’une, société d’aide à l’enfance – Visite sur place

Consentement pour la participation des membres du personnel scolaire et des partenaires communautaires

Je comprends que le groupe de discussion sera enregistré aux fins de l'évaluation des programmes novateurs pour élèves pris en charge. Aucune information récoltée lors du groupe de discussion ne sera utilisée pour identifier personnellement les participants, sauf avec leur consentement écrit explicite. Tous les dossiers liés aux groupes de discussion seront détruits dans les six mois suivant la présentation du rapport final au ministère de l'Éducation.

☐ J’accepte de prendre part à un groupe de discussion au sujet des programmes novateurs pour élèves pris en charge par une, ou qui reçoivent des services d’une, société d’aide à l’enfance.

☐ Je n’accepte pas de prendre part à un groupe de discussion au sujet des programmes novateurs pour élèves pris en charge par une, ou qui reçoivent des services d’une, société d’aide à l’enfance.

Ecole: ____________________________________________

Nom du participant: __________________________________

Signature du participant: ______________________________

Date: ______________________________________________

Adresse de courriel: __________________________________
9.4. Parent/Guardian & Student Invitations

9.4.1. English – Discussion Group – Parent/Guardian

Dear Parent or Guardian,

Re: Student Success Strategy – Site Visit [to program name] – Discussion Group

Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group (Directions) is conducting site visits to some schools involved in the Ministry of Education's Student Success strategy [program name]. The site visit is an opportunity to identify innovative practices for enhancing educational and well-being outcomes for students. The [school board] has given permission for [school] to participate in a site visit.

The child for whom you are responsible is being asked to take part in a discussion group with other students in the school to talk about his/her experience with the Student Success program. The discussion, led by a Directions researcher, will last no longer than 90 minutes and will take place at the school or program location as applicable. The discussion will be audio-taped for the researcher's use, and the contents of the discussion will not be shared with Ministry, school, and board personnel, or anyone else, in any way that would identify the student. Excerpts from the discussion group may be used in Directions' final report to the Ministry of Education, however to protect confidentiality, identifying information will be altered to ensure the student is not identifiable. Six months following the submission of the final report of the project, the files from the discussion groups will be destroyed.

We do not foresee any risk from participation in this research. Participation is voluntary and will not affect your child’s school grades or attendance. Students can stop participating in the study at any time, for any reason, if they so decide.

Please indicate on the attached form whether you permit your child to take part in the discussion group. Your cooperation is very much appreciated.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me by email at ______________________ or by telephone at ______________________. Please include “Student Success site visit” and the name of the school in the subject line of the email.

Sincerely,

Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group
www.directions-eprg.ca
Student Success – Site Visit

Parent/Guardian Consent for Student Participation in Discussion Group

I understand that the discussion group will be audio-recorded for Directions researchers’ use, and that my child will not be identified by name in the subsequent report. Information collected by the researcher from my child will be kept confidential and will be destroyed by the Directions researchers within six months of the final report being submitted to the Ministry of Education.

☐ I agree to allow my child (name) _______________________________ to participate in the discussion group for the Student Success site visit.

☐ I do not agree to allow my child (name) _______________________________ to participate in the student discussion group for the Student Success site visit.

School Name: ________________________________________________

Name of Student: _____________________________________________

Name of Parent/Guardian: ______________________________________

Signature of Parent/Guardian: _________________________________

Date: ________________________________________________________
9.4.2. English – Discussion Group – Student

Dear Student,

Re: Student Success Strategy – Site Visit [to program name] – Discussion Group

Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group (Directions) is conducting a site visit to the Student Success program in your school on behalf of the Ministry of Education. Your school was selected for a site visit to explore experiences and outcomes from this program. The [school board] has given permission for [school] to participate in a site visit.

Directions would like you to take part in a facilitated discussion group with other students in the school to talk about your experience with the Student Success Program [program name]. The discussion, led by a Directions researcher, will last up to 90 minutes and will take place at the school or program location as applicable. The discussion group will be audio-taped for the Directions researcher’s use, and the contents of the discussion will not be shared with the Ministry, school, and board personnel, or anyone else in any way that would allow you to be identified. Excerpts from the discussion group may be used in Directions’ final report to the Ministry of Education; however, to protect confidentiality, identifying information will be altered to ensure you are not identifiable.

We do not foresee any risk from participation in this research. Participation is voluntary and will not affect your school grades or attendance. You can choose to stop participating in the discussion group at any time, for any reason.

Please indicate on the attached form whether you agree to take part in the discussion group. Your cooperation is very much appreciated.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me by email at ________________ or by telephone at ________________. Please include “Student Success site visit” and the name of your school in the subject line of the email.

Sincerely,

Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group

www.directions-eprg.ca
Student Success – Site Visit

Consent for Student Participation - Discussion Group

I understand that the discussion group in which I will participate will be audio-recorded for the use of the Directions researchers, and that all information that I provide will be kept confidential by Directions researchers. That means that I will not be identified by name in the project report. All files related to the discussion group will be destroyed within six months of the final report being submitted to the Ministry of Education.

☐ I agree to participate in the discussion group for the Student Success site visit.

☐ I do not agree to participate in the discussion group for the Student Success site visit.

School Name: ____________________________

Participant Name: ________________________

Participant Signature: ____________________

Date: ____________________________
9.4.3. English – Interview – Parent/Guardian

Dear Parent or Guardian,

Re: Student Success Strategy – Site Visit [to program name] – Interview

Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group (Directions) is conducting site visits to some schools involved in the Ministry of Education’s Student Success strategy [program name]. The site visit is an opportunity to identify innovative practices for enhancing educational and well-being outcomes for students. The [school board] has given permission for [school] to participate in a site visit.

The child for whom you are responsible is being asked to take part in an interview with a Directions researcher to talk about his/her experience with the Student Success program. The interview will last no longer than an hour and will take place at the school or program location as applicable. The interview will be audio-taped for the researcher’s use, and the contents of the interview will not be shared with Ministry, school, and board personnel, or anyone else, in any way that would identify the student. Excerpts from the interview may be used in Directions’ final report to the Ministry of Education, however to protect confidentiality, identifying information will be altered to ensure the student is not identifiable. Six months following the submission of the final report of the project, the files from the discussion groups will be destroyed.

We do not foresee any risk from participation in this research. Participation is voluntary and will not affect your child’s school grades or attendance. Students can stop participating in the study at any time, for any reason, if they so decide.

Please indicate on the attached form whether you permit your child to take part in the interview. Your cooperation is very much appreciated.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me by email at _______________ or by telephone at _______________. Please include “Student Success site visit” and the name of the school in the subject line of the email.

Sincerely,

Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group

www.directions-eprg.ca
Student Success – Site Visit

Parent/Guardian Consent for Student Participation in Interview

I understand that the interview will be audio-recorded for Directions researchers’ use, and that my child will not be identified by name in the subsequent report. Information collected by the researcher from my child will be kept confidential and will be destroyed by the Directions researchers within six months of the final report being submitted to the Ministry of Education.

☐ I agree to allow my child (name) ____________________________ to participate in an interview for the Student Success site visit.

☐ I do not agree to allow my child (name) ____________________________ to participate in the student interview for the Student Success site visit.

School Name: ____________________________________________

Name of Student: __________________________________________

Name of Parent/Guardian: __________________________________

Signature of Parent/Guardian: ________________________________

Date: _____________________________________________________
9.4.4. English – Interview – Student

Dear Student,

Re: Student Success Strategy – Site Visit [to program name] – Interview

Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group (Directions) is conducting a site visit to the Student Success program in your school on behalf of the Ministry of Education. Your school was selected for a site visit to explore experiences and outcomes from this program. The [school board] has given permission for [school] to participate in a site visit.

Directions would like you to take part in an interview with a researcher to talk about your experience with the Student Success Program [program name]. The interview will last up to an hour and will take place at the school or program location as applicable. The interview will be audio-taped for the Directions researcher’s use, and the contents of the interview will not be shared with the Ministry, school, and board personnel, or anyone else in any way that would allow you to be identified. Excerpts from the interview may be used in Directions’ final report to the Ministry of Education; however, to protect confidentiality, identifying information will be altered to ensure you are not identifiable.

We do not foresee any risk from participation in this research. Participation is voluntary and will not affect your school grades or attendance. You can choose to stop participating in the discussion group at any time, for any reason.

Please indicate on the attached form whether you agree to take part in the interview. Your cooperation is very much appreciated.

If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact me by email at ______________________ or by telephone at ______________________. Please include “Student Success site visit” and the name of your school in the subject line of the email.

Sincerely,

Directions Evidence and Policy Research Group

www.directions-eprg.ca
Student Success – Site Visit

Consent for Student Participation in Interview

I understand that the interview in which I will participate will be audio-recorded for the use of the Directions researchers, and that all information that I provide will be kept confidential by Directions researchers. That means that I will not be identified by name in the project report. All files related to the interview will be destroyed within six months of the final report being submitted to the Ministry of Education.

☐ I agree to participate in an interview for the Student Success site visit.

☐ I do not agree to participate in an interview for the Student Success site visit.

School Name: ______________________________________________________________

Participant Name: __________________________________________________________

Participant Signature: _______________________________________________________

Date: _____________________________________________________________________
9.4.5. Français – Groupe de discussion – Parent/Tuteur

Cher parent ou tuteur,

Objet: Stratégie visant la réussite des élèves – Visite sur place chez [to program name] – Groupe de discussion


L'enfant dont vous avez la charge est invité à participer à un groupe de discussion avec d'autres élèves de son école pour parler de son expérience personnelle dans le cadre du Programme de réussite scolaire. La durée du groupe de discussion, animé par un chercheur ou une chercheuse du Groupe Directions, n'excédera pas une heure et aura lieu à l’école ou à l’emplacement du Programme, le cas échéant. La discussion sera enregistrée sur bande sonore pour faciliter la rédaction du rapport final. Cependant, le contenu des groupes de discussion qui pourraitidentifier les participants ne sera pas communiqué avec le ministère, l'école, les membres du personnel du conseil scolaire, ou autre personne. Le rapport final pourra comprendre des extraits des groupes de discussions. Toutefois, pour protéger la confidentialité, toute information pouvant permettre d’identifier les participants sera modifiée. Tous les dossiers liés aux groupes de discussion seront détruits dans les six mois suivant la présentation du rapport final au ministère de l'Éducation.

Nous ne prévoyons aucun risque associé à la participation de votre enfant. Sa participation est volontaire, n'influera pas sur ses notes de cours et n'affectera pas sa fréquentation scolaire. Les élèves peuvent décider de se retirer en tout temps pour n'importe quelle raison.

Nous vous prions d'indiquer sur le formulaire ci-joint si vous autorisez votre enfant à participer au groupe de discussion. Je vous remercie de votre collaboration.

Si vous avez des questions ou préoccupations au sujet de ce qui précède, n'hésitez pas à communiquer avec moi par courriel ______________________________ ou par téléphone ______________________________. Veuillez inscrire dans la ligne du sujet « Réussite des élèves – Visite sur place » et le nom de l’école.

Je vous remercie sincèrement pour votre attention.

________________
Le Groupe Directions recherche et analyse des politiques
www.directions-eprg.ca
Réussite des élèves – Visite sur place

Formulaire de consentement des parents ou du tuteur
pour la participation des élèves au groupe de discussion

Je comprends que le groupe de discussion sera enregistré sur bande sonore pour faciliter la rédaction du rapport final. Toutefois mon enfant ne sera pas identifié par son nom dans le rapport final. Toute l'information qui sera recueillie demeurera confidentielle et sera détruite dans les six mois suivant la présentation du rapport final au ministère de l'Éducation.

☐ Je permets à mon enfant (nom) ______________________ de prendre part au groupe de discussion qui aura lieu pendant la visite sur place.

☐ Je ne permets pas à mon enfant (nom) ______________________ de prendre part au groupe de discussion qui aura lieu pendant la visite sur place.

École: ____________________________________________

Nom de l'élève: ______________________________________

Nom du parent/tuteur: ________________________________

Signature du parent/tuteur: ___________________________

Date: _______________________________________________
9.4.6. Français – Groupe de discussion – Élève

Cher élève,

Objet: Stratégie visant la réussite des élèves – Visite sur place chez [to program name] – Groupe de discussion

Le Groupe Directions recherche et analyse des politiques fait une visite sur place pour observer le Programme de réussite scolaire dans votre école pour le compte du ministère de l’Éducation. Votre école a été sélectionnée pour recevoir une visite sur place pour offrir la possibilité de mieux connaître les expériences vécues et les résultats obtenus par le Programme. Le [conseil scolaire] a autorisé [école] de recevoir une visite sur place.

Le Groupe Directions vous invite à participer à un groupe de discussion avec d’autres élèves de votre école pour parler de votre expérience personnelle dans le cadre du Programme de réussite scolaire. La durée du groupe de discussion, animé par un chercheur ou une chercheuse du Groupe Directions, n’excédera pas une heure et aura lieu à l’école ou à l’emplacement du Programme, le cas échéant. La discussion sera enregistrée sur bande sonore pour faciliter la rédaction du rapport final. Cependant, le contenu des groupes de discussion qui pourrait vous identifier ne sera pas communiqué avec le ministère, l’école, les membres du personnel du conseil scolaire, ou autre personne. Le rapport final pourra comprendre des extraits des groupes de discussions. Toutefois, pour protéger la confidentialité, toute information pouvant permettre de vous identifier sera modifiée.

Nous ne prévoyons aucun risque associé à votre participation. Votre participation est volontaire, n’influera pas sur vos notes de cours et n’affectera pas votre fréquentation scolaire. Vous pouvez décider de vous retirer en tout temps pour n’importe quelle raison.

Nous vous prions d’indiquer sur le formulaire ci-joint si vous acceptez de participer au groupe de discussion. Je vous remercie de votre collaboration.

Si vous avez des questions ou préoccupations au sujet de ce qui précède, n’hésitez pas à communiquer avec moi par courriel _________________ ou par téléphone _________________. Veuillez inscrire dans la ligne du sujet « Réussite des élèves – Visite sur place » et le nom de votre école.

Je vous remercie sincèrement pour votre attention.

Ruth Baumann
Chercheuse et partenaire
Le Groupe Directions recherche et analyse des politiques
www.directions-eprg.ca
Réussite des élèves – Visite sur place

Formulaire de consentement des élèves
pour la participation au groupe de discussion

Je comprends que le groupe de discussion sera enregistré sur bande sonore pour faciliter la rédaction du rapport final, pourtant toute information demeurera strictement confidentielle. Je ne serai pas identifié par mon nom dans le rapport final. Les dossiers liés au groupe de discussion seront détruits dans les six mois suivant la présentation du rapport final au ministère de l'Éducation.

☐ J'accepte de prendre part au groupe de discussion qui aura lieu pendant la visite sur place.

☐ Je n’accepte pas de prendre part au groupe de discussion qui aura lieu pendant la visite sur place.

École: __________________________________________________________

Nom de l’élève: ________________________________________________

Signature de l’élève: ___________________________________________

Date: ___________________________________________________________
9.4.7. Français – Entrevue – Parent/Tuteur

Cher parent ou tuteur,

Objet: Stratégie visant la réussite des élèves – Visite sur place chez [to program name] – Entrevue


Nous ne prévoyons aucun risque associé à la participation de votre enfant. Sa participation est volontaire, n'influera pas sur ses notes de cours et n'affectera pas sa fréquentation scolaire. Les élèves peuvent décider de se retirer en tout temps pour n'importe quelle raison.

Nous vous prions d'indiquer sur le formulaire ci-joint si vous autorisez votre enfant à participer à une entrevue. Je vous remercie de votre collaboration.

Si vous avez des questions ou préoccupations au sujet de ce qui précède, n'hésitez pas à communiquer avec moi par courriel ______________________ ou par téléphone ______________________. Veuillez inscrire dans la ligne du sujet « Réussite des élèves – Visite sur place » et le nom de l’école.

Je vous remercie sincèrement pour votre attention.

Ruth Baumann
Chercheuse et partenaire
Le Groupe Directions recherche et analyse des politiques
[www.directions-eprg.ca](http://www.directions-eprg.ca)
Réussite des élèves – Visite sur place

Formulaire de consentement des parents ou du tuteur
pour la participation des élèves à une entrevue

Je comprends que l'entrevue sera enregistré sur bande sonore pour faciliter la rédaction du rapport final. Toutefois mon enfant ne sera pas identifié par son nom dans le rapport final. Toute l'information qui sera recueillie demeurera confidentielle et sera détruite dans les six mois suivant la présentation du rapport final au ministère de l'Éducation.

☐ Je permets à mon enfant (nom) ___________________________ de prendre part à une entrevue qui aura lieu pendant la visite sur place.

☐ Je ne permets pas à mon enfant (nom) ___________________________ de prendre part à une entrevue qui aura lieu pendant la visite sur place.

École: ______________________________

Nom de l'élève: ______________________________

Nom du parent/tuteur: ______________________________

Signature du parent/tuteur: ______________________________

Date: ______________________________

Cher élève,

Objet: Stratégie visant la réussite des élèves – Visite sur place chez [to program name] –

Entrevue

Le Groupe Directions recherche et analyse des politiques fait une visite sur place pour observer le Programme de réussite scolaire dans votre école pour le compte du ministère de l'Éducation. Votre école a été sélectionnée pour recevoir une visite sur place pour offrir la possibilité de mieux connaître les expériences vécues et les résultats obtenus par le Programme. Le [conseil scolaire] a autorisé [école] de recevoir une visite sur place.

Le Groupe Directions vous invite à participer à une entrevue pour parler de votre expérience personnelle dans le cadre du Programme de réussite scolaire. La durée de l'entrevue, animé par un chercheur ou une chercheuse du Groupe Directions, n'excèdera pas une heure et aura lieu à l'école ou à l'emplACEMENT du Programme, le cas échéant. L'entrevue sera enregistrée sur bande sonore pour faciliter la rédaction du rapport final. Cependant, le contenu de l'entrevue qui pourrait vous identifier ne sera pas communiqué avec le ministère, l'école, les membres du personnel du conseil scolaire, ou autre personne. Le rapport final pourra comprendre des extraits de l'entrevue. Toutefois, pour protéger la confidentialité, toute information pouvant permettre de vous identifier sera modifiée.

Nous ne prévoyons aucun risque associé à votre participation. Votre participation est volontaire, n'influera pas sur vos notes de cours et n'affectera pas votre fréquentation scolaire. Vous pouvez décider de vous retirer en tout temps pour n'importe quelle raison.

Nous vous prions d'indiquer sur le formulaire ci-joint si vous accepter de participer à une entrevue. Je vous remercie de votre collaboration.

Si vous avez des questions ou préoccupations au sujet de ce qui précède, n'hésitez pas à communiquer avec moi par courriel _________________ ou par téléphone _________________. Veuillez inscrire dans la ligne du sujet « Réussite des élèves – Visite sur place » et le nom de votre école.

Je vous remercie sincèrement pour votre attention.

Ruth Baumann
Chercheuse et partenaire
Le Groupe Directions recherche et analyse des politiques
www.directions-eprg.ca
Réussite des élèves – Visite sur place

Formulaire de consentement des élèves
pour la participation à une entrevue

Je comprends que l'entrevue sera enregistrée sur bande sonore pour faciliter la rédaction du rapport final, pourtant toute information demeurera strictement confidentielle. Je ne serai pas identifié par mon nom dans le rapport final. Les dossiers liés à l'entrevue seront détruits dans les six mois suivant la présentation du rapport final au ministère de l'Éducation.

☐ J'accepte de prendre part à une entrevue qui aura lieu pendant la visite sur place.

☐ Je n'accepte pas de prendre part à une entrevue qui aura lieu pendant la visite sur place.

École: ____________________________________________

Nom de l'élève: __________________________________________

Signature de l'élève: ________________________________

Date: _______________________________________________