

R-Life: Evaluation Report



January 2014

**Evaluation carried out by: Tony Beck, independent
evaluator**

Table of contents

Executive Summary

1. Background to R Life and the evaluation	1
1.1 Methodology	2
2. Project results	4
2.1 Effectiveness	4
2.2 Relevance	8
2.3 Sustainability	9
3. Recommendations	11

Annexes

Annex 1: R-Life Logic Model

Annex 2: Post-workshop survey questionnaire

Annex 3: Workshop evaluation after 3-4 months

Annex 4: Interviews with key stakeholders

Annex 5: Questionnaire for key stakeholders

Tables and Boxes

Table 1: R-Life outcomes

Table 2: Workshop questionnaire results on effectiveness

Table 3: Relevance of training rated by workshop participants

Table 4: Responses related to sustainability in workshop exit surveys

Box 1: Participant feedback on the R-Life workshops

Acknowledgements: the evaluator would like to thank Mary Catherine Bellamy and Steve Ayers at the John Howard Society of the North Island for their ongoing support and insights, as well as respondents to key stakeholder interviews. The cover photo is taken from the R-Life website.

Executive Summary

This report is a summative evaluation of the R Life Project, which received a grant of \$197,049 from the Community Action Initiative (CAI). R Life planned to: train 1, 450 people through webinars, workshops, distance education and through the project website; establish and build on partnerships; and create a community of practice on resilience which would support project sustainability. Originally planned from January to June 2013, R Life received an extension until the end of November 2013 to allow completion of planned activities.

R Life built on and scaled up an earlier CAI funded project, *Imagine Campbell River*. This was a pilot initiative for the CAI, in that this kind of scaling up had not been attempted by other projects, and the innovative nature of the project has been taken into account during this evaluation.

The evaluation methodology included: development of an evaluation plan; review of project background material and reports; review of relevant evaluation methodologies for the evaluation of web/distance training; workshop exit surveys with 197 workshop participants; nine key informant interviews; and data collected from 11 users of the R Life website. Data from these sources was triangulated and all data supported similar conclusions about project results.

Effectiveness

Most of the project activities and outputs were completed as planned, as follows:

- A number of high quality web and print products were developed related to resilience, including a workbook, PowerPoint, posters, and e-modules.
- Three trainers were hired on a contract basis who did an excellent job in providing training to a diverse group of participants.
- 535 individuals attended face-to-face training sessions.
- The R Life website had 828 unique visitors.

Key stakeholder interviews concurred that the training and training materials available were highly effective. They noted the excellent quality of the resource material and that the training sessions had been successful in meeting their objectives. Exit questionnaires demonstrated that facilitation of training was excellent, with responsive facilitators who clearly engaged participants in an interactive fashion; the three main objectives of the workshops were for the most part met, and the overall rating for the workshop was between good and excellent. The eleven responses concerning the overall quality of the R Life website also rated the material highly.

While the convening period demonstrated there is extensive demand for training on resiliency, the project faced challenges in locating appropriate sites for training. The project did not adequately use existing networks and channels to locate training venues. Targets for numbers to be trained of 1,450 were over-ambitious. Constraints to effectiveness included the need for greater staff expertise, the lack of a steering committee, the limited time available, and lack of outreach and marketing expertise. Nevertheless the project met or is likely to meet its long-term objectives.

Relevance

As with many similar projects, the R Life Logic Model was over ambitious in some areas, in particular in relation to sustainability. Also, the Logic Model was used more as a funding and evaluative than a planning tool. The projects outcomes related to relevance were met in that relevant training was provided to a variety of groups and very useful resource materials were produced. Evaluative evidence suggests that any future training could be targeted to groups which have had least exposure to resilience concepts

Sustainability

Positive results in relation to sustainability include:

- A cadre of people trained on resilience across BC who will likely incorporate elements of the training into their work places.
- R Life materials have been adapted and included in the Provincial Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E) two-week course.
- JHSNI has committed to hosting the R Life website, and one former project staff member will volunteer time to monitor and update R Life's web presence.
- A promotional video is being completed to disseminate the project resources throughout networks in B.C.

Some partnerships were strengthened during the project, however the planned uptake by partners, and the community of practice on resilience, did not materialize. The key constraints were the amount of time needed to build new partnerships, and the lack of a full-time project co-ordinator with relevant skills. One of the lessons of the R Life project is that partnerships need to be nurtured and supported on an ongoing basis, and over an adequate time period, if they are to enhance project sustainability.

Recommendations for the John Howard Society of the North Island and the CAI are included at the end of this report.

1. Background to R Life and the evaluation

This report is a summative evaluation of the R Life Project, which received a grant of \$197,049 from the Community Action Initiative (CAI). Funded through a \$10 million grant by the Province of B.C., CAI provides grants for sound and leading edge projects that are planned, led and implemented through community partnerships. The CAI aims to take a localized, collaborative approach to helping those affected by mental health and substance use issues in B.C. To accomplish this, the CAI creates networks and encourages dialogue between community mental health and substance use organizations around the province.¹

In 2011, The John Howard Society of North Island (JHSNI) received a grant of \$178,000 from the CAI for a project titled *Imagine Campbell River: A Place to Belong*, the precursor to the R Life project under evaluation. *Imagine Campbell River* had as its objectives: researching and developing an engaging message about community resiliency; the promotion of mental wellness using strength-based, life affirming approaches; and using a train-the-trainer model to develop community ambassadors to share its message community-wide and mentor specific vulnerable groups at key transitional times and developmental stages. *Imagine Campbell River* underwent a summative evaluation which found that the project was very effective, met most of its short terms goals and laid the foundations for meeting medium term goals, with significant results at individual and group levels which have helped to build community. Workshops in schools and outreach to Aboriginal communities were particular successes. It also found that project strategic planning and monitoring, and attention to sustainability, could have been stronger.²

The JHSNI received its second CAI grant to build on and scale up its training programme under *Imagine Campbell River* throughout Vancouver Island and beyond, extending the method of delivery to include webinars and online learning modules, and to establish a community of practice focused on resiliency. JHSNI received a convening grant from the CAI to develop the project, and noted in its project application significant demand for resiliency training. The plan under R Life was to train 1, 450 people through webinars, workshops, distance education and through the project website.

Training was to take place through existing partnerships, as well as partnerships developed through the convening process, with training planned with different service providers such as the Vancouver Island Health Authority, Vancouver Island University, several school districts, the Provincial Government, and several non-profit agencies. Establishing partnerships was seen in the project application as key to sustainability. It was also envisaged that communities impacted by the training would use new knowledge, skills, and strategies, together with an increased sense of connectedness, to promote resiliency within their agency, and for clients and the larger community. Originally planned from January to June 2013, R Life received an extension until the end of November 2013, to allow completion of planned activities.

It should be noted that the scaling up planned by R Life was a pilot initiative for the CAI, in that this kind of scaling up which had not been attempted by other funded projects. R Life needed therefore to work by trial and error to a certain extent, and the innovative nature of the project has been taken into account during this evaluation.

The short, medium and long-term outcomes of the project are set out in Table 1. The short and long-term outcomes were used as measures of project success, including the extent to which they are likely to contribute to long-term outcomes. The full R Life Logic

¹ <http://www.communityactioninitiative.ca/>

² <http://rlifeproject.ca/wp-content/uploads/2013/06/Imagine-Campbell-River-Final-Evaluation-Report.pdf>

Model is included as Annex 1. The quality of the Logic Model and strategic planning is discussed in Section 2.2.

Table 1: R-Life outcomes

Short-term outcomes	Medium-term outcomes	Long-term outcomes
<p>Clear and effective project activities and oversight</p> <p>Partnerships are effective in moving the project forward</p> <p>Updated and versatile training materials including Workshop/ Toolkit booklet and PowerPoint and improved content particularly for culture and trauma sections</p> <p>Effective sharing of the R Life Project across Vancouver Island and throughout BC</p> <p>Train the Trainer delivery throughout Vancouver Island</p> <p>Ongoing availability of On-line training modules</p> <p>Project sustainability is well-developed</p>	<p>Project is effective and work plan is completed</p> <p>Partnerships continue to develop to support the project and afterward</p> <p>Training Materials available online and by Train the Trainer delivery (ongoing) to promote increased knowledge of resiliency factors, self-regulation and stress management</p>	<p>Service providers have increased knowledge about resilience factors and understanding about how to promote these across populations</p> <p>Individuals can identify and practice resiliency factors in their daily lives, throughout the lifespan.</p> <p>Community agencies and key partners will collaborate about a community of practice regarding resiliency</p> <p>Individuals throughout BC have a measureable improvement in mental health and reduction in substance use issues</p>

1.1 Methodology

The evaluation methodology was as follows:

- ✂ Development of an evaluation plan in May 2013, based on the Canadian Evaluation Standards³ and CAI evaluation guidance⁴, which set out the evaluation tools to be used and evaluation timing.
- ✂ Review of project background material and reports, including monitoring reports, and an external evaluation of the whole CAI programme carried out by SPARC BC⁵.
- ✂ Review of relevant evaluation methodologies for the evaluation of web/distance training.⁶ Good practice suggests that the focus of evaluation of web-based training material should focus on access, use and impact.

³ <http://www.evaluationcanada.ca/site.cgi?en:6:10>

⁴ CAI Community Action Initiative: Toolkit for Creating a Project Evaluation Plan.

⁵ SPARC BC (2013) *Mid Term Evaluation of the Community Action Initiative: Taking stock of early results.* http://www.communityactioninitiative.ca/wp-content/uploads/Community-Action-Initiative-Mid-Term-Evaluation-_March-2013.pdf

⁶ Hewlett Foundation (2007) *A Review of the Open Educational Resources (OER) Movement: Achievements, Challenges, and New Opportunities*; Lokkee, B., M. Moore and J. Burton (2002) "Measuring Success: Evaluation strategies for distance education." *Educause Quarterly*, November; "What constitutes quality in web based training" http://www.webbasedtraining.com/primer_quality.aspx; MIT OpenCourseWare (2006) *Program Evaluation Findings Report*. Cambridge: MIT; Silius, K. and A-M Tervakari (no date) "An Evaluation of the Usefulness of Web-Based Learning Environments." Mimeo.

- ✂ Carrying out exit surveys of workshop participants. One hundred and ninety seven participants completed the survey, or 37 per cent of workshop participants. There were four categories of participants: high school staff (46 per cent or respondents to the questionnaire); RCMP drug awareness and DARE officers (21 per cent); Correctional Centre inmates (20 per cent); and service providers (14 per cent). The exit survey is included as Annex 2. Participants were also asked to complete a follow-up questionnaire 3-6 months after the workshop to determine use and retention, and five participants completed this follow-up questionnaire, which is included as Annex 3.
- ✂ Carrying out nine key informant interviews, including from JHSNI, partners, and the CAI. A list of key informants interviewed is included as Annex 4. The questionnaire used for these interviews is included as Annex 5.
- ✂ Data collected from 11 users of the R Life website.

Data from these sources was triangulated and all data supported similar conclusions about project results.

Limitations to the methodology

Three project partners were unavailable for interview and the evaluation therefore had to rely on only nine key stakeholder interviews. While 59 workshop participants indicated that they would complete a follow-up questionnaire to the workshop after 3-6 months, only five did so. As the project was only 9 months in duration, it was not possible to assess fully if its long-term outcomes were met; instead the evaluation assesses if these long-term outcomes are likely to be met. Despite these limitations the evaluator believes that adequate data was received to draw conclusions on the results of the project.

Report organisation

The report focuses on three of the standard evaluation criteria: relevance, effectiveness and sustainability. The other two standard evaluation criteria, efficiency and impact, were outside the scope of the evaluation, the former as the evaluator was not requested to review this, and the latter because the project is of too-short a time-frame to assess fully longer-term results.

2. Project results

2.1.1 Effectiveness of the R Life training and website

Most of the project activities and outputs were completed as planned, as follows:

- A number of high quality web and print products were developed related to resilience, including a workbook, PowerPoint, posters, and an e-module. These complementary products are targeted at and can be used by a wide range of potential users in different settings, for example, workshops, through self-learning, or one-on-one training.
- Three trainers were hired on a contract basis who did an excellent job in providing training to a diverse group of participants.
- The curriculum material from *Imagine Campbell River* was refined and updated.
- The project was efficiently run and the project evaluation was carried out as planned.
- 535 individuals attended face-to-face training sessions; this is likely to have led to indirect benefits with participants in training sessions passing on the knowledge acquired to colleagues and others.
- The R Life website had 828 unique visitors.

Key stakeholder interviews, including with the project funder, concurred that the training and training materials available were highly effective. They noted the excellent quality of the resource material and that the training sessions had been successful in meeting their objectives. Overall service providers and others interviewed rated the training and resource materials very highly.

A number of questions in the workshop exit survey covered effectiveness and project outcomes, as set out in Table 2.

Table 2: Workshop questionnaire results on effectiveness

Question	Scale	Rating
The content was presented in an interesting and engaging way	1 to 4 ⁷	3.54
The facilitator(s) was knowledgeable and well informed	1 to 4	3.68
The facilitator(s) listened and responded effectively to questions and concerns.	1 to 4	3.82
My overall rating for the workshop presentation is:	1 to 5	4.27
My overall rating for the workshop administration is:	1 to 5	4.32
How far did the workshop meet its objectives: a. Define resilience and strengthen participants' sense of why it is important.	1 to 5	4.35
How far did the workshop meet its objectives: Increase knowledge and skills in promoting resilient qualities in oneself and others.	1 to 5	4.15
How far did the workshop meet its objectives: Provide learning that can be passed on to youth.	1 to 5	4.19
My overall rating for the entire workshop is:	1 to 5	4.38

⁷ Workshop participants selected from a four point scale as follows: strongly disagree (1); mildly disagree (2); mildly agree (3); strongly agree (4); or a five point scale: poor (1); unsatisfactory (2); satisfactory (3); good (4); excellent (5).

It is evident from Table 2 is that R-Life training was highly effective:

- Facilitation was excellent, with responsive facilitators who clearly engaged participants in an interactive fashion.
- The workshops were well administered, with participants rating administration as between good and excellent.
- The three main objectives of the workshops were for the most part met.
- The overall rating for the workshop is between good and excellent.

Participants' narrative comments in exit questionnaires were also very positive, with some useful suggestions about how the training could be improved, as can be seen in Box 1.

Box 1 Participant feedback on the R Life workshops

Service providers

The various definitions of resilience were very useful, and something to go back to at a later date with my organisation.

Loved it! Makes you think about life, and will be using this in my personal and professional life.

This was an excellent course but general examples could have been improved – we needed something more specific related to our professional work.

Correctional Centre inmates

I enjoyed the course, it opened my eyes to life on life's terms, very educational.

The course gave me insights to pass on to my child.

The cultural part of the course was hard to understand.

RCMP

I appreciated the theories and deeper understanding of root issues, and the attentiveness to the needs and questions of our group by the workshop facilitators.

I am well read in resiliency so the information was repetitive, but the way the presenters facilitated communication was excellent, respectful and educating.

Information was presented in a very accessible fashion with practical, real life examples and insights. It didn't feel "academic" – was very relatable.

School teachers and high school students

Excellent presenters, great structure. Love the discussion within the presentation as well!

Inclusion from everyone in the group and feedback from everyone who participated in discussions and activities was very valuable.

We work in an alternative school therefore resiliency is a topic often covered, but this was a very useful update.

Within the overall rating there was some variation between the higher and lower scoring questions. The facilitators' listening and response skills were rated highest, at the equivalent of 96 per cent, while achievement of the project objectives were lowest, at around 85 per cent – however, these were still rated as good. This suggests that while the workshops were well presented they did not always lead to the planned results.

To put the R Life training in comparative perspective, the mid-term evaluation of the CAI programme found that training funded by the CAI had been relatively successful (p. 32): "Participants in CAI supported training reported positive learning outcomes and the funded projects are demonstrating strong progress toward effective implementation of culturally appropriate practices and approaches."

The eleven responses concerning the overall quality of the R Life website also rated the material highly, with seven respondents noting that the material was very valuable and four noting that it was valuable. However, it is difficult to draw firm conclusions from such a small sample of users, especially given that there were almost 1,000 views of the website during the project period. Ideally the effectiveness of the website would be assessed through assessment of access, use and impact.⁸ R Life did not have the capacity to set up a detailed evaluation framework so that while the website contains high quality and useful resources it is difficult to determine their actual use, particularly given the busy knowledge market on the internet, and that many users browse pages without using the materials they contain.

2.1.2 Coverage

During the development of the project, JHSNI met with 18 individuals representing 12 organizations, and communicated with five other stakeholders on Vancouver Island, and confirmed during this development period that there was strong interest in training. The curriculum was then piloted in Victoria, Sooke, and Nanaimo, training 81 professionals. The feedback from these pilot sessions was positive, with 98 per cent of participants stating their skills and knowledge around resilience increased as a result of the training, and 100 per cent either strongly agreeing or agreeing that there was a need for this type of training in their community.

While the convening period demonstrated there is extensive demand for training on resiliency, and while the training that was carried out was highly effective, the project faced challenges in locating appropriate sites for training. Interviews with key stakeholders for this evaluation suggests that extensive demand for R Life training does exist, but that the project did not adequately use existing networks and channels to locate training venues. R Life training could have been marketed more actively to access new training possibilities, and project communication with existing and potential partners could have been stronger. Targets for numbers to be trained of 1,450 set out in the project planning document were over-ambitious, and it is likely that less than half of that number received training and/or completed the modules on the R Life website.

⁸ a. Access

- How well is the target group defined?
- How appropriate was the online material?
- Was the web site easy to navigate? Was it aesthetically pleasing as well as legible? Did each page in the site download easily?
- Is there a good balance between providing rich digital learning materials and making learning materials as widely available as possible?
- Is there an effective marketing plan in place to promote use and sustainability?

b. Use

- Is the target group being reached?
- How many users are completing the training?

c. Impact

- Are the learning goals of the project, as set out in the project document, being met?

The project final report notes one of the reasons for lower than planned coverage: “We didn’t get any interest for webinar training. We’ve subsequently learned that this form of training is not popular with a significant number of people. The discussion we had around this spurred us to look instead at putting a video on our website that walked people through our material.” While this issue could have been resolved during the planning phase, the project should also be commended for taking a proactive approach and determining an alternative.

2.1.3 Constraints to effectiveness

Interviews with key stakeholders suggested that there were four main constraints to increased effectiveness:

- **Staff availability and expertise.** The project didn’t have a full-time co-ordinator, and the staff hired had a lack of project co-ordination experiences. In contrast the evaluation of the *Imagine Campbell River* project found that having an experienced co-ordinator in place was a contributing factor to project success. The mid-term evaluation of the CAI programmes found similar constraints across the Province (p. 5): “Progress reports included mention about some challenges around being able to demonstrate impacts within and across communities due to difficulties in recruiting and retaining qualified staff. This was noted in more rural and remote communities in particular, although some creative solutions were found to address these challenges (i.e., remote coordination).”
- **Steering Committee.** *Imagine Campbell River* was developed and guided by a Steering Committee, which contributed significantly to the success of the project. There was no equivalent body for R Life.
- **Limited time frame.** The project was originally slated to be for six months, to fit with the CAI funding cycle, and was extended for a further five months. This short project cycle meant that some project objectives were too ambitious for the time-frame (see Section 2.2 for details), and fed into the constraints to hiring staff with project co-ordination experience. The timing of the funding, in the middle of the school year, also made it difficult to plan with schools. If the *Imagine Campbell River* and R Life projects had been consecutive and funding had been guaranteed for 2.5 years from the beginning of the project then R Life’s objectives would have been manageable.
- **Outreach and marketing.** The factors above also fed into a lack of outreach and marketing expertise in the project, which meant that while high quality products were produced, they may not be used optimally. Understandably the project staff had training and/or social service skills, as opposed to outreach/marketing skills.

The three long-term outcomes related to effectiveness in the project logic model are as follows:

- Service providers have increased knowledge about resilience factors and understanding about how to promote these across populations.
- Individuals can identify and practice resiliency factors in their daily lives, throughout the lifespan.
- Individuals throughout BC have a measureable improvement in mental health and reduction in substance use issues.

Questionnaire responses and key stakeholder interviews suggest it is likely that the first two outcomes will be met to a certain extent. The R Life training and website will likely

lead to a contribution to the third outcome, but causality is difficult to measure given current data available.

2.2 Relevance

Planning

Key stakeholders noted that R Life was a pilot attempt at scaling up a successful project that had been previously run in one community. It was at the time of funding the only CAI funded project to attempt to scale up training of this kind. R Life was therefore an innovative project from which lessons can be learnt for other similar initiatives. The risks involved with an innovation of this kind could have been more clearly set out in the project document and the Logic Model, and a lesson learning component could have been included at an early stage.

The R Life Logic Model establishes a clear connection between its different levels (activities, outputs and outcomes). As with many similar Logic Models it is over ambitious in some areas, in particular in relation to sustainability. Also, as with many projects, the Logic Model was used more as a funding and evaluative than a planning tool. Project reports do not refer specifically to the outcomes in the Logic Model, and it appears that these outcomes were not used for planning purposes through the project cycle.

Relevance of training material

In the workshop exit surveys participants were asked two questions about the relevance of training, as set out in Table 3.

Table 3: Relevance of training rated by workshop participants

Written materials and handouts were useful, organized and easy to use.	1 to 4 ⁹	3.51
How far will you use the workshop materials as a reference in the future?	1 to 5	3.51

While this rating is satisfactory or better, relevance was the area with the lowest ratings among the 12 questions covered in the exit surveys. The linkage between relevance and sustainability is further explored in Section 3.

While all groups of participants rated the training highly on almost all of the 12 questions in the workshop exit survey, there was some difference in rating of the workshops among the different sets of trainees. Inmates at the Correctional Facility In Nanaimo (20 per cent of respondents) and RCMP Officers (21 per cent) consistently rated the training more highly than service providers (14 per cent) and high school teachers (46 per cent). Correctional Facility inmates rated the training as above the average for all trainees in all 12 questions on the exit survey, and teachers rated the training as below the average in all 12 questions. Based on narrative comments in the exit surveys, the reason for this may be that the latter two groups already had some access to theories of resilience or related concepts in their ongoing training. This finding suggests that any future training could be targeted to groups which have had least exposure to resilience concepts.

Of the 11 users who filled in data related to the website, eight were female. Seven noted that they were very likely and three that they were likely to refer a friend to the website. Five users noted that they were very likely and five that they were likely to check back to the site for updates; and eight of the eleven people responding were using the site for work. While these numbers are too small to draw any definitive conclusions, they suggest that the website is providing relevant information to potential users.

⁹ Workshop participants selected from a four point scale as follows: strongly disagree (1); mildly disagree (2); mildly agree (3); strongly agree (4); or a five point scale: poor (1); unsatisfactory (2); satisfactory (3); good (4); excellent (5).

It can be concluded that the following outcomes of the project have been met:

- Training Materials available online and by Train the Trainer delivery (ongoing) to promote increased knowledge of resiliency factors, self-regulation and stress management
- Updated and versatile training materials including Workshop/Toolkit booklet and PowerPoint and improved content particularly for culture and trauma sections

2.3 Sustainability

The project Logic Model includes three outcomes related to sustainability:

- Project sustainability is well-developed
- Partnerships continue to develop to support the project and afterward
- Community agencies and key partners will collaborate about a community of practice regarding resiliency

The project proposal also noted: “the ‘philosophical shift’ that comes with embedding the information and practice throughout communities will provide significant sustainability. It is anticipated that at the end of the project, communities impacted by the training will use new knowledge, skills, and strategies, together with an increased sense of connectedness, to promote resiliency within their agency, clients, and larger community.”

R Life has achieved positive results in relation to sustainability:

- There is a cadre of people trained on resilience across BC, and it is likely that some/many of these people, particularly service providers, RCMP officers and high school teachers, will incorporate elements of the training into their work-places.
- R Life materials have been adapted and included in the Provincial Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E) two week course, which now includes one hour on resiliency. About 50 people a year are trained through this course.
- JHSNI has committed to hosting the R Life website, and information and resources on the website will continue to be available for free. One former project staff member will volunteer time to monitor and update R Life’s web presence, and JHSNI staff will also monitor the website and other social media to ensure they are up to date.
- JHSNI will also donate staff time to offer a few face-to-face trainings per year on a cost recovery basis. JHSNI may be able to continue to offer more extensive training on a cost recovery basis.
- A promotional video is being completed to disseminate the project resources throughout networks in B.C.

Two questions in the workshop exit surveys covered sustainability, as set out in Table 4.

Table 4: Responses related to sustainability in workshop exit surveys

How far have your skills and knowledge around resiliency increased as a result of the training?	1 to 5	3.46
---	--------	------

How far will you use the workshop materials as a reference in the future?	1 to 5 ¹⁰	3.51
---	----------------------	------

While the rating for these areas are still quite positive – between reasonably and to a large extent - they are the lowest rated areas in the survey and were rated some way below workshop implementation. The five workshop participants who completed the follow-up survey 3-6 months after the workshop still rated their participation in the workshop highly; however, they had applied the learning in the workshop, or used the resources materials provided, or accessed the R Life website, to a limited extent. Given the size of this sample these results are indicative only.

Partnerships

As noted above, development of partnerships was key to the project sustainability strategy. Some partnerships were strengthened during the project, e.g. with the RCMP. However, the planned uptake by partners, and the community of practice, did not materialize. The key constraints were the amount of time needed to build new partnerships, and the lack of a full-time project co-ordinator with relevant skills. Key stakeholders noted that developing new partnerships takes time, and can be challenging. Overall the project might have been less ambitious about partnerships and the plan to set up a community of practice, and explored other options for sustainability such as integrating the R Life resources into other ongoing training by service providers – as happened in the case of the D.A.R.E. training – and particularly given the time frame and skill sets available through contracting staff.

The challenges of establishing and maintaining partnerships are noted in the CAI mid-term review (p 9, 44):

The progress reports noted some challenges around enhanced cross-sector and cross-cultural collaboration, specifically with some agencies and organizations not being able to collaborate as intended due to external constraints (i.e., job action or competing demands on limited organizational capacity)....new “upstream” or preventative projects and partnerships require time and on going resourcing to mature into sustainable programs that are responsive to local strengths, needs and cultures.

Clearly R Life was not alone in establishing and maintaining partnerships, and one of the lessons of the R Life project was that partnerships need to be nurtured and supported on an ongoing basis and over an adequate time period if they are to enhance project sustainability.

¹⁰ Respondents rated these two areas on a five point scale: not at all (1); somewhat (2); reasonably (3); to a large extent (4); to a very large extent (5).

3. Recommendations

The R Life project is not continuing on a funded basis, so recommendations below focus on what can be done on a low or no cost basis

Recommendations to JHSNI

- Seek opportunities where R Life training resources can be integrated into other ongoing training, as happened with D.A.R.E. training. Seek support from the CAI and the Ministry of Health in doing this.
- Continue to disseminate good practice and showcase the *Imagine Campbell River* and R Life work and resources through the promotional video being prepared.
- Include in the website details of which resources are aimed at which kinds of users.
- Build projects around staff availability and capacity, and develop projects iteratively taking into account both intended outcomes and staff availability.
- Develop Logic Models with indicators to measure results, and include risks and assumptions in the Logic Model¹¹, which will support strategic planning.

Recommendations to the CAI

- Prepare a lessons learned briefing note from the experience of R Life in relation to scaling up, developing partnerships, and sustainability.
- Support agencies in developing frameworks which can assess performance of websites.
- Support agencies in developing and using effective and realistic logic models.

¹¹ A useful resource is: http://www.who.int/ncd/vision2020_actionplan/documents/LFAUNDP.pdf. For training on Logic Models see: <http://events.r20.constantcontact.com/register/event?oeidk=a07e8iz993865ad6768&llr=98bymgcab>

Annex 1: R Life Logic Model

Inputs	Activities		Outcomes -- Impact		
	Activities	Outputs	Short	Medium	Long
<p>4 part time contracted staff (approx. 20 hours per week for 24 weeks)</p> <p>Project Management support – JHSNI</p> <p>Seeds of Resilience Training developed by Imagine Campbell River</p> <p>Partnerships with agencies on Vancouver Island</p> <p>Program Budget (CAI and in-kind)</p> <p>Equipment, supplies, resources</p> <p>Clerical and facility support</p>	<p>Contract with staff – develop work plan, weekly management/ team meetings</p> <p>Develop working partnerships</p> <p>Revise and update Seeds of Resilience Training materials (esp. Culture and Trauma)</p> <p>Marketing plan for face to face training and web presence</p> <p>Plan and Deliver Face to Face training</p> <p>Develop online web presence</p> <p>develop on-line training modules</p> <p>sustainability planning throughout</p>	<p>Jan 2013- completion of work plan (partnerships, marketing, face to face and online training)</p> <p>communication and collaboration with partners (email and in person)</p> <p>># of activities co-organized with partners</p> <p>updated training materials</p> <p># of marketing activities (press release, online presence, etc.)</p> <p># of presentations</p> <p># of individuals trained</p> <p>website/ # of visits</p> <p># of modules developed</p> <p># of individuals accessing online training</p> <p>sustainability plan is developed by project end</p>	<p>Clear and effective project activities and oversight</p> <p>Partnerships are effective in moving the project forward</p> <p>Updated and versatile training materials including Workshop/ Toolkit booklet and PowerPoint and improved content particularly for culture and trauma sections</p> <p>Effective sharing of the RLife Project across Vancouver Island and throughout BC</p> <p>Train the Trainer delivery throughout Vancouver Island</p> <p>Ongoing availability of On-line training modules</p> <p>Project sustainability is well-developed</p>	<p>Project is effective and work plan is completed</p> <p>Partnerships continue to develop to support the project and afterward</p> <p>Training Materials available online and by Train the Trainer delivery (ongoing) to promote increased knowledge of resiliency factors, self-regulation and stress management</p>	<p>Service providers have increased knowledge about resilience factors and understanding about how to promote these across populations</p> <p>individuals can identify and practice resiliency factors in their daily lives, throughout the lifespan.</p> <p>community agencies and key partners will collaborate about a community of practice regarding resiliency</p> <p>individuals throughout BC have a measureable improvement in mental health and reduction in substance use issues</p>

Annex 2 Post-workshop survey questionnaire

R Life Resiliency Workshop Workshop Evaluation at exit

Course Name: R Life Resiliency Workshop	Date(s):
Facilitator(s) Name:	Location:

1. Workshop presentation

Please circle one

	N/A	Strongly Disagree	Mildly Disagree	Mildly Agree	Strongly Agree
1. The content was presented in an interesting and engaging way.	0	1	2	3	4
2. The facilitator(s) was knowledgeable and well informed.	0	1	2	3	4
3. The facilitator(s) listened and responded effectively to questions and concerns.	0	1	2	3	4
4. Written materials and handouts were useful, organized and easy to use.	0	1	2	3	4

My overall rating for the workshop presentation is:

(please circle) 1 2 3 4 5
 poor unsatisfactory satisfactory good excellent

2. Workshop Administration (check mark column that applies)

Amount of workshop content should...	Increase	Decrease	Stay the same
Pace of the workshop should...			
Amount of audio visual should...			
Amount of handouts should...			
Group activities should...			
Lectures should...			

My overall rating for the workshop administration is:

(please circle) 1 2 3 4 5
 poor unsatisfactory satisfactory good excellent

3. Workshop results

3.1 How far did the workshop meet its objectives:

a. Define resilience and strengthen participants' sense of why it is important.

(please circle) 1 2 3 4 5
 poor unsatisfactory satisfactory good excellent

b. Increase knowledge and skills in promoting resilient qualities in oneself and others.

(please circle) 1 2 3 4 5
 poor unsatisfactory satisfactory good excellent

c. Provide learning that can be passed on to youth.

(please circle) 1 2 3 4 5
 poor unsatisfactory satisfactory good excellent

3.2 Modules

3.2a How far will you use the workshop materials as a reference in the future?

(please circle) 1 2 3 4 5
 Not at all sometimes often very often extensively

3.2b How far have your skills and knowledge around resiliency increased as a result of the training?

(please circle) 1 2 3 4 5
 Not at all somewhat reasonably to a large extent to a very
large extent

3.3 General comments

1. What was most valuable about this course?

2. What was least valuable about this course?

3. Additional suggestions or comments:

My overall rating for the entire workshop is:

(please circle) 1 2 3 4 5
 poor unsatisfactory satisfactory good excellent

Note: We are planning a brief follow up survey similar to this one 3 months after the completion of the workshop. This will help us assess the extent to which participants have used the knowledge gained in the workshop. Would you be willing to participate through email in this survey, which will take about 20 minutes?

If yes, please provide:

Name: _____

Email: _____

Thank you!!!

Annex 3
Workshop Evaluation after 3-4 months

Thank you for agreeing to complete a follow up questionnaire concerning the R Life Resiliency Workshop you attended. We are following up with participants to see how they have used the workshop material. Completed questionnaires will be used to improve the quality of future workshops, and as part of the information base for the independent evaluation of the R Life project.

Completing this questionnaire should take about 10-15 minutes of your time.

Please highlight your rating on the 1-5 scale, and note any additional comments in the space provided.

Please return the completed questionnaire as an attachment to tonybeck@shaw.ca

Deadline for responses is the 17th July.

1. On reflection and now that several months have passed, please rate your overall level of satisfaction with the R Life Workshop.

1	2	3	4	5
Very unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	Satisfied	Very satisfied	Extremely satisfied

Please expand on why you have given this rating.

2. What do you remember most about the workshop?

3. How far have your skills and knowledge around resiliency increased as a result of the training?

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	Somewhat	Reasonably	To a large extent	To a very large extent

Please expand on your rating.

4. How far have you applied the learning from the workshop in your professional practice?

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	Somewhat	Reasonably	To a large extent	To a very large extent

Please expand on your rating.

5. To what extent have you referenced the resource materials provided in the workshop, the R Life website, or other related materials?

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	Very occasionally	Sometimes	Often	Very Often

Please expand on your rating.

6. How far will you use the workshop materials as a reference in the future?

1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	Very occasionally	Sometimes	Often	Very Often

Please expand on your rating.

7. Any other comments?

Annex 4

Interviews with key stakeholders

Steve Ayers, John Howard Society of the North Island

Ben Badgero, project consultant on website development

Mary Catherine Bellamy, John Howard Society of the North Island

Gus Papagiannis, Drug Awareness Area Coordinator, RCMP

Sarah Foster, Director of Operations
Boys and Girls Club of Central Vancouver Island

Ellie James, Manager of Youth and Family Services , Boys and Girls Club of Greater
Victoria

Carrie Morris, Central Island Coordinator, Discovery Youth and Family Substance Use

Laura Tate, Provincial Director, CAI

Linda Leonardo, Grants Contract Manager, CAI

Annex 5: Questionnaire for key stakeholders

As the Community Action Initiative funded project will be complete by June 2013, an end of project evaluation is being conducted by an external evaluator, Tony Beck. The evaluation will be used to report to the project funder, and for learning by project actors.

Questionnaire for project partners

Not all questions will be addressed to all respondents

A. Background

1. Which organisation do you work for, and what is your current position?
2. How have you and your organisation been involved with use of the RLife curriculum?
3. When and how did your organisation become a partner with JHSNI?

B. Quality of partnership

4. How would you rate the quality of partnership around the RLife training?
5. Extremely effective 4. Very effective 3. Effective 2. Somewhat effective 1. Limited effectiveness

What is the reason for giving this rating? Please expand.

5. Is there anything in the partnership that could be improved?

C. Quality of curriculum

5. In what ways has your organization been using the RLife curriculum?
6. How would you rate the quality of the RLife curriculum?
5. Excellent 4. Good 3. Satisfactory 2, Unsatisfactory 1. Poor

What is the reason for giving this rating? Please expand.

7. How long does your organisation plan to use the RLife curriculum for?

8. Are there any ways you can think of where the curriculum could be improved?

D. Sustainability of partnerships

9. If relevant, do you envisage the partnership/s developed around the RLife curriculum continuing?

10. Has your organisation connected to or made linkages with any other organizations around the RLife training?

11. Which aspects of the partnership do you value most?

E. Final comments

12. What is your overall assessment of the CAI funded project?

5. Extremely effective 4. Very effective 3. Effective 2. Somewhat effective 1. Limited effectiveness

Please expand on your rating.

13. Are there any other successes that have been realized through the project that you can share?