

This report summarizes the views expressed by Montreal Youth Project (MYP) project facilitators. It draws an initial brief picture of the local context and implementation of the MYP in the 29 CLSC territories. It should be considered in the setting of the broader MYP evaluation that began two years ago.

For more information on the evaluation protocol and research team, readers may refer to MYP Evaluation No. 1¹ for further details.

MYP Evaluation Team

¹ MYP Evaluation, Montreal Youth Project Evaluation Team, Information Letter, February 2001. 1(2001). For a copy just call Isabelle Laurin (528 2400, ext. 3971).

Summary of Interviews with Project Facilitators

The document is in two parts: methodology is described first and then the interviews are summarized and cover nine separate aspects.

Objectives of the Interview

The objectives of this initial interview with project facilitators were:

- To find out project facilitators' perceptions of their role and the MYP itself
- To describe the local context at the time the MYP was introduced
- To describe how the MYP was set up locally.

Method

All project facilitators were met at the CLSC for a semi-structured interview lasting approximately 45 minutes. The interview chart contained 20 questions.

Interviews were carried out over a period of 11 months, from January to November, 2001. They have been consolidated and analyzed based on the various sections of the interview chart.

Fifty percent of project facilitators have been involved in the MYP since it began in 1999. Most of the others joined the project during 2000 and some in 2001 to continue action initiated by project facilitators who had left.

All were designated project facilitators because of the executive positions they had occupied in the child/family sector of the CLSC.

We wish to alert readers to the fact that when an idea is quantified in this report, it does not mean that others respondents think the contrary. For example, if it is stated that 8 respondents hoped for better leadership on the part of the Régie, that does not mean that the other 21 held the opposite opinion. The question is not specifically on that aspect, but more on what they hoped for from the Régie.

....

....

Generalizations should be avoided. In addition, since interviews took place over a period of 11 months, MYP activities may have progressed in areas where the first project facilitators were interviewed. Consequently, the circumstances described at that time may differ from the present situation with respect to some aspects of the interview.

Summary of Interviews

Definition of the MYP

If answers on the definition of the MYP are consolidated, the following definition is obtained:

The MYP is a project initiated by the Régie régionale and applies to young people 0-25 years of age. It involves consultation at both the local and regional level, and its goal is to identify the needs of young people and grey areas with respect to services so that action priorities can be established. The purpose of the MYP is to improve the integration, accessibility, continuity and uniformity of services in order to better meet the needs of the population in each CLSC territory. The MYP is also intended to increase prevention and promotion activities, and implement a closer partnership between the Centres jeunesse (CJ) and the CLSCs.

The aspect most frequently mentioned was consultation. Slightly more than half of respondents then said that the MYP's purpose was to improve the integration, accessibility, continuity and uniformity of services. Other aspects were given by less than 25% of respondents.

Expectations of the MYP

The majority of respondents said that they had had expectations regarding resources. They believed that there was funding for the MYP and were counting heavily on this money to mobilize partners and develop new projects.

A number of them expected that the MYP would be an opportunity for the various people involved to come out from behind the doors of the CLSC, relate to their partners and work together with them. They also expected the MYP would improve relationships with institutional partners.

Mobilization

Almost half of respondents began by saying that consultation already existed in their territory, so the MYP had not changed anything in this respect.

More than half the territories have youth consultation groups that have been operating for several years and cover several age groups. Most of these groups did not include children 0-5 years of age, but 18-25 year-olds were often covered. The 0-5 age group however had not been ignored, since two-thirds of the territories have consultation groups specifically for this age level.

Mobilization Strategies

If we look at the first strategy used by individual territories to mobilize their partners, one-third of respondents said that their first choice was to present the MYP to consultation groups in their territory; another third decided to organize a focus group day bringing together all partners in the territory. Other territories, which were fewer in number, first formed an MYP coordination committee or sent a questionnaire to their partners to know what their services and needs were. Lastly, in two territories, a situation statement was drawn up by the CLSC itself, at the very beginning, to be used as a mobilization tool.

Strong Resistance to the MYP

One-third of respondents stated that the MYP received a generally favourable welcome in their territory. The remaining two-thirds spoke of an unfavourable or neutral reception, and a certain degree of suspicion. In several territories, the most negative reactions came from community organizations.

The strongest reaction against the MYP was caused by the fact that the organizations saw the project as being a command from the Régie, and did not appreciate that body telling them what to do. The fact that the MYP originated with the Régie also raised the fear, for community organizations, that their funding from the Régie would be affected if they did not take part in the Project.

Coordination Structure

A specific MYP coordination committee was set up in 17 territories, and included various partners, such as the police, school boards, hospitals, community organizations, etc.

An internal CLSC committee was formed in five territories. In these cases, no coordination committee with outside members was established. In six territories, project facilitators decided to develop their MYP-related activities via the consultation groups only. In three instances, the consultation group and an internal committee were both used. In one territory, no MYP coordination structure was set up.

Action Plan

Most territories were able to name the problem areas on which they planned to work. These are given in table 1, page 4. Some respondents cited very broad problems such as poverty, while others targeted much more specific areas and age groups. A number of territories seemed to want to work on problems relating to consultation and access to services.

Régie Support

Project facilitators' views of the Régie's support at local levels denote a certain amount of dissatisfaction. A number could not identify the support measures per se. Some did however acknowledge that the Régie had offered support but, as it was not suited to the particular requirements of the individual territories, they did not take advantage of it. Others added that they did not want support from the Régie, because it would have been unpopular in their territory. Some respondents said they were satisfied with the "Working Together" training program. Against that, others acknowledged the efforts made regarding regional mobilization and said it had proved useful after some months, particularly in the case of school boards.

Role of the Régie

The role that project facilitators mainly expected the Régie to play was that it would be the driving force in the MYP and would ensure the efficient, transparent transmission of information. There was a great deal of criticism on how these roles were carried out and, more specifically, the question of transferring resources before problems arose. There was a lot of confusion in this area, with schedules being delayed, no follow-up or information on how matters were progressing, or differences in the terms used regarding the redeployment of resources. All this seems to have a demotivating effect.

As far as taking a leading role in intersectorial action was concerned, it was acknowledged that the Régie had been very active at the beginning. Now, there is a feeling that it is running out of steam and it was hoped that the Régie would again provide firm, motivating leadership.

Some respondents said they were satisfied with the part played by the Régie. They appreciated flexible schedules, the consideration given to local aspects, the distribution of information and supervision of the project.

MYP Evaluation

MYP Evaluation is edited by the Montreal Youth Project Evaluation Team. The objective of this newsletter is to inform all partners interested in the evaluation of the project throughout its realization.

Research and writing:
Isabelle Laurin.
Design and Layout:
Yves Laplante.

The evaluation of *Projet jeunesse montréalais* is financed by the Canadian Health Services Research Foundation, the Fonds de

recherche en santé du Québec and the Régie régionale, Directions de la programmation et de santé publique.

© Direction de santé publique Régie régionale de la santé et des services sociaux de Montréal-Centre.

Legal Deposit: 2001, Bibliothèque nationale du Québec, Bibliothèque nationale du Canada, ISSN: 1496-5658.

Information:
(514) 528-2400, local 3971.

Table 1 : Problems on which Project Facilitators Intend to Work.

Territory	Problems on which Project Facilitators Intend to Work
1	<i>The action plan will be based on objectives to be achieved by the selected target groups instead of problems.</i>
2	<i>Reciprocal knowledge of resources, language and behaviour problems, involvement of decision-makers, and informing them about needs, access to resources.</i>
3	<i>Neglect of 0-5 year olds, create support for immigrant mothers, open a drop-in day care centre at the CLSC, establish a community activity centre, take action with boys in single-parent families, open a multiethnic beauty salon for women, provide speech therapy services for immigrants learning several languages.</i>
4	<i>Neglect, violence, school dropouts, assistance with entering the job market, involvement of fathers.</i>
5	<i>Nothing specified.</i>
6	<i>Nothing specified.</i>
7	<i>Nothing specified.</i>
8	<i>Will choose three priority targets.</i>
9	<i>Eating disorders, mental health problems, children 0-5 year of age, prevention-promotion.</i>
10	<i>Marital violence, behavioural problems in children 0-11 years of age, aggressive behaviour in adolescent and young adults, violence in relationships, exclusion and marginalization of 0-11 year olds, adolescent pregnancy.</i>
11	<i>Continue consultation and set up a family centre plan.</i>
12	<i>Social isolation, poverty, dietary safety and funding of community organizations.</i>
13	<i>Abuse and neglect of 0-11 year olds, parental attachment, information exchange between organizations, distribution of information in the community, prevent violence of 12-14 year olds, bring cultural communities closer together.</i>
14	<i>Parent support, lifestyle support, access to services, coordination of services.</i>
15	<i>Nothing specified.</i>
16	<i>Parenting skills and violence.</i>
17	<i>School dropouts and access to day care centres.</i>
18	<i>Poverty, parental respite, agreement on 6-12 and 18-24 years olds</i>
19	<i>Mental health, neglect and poverty, perinatal care, early stimulation, increase consultation on 0-11 years olds and increase cooperation between CPEs (centres de la petite enfance) and day care centres.</i>
20	<i>Parenting skills, firm up consultation on all age groups, mental health of 6-11 years olds</i>
21	<i>0-5 years olds, prevention in schools.</i>
22	<i>Nothing specified.</i>
23	<i>Work and contact with parents, parental skills, organize activities for 2-4 years olds, contact with CPE and schools.</i>
24	<i>Accessability of multicultural community services, target 6-11 age group.</i>
25	<i>Research how young people integrate themselves into the community, connect youth resources, obtain services of a street worker</i>
26	<i>Nothing specified.</i>
27	<i>Nothing specified.</i>
28	<i>Parental skills.</i>
29	<i>Suicide.</i>