Country: SLOVENIA

Partner organisation   PILOT PARTNERS

Course site(s):   MARIBOR

Contact person: IGOR KRAMPAČ
                                  project manager

I. Basics

1. Are there any differences between the intended target groups for FreD goes net and what was actually achieved?

Below is a summary of the intended target groups as originally defined. Please delete the entries in the column "planned" and replace them with the correct information for your country in the new column "implemented".

Criterion	PLANNED (according to 2008 RAR)	IMPLEMENTED (Pilot phase 2009)	brief comment if necessary
Age	14 to 21-year-olds	13-25 year olds	
Access route	– Police / judiciary system School – Workplace	– Police – School	There is no law implemented in our justice system
manner of (first) coming to notice	It is possible to also include youths that have come to notice several times on account of their drug use	First notice + youth that was detected several times	
Substances	– Illegal drugs except heroin – Alcohol	– Illegal drugs except heroin – Alcohol	
classification of drug user	Experimental to high risk drug user	Experimental to high drug user risk	Those, who were at high drug use risk, were after the course referred to more intense therapy within other programs.

2. Meeting the main aims

2.1. Was it possible to implement FreD goes net in the pilot regions?

$\boxed{X}$ yes $\square$ no

2.2. In the pilot regions, has FreD goes net contributed to improving access to drug-consuming adolescents and young adults?

$\boxed{X}$ yes $\square$ no

Reasons for this:

With the help of FreD goes net programme, more experimental drug users were detected and we noticed that teachers and counsellors became more sensitive to this problem as they have the programme where they can refer this youth.

2.3. In the pilot regions, has FreD goes net contributed to developing or improving cooperative relationships between the chosen settings (police, schools etc) and drug counselling organisations/institutions (course sites)?

$\boxed{X}$ yes $\square$ no

Reasons for this:

Before the programme was implemented all those institutions (police, schools, drug programmes) worked individually and with the pilot phase of FreD goes net, they became more connected and cooperative (exchange of information/improvements, further treatment, tracing drug users) and got a better insight in the work of those institutions.

2.4. If cooperation as set out in 2.3 was successfully established/developed, will it be sustainable and continue beyond the pilot phase?

$\boxed{X}$ yes $\square$ no

Reasons for this:

Because in our case it has proven to be successful as we already described above.

2.5. Were there any specific conditions/changes (political, economic) in your country during the first two years of FreD goes net that affected the implementation of the project?

$\square$ yes $\boxed{X}$ no

II. RAR

In the first project year all partners used the method of RAR to carry out a stocktake of the current situation and current needs. This consisted of three elements:

– Background research,
– Interviews with key persons
– Identifying „good practice projects".

Results were documented in country reports.

1. Did you identify good practice projects in your country that met the agreed criteria?

☒ yes ☐ no

2. Looking at it retrospectively after concluding the pilot phase: Was the method of RAR useful in identifying suitable settings for your site(s)?

☒ yes ☐ no

Reasons for this:

RAR method was very useful as we got an insight into the work of those institutions, in the possibility of referral from those institutions and we got a broader perspective on the implementation of the project, which helped in creating agreements in the next phase.

3. Judging by the results it achieved, and based on your professional perspective, was the time spent on the RAR exercise justified?

☒ yes ☐ no

Reasons for this:

Already mentioned above.

4. Would you recommend this method of stocktaking to other early intervention projects?

☒ yes ☐ no

Reasons for this:

It's a good method for creating starting points, possibilities and expectations of the project, which is important in the next phase of making contracts and cooperation agreements.

III. Cooperation

1. Implementation of FreD goes net requires **viable cooperative relationships between the participating institutions. What methods of establishing/maintaining these have proven successful in your pilot region?** (e.g. informal verbal agreements, formal written agreements, regular meetings, agreements at certain levels of hierarchy) Please describe these.

The cooperation with schools was established through the National Education Institute. The agreements were made about the cooperation with schools and the implementation of the project as an alternative measure in case of alcohol and drug problems detected in schools. Within the agreement with National Education Institute we had 4 presentations of the project on primary schools for headmasters of primary schools in Maribor and surrounding area, and 1 presentation for all high school headmasters.

Furthermore the project was presented to all police stationmasters, who are responsible for the referral of young offenders to the project FreD, in Maribor region. Each month stationmasters are given FreD goes net flyers and are given the report how many people of the target group attended the project. At the same time, police stationmasters give us feedback on how many flyers were distributed.

Our agreements with schools and police were formed on verbal level.

2. What difficulties were encountered in developing and maintaining cooperative relationships?

Please describe these.

The main problem for the school counselors were, how to confront the parents and adolescents to take an active role in solving this problem and accepting the alternative measure. Our best solution on dealing with this issue, which is now practiced in schools, is having the counselor contact us (while having counseling with the parents) and making the appointment instead of the parents.

The problem with the recruitment from the police was the fact that the referrals are so far quite rear which we attribute to not having legal framework in our system for pedagogical measures to be taken rather than imposing penal measures.

3. Did you enter into any written cooperation agreements?

☐ yes ☒ no

If not: Why not?

The agreements with institutions were formed within our meetings, on the basis of which the record /note were made, but no formal agreement was signed.

4.   Was there a local steering group for implementing the FreD approach?

☐ yes   **X** no

If no steering group was created, why not?

We did not create a steering group because (as mentioned above) the cooperation is on voluntary basis, but we did have periodic (once every 4 months) meetings with the representatives of each institution (with the representative of police and counsellors from schools).

5.   Please list those institutions/organisations/services that really did refer young persons to the courses.

Police / judicial system
Which institutions and divisions exactly were these? Who were your contact persons (function/position)? Why was cooperation successful in these specific cases?

All police units from the Police department Maribor were included in the project.

Most youngsters were referred on the basis of been caught because of the possession of non-legal drugs, or driving under the influence of drugs. Our contact person is the prevention coordinator in the police unit.

School
What types of school? Who were your contact persons (function/position)? What characterises the schools that were willing to cooperate/where cooperation was successful?

They were mostly referred from secondary schools, 2 youngsters from primary school. They were mostly referred from counsellors (dipl. psychologist, dipl. pedadog, dipl. social workers) and some from headmasters.

Most of the schools are vocational schools (mechanical school, construction school, design school, school of agriculture,…).

Other settings, specifically:
What divisions/ contact persons (function/position)?
Why was cooperation successful in these cases?

6. **Chapter 4.4 of the manual gives recommendations for successfully establishing structures of cooperation. Did you find these tips helpful?**

   ☒ yes   ☐ no

   Reasons for this:

   Our cooperation with those partners was successful already previous to the FreD goes net project and approach (that is recommended in the chapter 4.4) was already practised. We find these recommendations as a base for creating a cooperating team.

7. **Do you have any further suggestions or comments on the topic of "cooperation"?**

   NO, we don't have any further recommendations

IV. Access

1.   The role of the respective legal provisions in facilitating access to FreD courses:

The manual presents an overview of the legal provisions that currently apply in each country. After completing the pilot phase, would you say these facilitate or obstruct access to drug-using youngsters?

Police context / judiciary system:

☐ Current provisions facilitate access   ☒ obstruct access

reasons for this:

Because there is no law that would implement FreD goes net course as a way of avoiding punishment. Everything is on voluntary basis.

School context:

☐ Current provisions facilitate access   ☒ obstruct access

reasons for this:

Again there is no general law/rule of alternative measure (FreD goes net course) that would apply to all schools. Therefore the success of cooperation and recruitment of youngsters from each school was dependent on sensibility, inventiveness and activity of teachers, counsellors and headmasters of school.

Other (please state which):

☐ Current provisions facilitate access   ☐ obstruct access

2.   Were there any differences between these legal provisions (and any other rules and agreements) 'on paper' and their implementation 'in real life'?

☐ yes   ☒ no

3.   Which flyer did you use for 'your' young persons? Please enclose 5 copies.

☒ yes   ☐ no

Basically used the available   or   developed our own flyer
flyer (the template)

4. Did you change any of the main messages of the template?

☐ yes ☒ no

5. Can the universal flyer for young persons (the emplate) be included as a recommendation in the handbook or does it need to be changed in any way?

It can be used in the handbook, as it gives basic information of the course and is visually appealing to youngsters.

6. What are typical situations for youngsters to come to the notice of a particular setting and be referred to FreD?

	Typical situation of coming to the notice…
of the police / judiciary system	Driving a car under the influence of drugs, Possession of drugs, Caught smoking cannabis, Interventions on different offences
of school	Attend class under the influence of forbidden drugs/alcohol, parents searching for help for their children, who use drugs, suspect on drug consumption on the basis of not attending school,
of another setting (please state which):	–

7. What benefits can young persons draw from taking part in a course that could motivate them enough to contact the course leader?

	gains or benefits obtained from participation
Police / judiciary system	Possible benefits when youngster is brought in front of the judge
School	Attendance of the course is a way of taking alternative measure, so the youngster is not excluded from the school or being punished in some other manner
Other setting (please state which):	–

8. FreD goes net works to the principle that "coming to notice on account of legal or illegal drug use is followed by intervention." For your chosen settings, please describe a **typical chain of events/the individual steps from first being noticed all the way to completing the intervention** (bullet points; if needed refer to the chart "Alex is caught…" from the ppt of the kick-off workshop – see attachments of the e-mail that was used to send out this questionnaire).

SCHOOL: Person gets caught and is identified as a drug user ------- counsellor in school invites the youngster and his/hers parents to the meeting, where they are informed about the course and are given the flyer -------the counsellor calls the Trainers of t he course and arranges a date of intake interview ------- youngster (and his parents) goes through the intake interview and is informed about the course dates (if the youngster doesn't show up, the school counsellors are informed about not attending the intake interview) ------- the youngster attends the course ------- after the completed course he gets the certificate, which he shows to the institution, that referred him ------- the youngster by attending the course finishes the alternative measure.

POLICE: Person gets caught and is identified as a drug user ------- police man informs the person about the course and gives the youngster a flyer -------youngster calls and arranges a date for intake interview ------- youngster (and his parents) go through the intake interview and is informed about the course dates ------- the youngster attends the course ------- after the completed course he gets the certificate, which might help him, when he is called to the court.

9.   Were the parents involved in referring the youngsters to FreD?

☒ yes   ☐ no

If yes:

– How and in what form were they involved?

With youngster under 18 years, parents came along to the intake interview. They were given basic information on the course, than the intake interview was continued with the youngster alone.

– Would you recommend parental involvement to new FreD sites?

☒ yes   ☐ no

Reasons for this:

In the adolescence and the period of experimenting with drugs, young people need the leadership of adult, responsible person, which are mainly parents. We believe that parents should be informed about their children and their problems in order to offer and enable appropriate help as soon as possible. Parents are responsible and obligatory to make a decision (when this is necessary) in the name of the child.

10. **Do you have any other comments on the topic of access? What measures do you find helpful in facilitating access to the intake interview and/or course?**

In the case the course does not take place in the period of one week after the intake interview, we recommend to stay in touch with the youngster by meeting him/her more often (once a week till the course) and preparing him/her for the group.

V. Implementing the intervention (Intake and courses)

1. After the intake interview, what were typical reasons for you to find that FreD was unsuitable for the adolescent/young adult in question?

In our case there were no adolescents who were unsuitable for the course, as the institutions were well informed about the target group and referred only those who were suitable.

In case we recognized the problem as more serious, we referred the youngster to other – more intense programme after the course.

2. On average, how many weeks were there between the intake interview and the beginning of the course?

2-3 weeks

3. Up to this point, at which sites did you carry out how many courses with how many participants?

Name of site 1: ZZV Maribor – project CPO, Ljubljanska ulica 4
   6 courses with   41 participants, who finished the course

Name of site 2: ZZV Maribor, Prvomajska ulica 1
   5 courses with   31 participants, who finished the course

4. How many sessions did you divide the course into?

☐ 2 sessions   ☐ 3 sessions   ☒ 4 sessions

5. Did some of the sessions also take place at weekends?

☐ yes   ☒ no

6. How satisfied are you generally with the exercises that currently make up the course?

Please rank on a scale from 1 to 4
(1 = very satisfied, 4 = not at all satisfied)

2

7. **Please name (up to 3) exercises that have proven particularly effective:** The following should definitely remain in the manual (please give the exercise name and number):

   6.2 Reasons - Effects – Consequences
   8.1 Definition of pleasure, abuse, habituation and addiction
   11 Consume graph

8. **Were there any exercises in the course that proved ineffective or too difficult to implement?**

   ☒ yes   ☐ no

   If yes: please list a maximum of three together with the respective name and number.

   7.1   Quiz "The spliff is hot"
   9.1   Risk positioning
   7.2.b Mikado

9. **Are there any other exercises you would like to be included in the manual?**

   ☐ yes   **☒** no

   If yes: please write them out separately in the format of the manual and attach to this report.

10. **Was / is implementing the FreD courses something that enriches your work?**
    Did you gain any particular insights? Did something unexpected happen?

    The course gives the youngster a good insight into the problem and we notice that these youngsters were more willing to take part in other, more intense programme after the course.

11. **What are your experiences with respect to group composition?**
    (gender, age, different substances consumed, different patterns of consumption etc)

    Our experiences with several groups showed that it is better to seperate groups according to substance use (not to mix those who tried only alcohol with those who were experimenting with several drugs).

    The experiences also showed us, that if the group is of big age range, younger participants take on a less active role.

12. **Do you have any further comments/ideas/recommendations on the topic of course implementation?**

We would recommend some extra hours for the course, as we find the discussion after each exercise very important and precious in sense of giving insights to the youngsters and getting to know their thinking, acting and the problem situation.

Further after the course we would recommend an individual session with the youngster in order to discuss about his decisions/plans, new insights and offer him support (to get in some therapy, to tell the parents about his problem, to include school in active problem solving, to create a new social network …)

We would also recommend some monitoring after the course (1-2 months after finishing the course) – to check whether the youngster acted on his decisions to change same patterns, which were formed during the course.

VI. Summary

1. Do you find the overall concept and approach of FreD goes net convincing?
Please rate on a scale from 1 (yes, very) to 4 (no, not at all)

2

Reason:

Look at the previous question.
Because of the above recommendations we gave the mark 2 and not 1.

2. If you had several pilot sites: Were your experiences at each site fundamentally different? (e.g. with respect to cooperation, access or course implementation)
Skip this question if there was only one pilot site.

☐ yes   ☒ no

3. Please summarise the aspects you consider central for each of the thematic blocks.

	aspects that obstruct...
… cooperation	– week sensibility of the counselors in cooperating institutions to the problem of drug use; – the way how information about the course was presented to the youngsters (from the institutions which referred the youngster);
… access	– no legal framework for the participation to the course;
… course implementation	– big age range of the group; – not enough time for intense discussion after the exercises.

	aspects that facilitate...
… cooperation	– good communication with partners and the good flow of information; – good recognition of the project in media ;
… access	– location, where the project takes place (central location, near schools); – sensibility of the counselors and teachers in recognizing the problem; – pilot partners being good informed about each course; – chance of immediate intake interview ;
… course implementation	- sensible, well informed, experienced trainers of FreD course; - good communication between trainers and equality; - good coordination between 2 trainers while having the course; - nice, warm, pleasant room, where the course takes place; - division of the course in 4 units, as the effective concentration of the participant lasts for approximately 1-2 hours