

Country: Latvia  
Partner organisation: E.C.  
Course site(s): Riga, Valmiera  
Contact person: Solvita Lazdina

## 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	14-19	
Access route	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Police / judiciary system</li> <li>- School</li> <li>- Workplace</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Police</li> <li>School</li> </ul>	
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	Yes, but that is only because there are no programmes to send them to.	
Substances	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Illegal drugs except heroin</li> <li>- Alcohol</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Illegal drugs except heroin</li> <li>Alcohol</li> </ul>	
classification of drug user	Experimental to high risk drug user	Experimental to high risk drug user	

### 2. Meeting the main aims

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

yes     no

Comments:

*FRED courses were implemented in 3 regions – Riga, Valmiera, Vaidode.*

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

yes  no

Reasons for this:

*Partly. The benefit of the project was the possibility of participation in the project for those users who managed to get into the attention of the police and particular schools. Before, they had been only identified and the work was done with them only in the case when the diagnosis of addiction had been set by a narcologist.*

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)?**

yes  no

Reasons for this:

*Partly. In Valmiera the cooperation with the police was already brought in practice. The project gave the possibility to involve clients who use alcohol and drugs, thus widening the range of the cooperation. Also, the previous contacts were used.*

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

yes  no

Reasons for this:

*The cooperation can be continued successfully if the implementation of the programme will be included in the town budget, making the further processes of the project possible.*

*In addition, it can be added that we sent the letters of gratitude to our cooperation partners, including the management of the State Police for the participation in the project in whole.*

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?*

yes     no

If yes, what were they?

*Yes, economical and political crisis: in many fields there was a decrease in finance and work positions. That resulted into higher working load per person, lower work motivation, and narrowed feels of interest.*

*Also it brought isolation from new ideas, mistrust to authorities and organisations. Indifferent attitudes, disrespect to authorities and legal institutions among youngsters, that lessens the ways to have an influence upon these young people.*

---

## 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:

*Yes, that was a possibility to identify suitable settings and choose suitable partners. Unfortunately, the economic slowdown did not allow cooperation in full amount as it was planned before. Many organizations began to work in more economic, save mode, excluding extra involvements in other activities.*

**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:

*It was a good preparation, resuming contacts, informing about the FreD project, recognition of the filed.*

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

yes  no

Reasons for this:

*It gives a possibility to recognize the potential weak and strong points (additionally to all the aforementioned).*

### 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.

*Working with the police, the official contract with the Chief of the State Police was necessary. Signing the contract was a long process. It was harmonized through different levels of legal units of the State Police. Theoretically, after harmonization the cooperation was possible in every location in the country. But the work was carried out in the places where the police (officers) were willing to cooperate. In the cooperation with the schools and children's homes, we signed contracts where the role of both parts was described. But more importance was given to the oral agreements, bilateral interest in cooperation, not to the paper.*

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

Please describe these.

*If the organization was interested in cooperation, no difficulties were encountered in cooperative relationships. Some difficulties were encountered at the beginning of the cooperation, when the steps had to be reminded persistently to get the young people participate in the programme.*

3. **Did you enter into any written cooperation agreements?**

yes     no

If yes: How many such agreements did you have and with which cooperation partners?

– Site 1: (Name of town)

*Valmiera*

- 1. Youth centre "VINDA", support office*
- 2. The State Police (contract with the management in Riga)*

– Site 2: (Name of town)

*Riga*

- 1. Riga Addiction Prevention Centre (not existing any more)*
- 2. Schools (6), after-school youth centres (1), children's home (1)*

If not: Why not?

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

yes     no

If yes, please list the members and rate the work of the steering group in implementing FreD goes net for each of the pilot sites.

– Site 1: (Name of town)

*Jānis Olmanis, director of the Support Office, member of Valmiera City Council*

*Rita Ozarska, chief inspector of the State Police*

*Eva Sčre, director of regional support centre Dardedze in Valmiera*

*oīna Zavacka, Koceni Elementary school principal*

*Ilva Dunka, inspector of the State Police in work with juveniles*

If no steering group was created, why not?

*In Riga, members of the police education boards, and city council found plausible reasons not to come together or suggested to turn to lower level officers for communication, thus losing the main idea of the 'steering group'.*

**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?

*In the police these were inspectors who are responsible for the work with juveniles. Specialists were interested in the youth getting suitable support and developing their skills which reduce any socially unacceptable behaviour risks in the future.*

***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?

*1) Elementary schools, boarding-schools, evening school*

*2) Contact persons differed – in some schools these were principals, in other – social pedagogue or deputy principal.*

*3) The problems were recognized. Sometimes the lack of knowledge appeared how to solve them. Interested in finding different solutions.*

**Other settings, specifically:**

What divisions/ contact persons (function/position)?

Why was cooperation successful in these cases?

Children's homes (Riga). Contact persons – social educators.

Successful cooperation because active and concerned social educators, who kept a close watch on involvement and attendance of FreD course.

Children and youth centre (Riga). Contact person – social educator.

Successful cooperation because social educator is attentive, enthusiastic and interested into her/his work and adolescents that he/she is in charge of, and notices the current interests of the adolescents.

**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:

*Principles, which are taken into consideration, are described in this chapter.*

*Meanwhile, reading these tips brings to understanding how much is still to be improved and changed*

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

---

## 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:

*The material gives a concentrated view on the legislation and its using possibilities. At the same time, personal contacts and the interest from the other part are important.*

**School context:**

Current provisions facilitate access       obstruct access

reasons for this:

*Not submitted.*

**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

If yes: What were the differences?

*Administrative breaches are not always recorded. Sometimes they are not "seen".*

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

yes       no

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

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?

*Yes, it can be included.*

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

	<i>Typical situation of coming to the notice...</i>
of the police / judiciary system	Fights when intoxicated, ruffian behaviour when intoxicated on streets, apartments, clubs; caught on the street with an opened bottle; being on street after the legal time for adolescents (till 18 y.) being in inappropriate place (clubs, ect.) for underage breach of law under the influence of alcohol or drugs
of school	Parties, meetings with friends in the territory of school/dormitory Friends, classmates tell to their teachers Low grades, skipping the school, information from family, previous school
of another setting (please state which):	<i>In children' s home:</i> Don' t stay at home during the night Come home intoxicated aggression, anxiety which results into fights linked to intoxication or hangover come in to notice (kept a closer watch on) because of earlier violation of laws, being in narcologic or psychiatric register  <i>In children and youth centre:</i> noticed talking about drugs, obtaining and using them, comparing each other's experience

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	<p><i>Boarding – school:</i>                  An opportunity to store up „bonuses“, positive actions to improve their references/ characterization in police/ their case                  To get off the register of lawbreakers in police</p>
School	<p>The program in short and defined                  The social educator will not rest encouraging them until they go to the course                  To get better references/characterization in school, getting the certificate in the end                  New interesting information on the topic of their current interest</p>
Other setting (please state which):	<p><i>Children’ s home:</i>                  The program in short and defined                  There will a be a certificate in the end – collecting the “good jobs”, trying to become positively noticed (that also would add a chance to get adopted)                  There will be a possibility to get a T-shirt in the end’                  The social educator will not rest encouraging them until they go to the course</p> <p><i>Children and youth centre:</i>                  New interesting information on the topic of their current interest                  There is nothing interesting to do after school anyway, so why not spend it usefully                  The program in short and defined</p>

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).

*Boarding – school:*

*Friends gather in territory of school/dormitory and are caught by nurse/teacher -> youngsters involved in substance usage have negotiation with social educator -> sometimes involving parents, -> if rules violated repitedly – negotiation with headmaster of the school, could be also police, and recommendation to involve professionals outside the school (psychologist, narcologist, groups).*

*Also when involving parents encouragement to contact professionals outside the school (psychologist, narcologist, groups) is common, next is up to parents and the young person. Police – going on spot check in the town, the police catches a youngster under the influence of alcohol (he might be riding a scooter, behave loud; it might be a group of*

youngsters). The police fills the report, brings the youngster to an isolator. Afterwards, a meeting with the police inspector is appointed for the youngster. During the appointment, the police officer informs about the project, gives the booklet, and tells the available times for interviews. The person (if accepts participation) comes to the intake interview. If he corresponds with the profile of a project participant, the times are told when to come to the programme. If all the programme events are attended, the young person gets a certificate and gets off the register of the lawbreakers earlier or at once, depending on the breach of law.

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

yes  no

If yes:

– How and in what form were they involved?

*They were informed about the programme by police officers. Some parents brought their children to the intake interview.*

– Would you recommend parental involvement to new FreD sites?

yes  no

Reasons for this:

*YES, if it is possible, because it would be helpful for the change in drug abuse, and their attitude that also the whole family change the attitudes. It would be useful because many parents are blinded by many myths and informed not enough about the effects and consequences of drug abuse and undervalue the risks.*

*NO, because many young people take the participation in the course as a personal achievement (especially those living in the children's homes and boarding schools).*

**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?**

*Youth did not call themselves. Therefore another way of contacting them was needed. In cooperation with school and police specialists, the youth was sent to the leader of the programme at particular time and place. Access was gained by identifying the benefits for the potential participants.*

---

## 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?

*Suspicion of usage of alcohol/illegal substances did not confirm.  
The adolescent cannot be qualified as „ early use“, he/she is a systematical or even addicted user; other kind of help is needed (medical, psychological, psychiatric).  
The adolescent has anxiety disorders which result incapability to keep attention longer than 15 minutes.*

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

1 - 2 weeks

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

Name of site 1: Riga \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_6\_\_ courses with \_\_49\_\_ participants

Name of site 2: Vaižode \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_1\_\_ courses with \_\_9\_\_ participants

Name of site 3: Valmiera \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_8\_\_ courses with \_\_48\_\_ participants

**In case of strongly divergent numbers, can you think of reasons?**

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):

*5.4.1. 6b Reasons – effects - consequences*

*5.4.3. 11 Personal drug use – Diagram of drug use*

*5.4.2. 8b Keyboard model*

*Also*

*5.4.2. 8a Drugs as stimulants and props/aids, drug abuse, habituation, addiction*

*5.4.1. 5 Legal aspects – Statement cards*

*5.4.2. 5.4.3. 9b Blanket turning*

**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.

*5.4.3. 10 Personal protection and risk factors - "Check yourself" test*  
*5.4.4. 14 Other means of support*

*5.4.4. 15 Setting personal goals 1) An encounter with your future self*

*Also:*

*5.4.1. 4 Expectations and questions*

**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?

*Yes, the course noticeably enriched our offer of different intervention and addiction prevention courses. In Latvia there was no short term course specifically for early drug and alcohol abusers. And during the year it was proven that this type of course is needed due to the rise of marihuana and synthetic spice mixes with cannabinoids.*

**11. What are your experiences with respect to group composition?**

(gender, age, different substances consumed, different patterns of consumption etc)

*More profound work and better understanding of subject and exercises were possible with groups of young people aged 15-17 and 16-20, than 13-15 years old.*

*Adolescents from children' s homes are less motivated than from schools.*

*Adolescents from children' s homes are very specific auditorium, and course trainer has to be sensitive to topics that touches family and home issues. Also these young people have more psychological disturbances that affect the ability to reflect on the exercises and given information, therefore more careful selection of participants has to be held during intake interviews.*

*It seems that the group is more effective when the consumption patterns and substances used are similar, otherwise some participants may feel being either too „inexperienced“, or too „desperate case“.*

*Adolescents who poorly speak the course language, even though understanding is good, tend to drop off the course (eg. Russian in an Latvian group).*

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

*In some courses, especially with older participants, there was a feeling that in the end or third part of the course it would be useful to include a short (up to 30 min) documentary film on drugs and discussion about it. But we have to encounter that it brings extra time to the course (1-1,5 h hour).*

*There is a particular film in Latvian by one journalist (film „Dzīves derīguma termiņš“ by S.Semjonovs).*

## 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)

1

Reason:

*Used approach is appropriate for work with youth at risk. Main concept and the way of explanation used in programme was easy perceptible and understandable. The concept was easy to use in practice.*

**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

If yes: Please describe these differences.

*It is a noticeable difference for course to take place in Riga (capital city) or in small town as for example Vainode, as both young people and contact persons are more motivated for cooperation. Small town is a more closed environment mostly with limited resources, on contrary with large cities, where there are variety of possible help and education sources. Small towns are more open for new projects.*

*Also young people in Riga, big cities have more places to entertain themselves, but in small towns even a "correction course" seemed to be entertaining.*

*Also it was a lot more likely to gather a group of young abusers in a "closed area" like boarding-school than in regular secondary school.*

*In Valmiera, the police was very interested in the project. Before the beginning of the work, they called and showed their worries that the programme can be implemented without their participation. They were personally interested in reducing substances abuse. In the limits of a smaller town, it seems easier to change the situation. The police in Riga made excuses that it is not possible, it is not worth the efforts.*

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

***aspects that obstruct...***

- |                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| ... cooperation           | Part of the members of institutions were not motivated to cooperate and participate in the project. Part of schools regarded their participation in the project as a public recognition of their problems, which they did not accept.        |
| ... access                | A phone call from a young person to apply in the programme was not the right choice how to get youth to apply. Access was delayed also by several partners who were not interested to motivate the youth for participation in the programme. |
| ... course implementation | In Latvia, the support activities for drug using youth are poor developed and often not available. The lack of services appeared as difficulties while supporting an interested young person with suitable and available service.            |

***aspects that facilitate...***

- |                           |  |
|---------------------------|--|
| ... cooperation           | Maintaining the relations and recognition for the partner let the cooperation develop. Cooperation partners highly admitted the implementation of the project in many EU countries (it helped for the partners involvement in the project)   |
| ... access                | Contact persons (from school, police) had a great and crucial role in motivating youth for participation in the programme. Face to face contact during the intake interview was essential, as it reduced the stress and insecurity and encouraged to participate in the programme. |
| ... course implementation | The activities were suitable for the group of youth. The programme is developed so that it fits the needs and urgent topics of youth.  |