Training External Facilitators to Provide CCASA's "Who Do You Tell?"™ Child Sexual Abuse Education Program: An Evaluation

by

Leslie Tutty, Ph.D., RSW
Academic Research Coordinator, RESOLVE Alberta
Brenda Strafford Chair in the Prevention of Domestic Violence and
Professor, Faculty of Social Work

and

Choni Tenzin, BSc

Report Prepared for Calgary Communities Against Sexual Abuse

March 2009

Acknowledgements

Annemarie Tocher, formerly with the Calgary Communities Against Sexual Abuse, was instrumental in developing this research. Thanks so much for her time and contributions to the project.

The project received funding from CCASA funds and the Prairie*action* Foundation. Without this support, the current evaluation could not have been conducted.

Thanks also to RESOLVE Alberta former staff member Sarah Ann LeDrew for conducting the interviews. Current RESOLVE Research assistant, Choni Tenzin, assisted with the qualitative data analysis.

The research was conducted by RESOLVE Alberta, a family violence research institute based at the University of Calgary. RESOLVE Alberta is part of a tri-provincial research institute with the administrative office at RESOLVE Manitoba (at the University of Manitoba) and Saskatoon (the University of Saskatchewan). Dr. E. Jane Ursel from RESOLVE Manitoba is the Director the RESOLVE Network. The functioning of RESOLVE has been greatly assisted by receiving external funding from the Partnership Program of the National Crime Prevention Program of Justice Canada. Our greatest ongoing support, for which we are extremely grateful, is from the Prairie*action* Foundation. Their website is www.prairieactionfoundation.ca. The RESOLVE Alberta website is www.ucalgary.ca/resolve.

Most importantly, we would like to acknowledge the newly trained facilitators and the CCASA staff members who shared their knowledge and impressions in the interviews. Their input has been invaluable.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

The "Who Do You Tell?"™ child sexual abuse education program of the Calgary Communities Against Sexual Abuse has been offered for over two decades within the city of Calgary. Evaluations of the program (Tutty, 1997; 2004) have been positive, identifying that elementary school-aged children learn the concepts taught and retain this knowledge over at least several months (Tutty, 1997). Further, children interviewed in focus groups commented that the program information is relevant and important to them and recommend that it be available to other students (Tutty, 2004).

Despite its successes, the WDYT program, as with other school based education efforts, has experienced a number of implementation challenges. Beyond funding, which is an ever-present and ongoing problem for the small non-profit agencies that generally administer prevention efforts, the role of program facilitator can be repetitive and retaining staff a challenge. Moreover, offering and maintaining the program has its own unique challenges. The current waitlist for the program in Calgary is about four or five years. How, then, can the agency best address requests from other Alberta communities to provide WDYT to their students?

This research evaluates a pilot project of the Calgary Communities Against Sexual Abuse (CCASA) experimented with a new structure of service delivery for their sexual abuse prevention program, "Who Do You Tell". Historically, the program has been delivered by staff from CCASA. However, the agency was experiencing some problems with relying solely upon their own staff to deliver the program, in that the demands of the program were too great to meet on a continual basis.

As a possible solution to this problem, CCASA has partnered with agencies in several Alberta centres, training their staff to deliver the "Who Do You Tell" program. CCASA wished to assess the impact of this new change in service delivery, and approached RESOLVE Alberta to conduct the evaluation. This report documents a qualitative evaluation of that training based on in-depth interviews with 12 respondents: four CCASA staff and eight newly trained facilitators.

Summary of the Evaluation Findings and Recommendations

In general, both the CCASA program staff and the newly trained facilitators found the training and materials very helpful and subsequently felt prepared to deliver the Who Do You Tell program. In reality, only two of the facilitators interviewed had the opportunity to offer the program to students. These two individuals were pleased with both the manual and their training to deal with possible disclosures of abuse. Their presentations went well and their interactions with teachers and principals were positive.

Both the CCASA staff and the trainees made recommendations to improve the training. Interestingly, the same suggestions often came from both constituent groups: The CCASA staff had a good sense of how they might improve the training suggesting several strategies that were also validated by their "students."

Recommendation 1: That CCASA continue to offer training to Alberta community representative in agencies outside of Calgary. Overall, the training was viewed positively, with the remainder of the recommendations highlighting some minor suggested improvements.

Recommendation 2: Ask new facilitators to review the manual and the videos prior to the actual training. Both CCASA staff and the newly trained facilitators suggested that this would enhance the training since the recipients would be better prepared.

Recommendation 3: Provide two manuals in the training package. Although the agencies had copies of the manual, it was difficult for both trainers to preview the document. Since the program requires two facilitators, having two manuals only makes sense.

Recommendation 4: A lot more training time for role plays and scenarios. This point was mentioned by both the CCASA staff and the newly trained facilitators. From the perspectives of the staff members, if the trainees had had the opportunity to preview the manual, this would have allowed more time for doing role plays, and instructions on how to handle sensitive situations, including disclosures. The agency facilitators also noted the utility of the role-plays and would have liked more time to be spent on these,

Recommendation 5: Tailor the training to better fit the participants. The current trainees were from diverse agencies. In one instance, the agency was a sexual assault centre and the trainees were well aware of statistics with respect to child sexual abuse and assaults. These individuals would have preferred to spend more time on other aspects such as disclosures and role-plays.

Recommendation 6: Explore ways to make the program presentation more concrete. Several of the newly trained facilitators suggested that having a video of actual "WDYT?"™ presentations or offering the opportunity to shadow the CCASA staff as they provide the program would be useful additional options.

Recommendation 7: Add a training component with respect to community collaboration that suggests how to connect with schools to offer the program. Education is more than just a program: It entails developing trust between agency and school and considerable time up-front is often necessary to forge these relationships.

Recommendation 8: Determine ways to more adequately support new facilitators after the training. While continued contact after the training through emails and phone-calls was suggested, this did not ease the anxiety of some of the trainees. Perhaps a slightly more formal follow-up, scheduling a teleconference meeting three months or so after training, for example, would address some of the staff worries.

Recommendation 9: CCASA could continue to mentor the new facilitators after the staff training. CASSA staff members have a wealth of experience in key issues such as how to connect with schools to offer the program and how to continue the collaboration beyond the "WDYT?"™ program proper. Rather than the training being a "one-shot" enterprise, providing ongoing mentorship and dialogue would benefit all parties.

In summary, disseminating CCASA's "Who Do You Tell?"™ child sexual abuse education program seems viable using the comprehensive training model utilized in this pilot project. The two newly trained facilitators who, in fact, put their skills and knowledge to the test were pleased with the results. The other trained staff were hopeful that they would have similar opportunities in the near future.

Chapter One: Child Sexual Abuse and Education / Prevention Programs

This research evaluates a pilot project of the Calgary Communities Against Sexual Abuse (CCASA), in which CCASA used a new structure of service delivery for their sexual abuse education program, "Who Do You Tell?"™. Historically, the program has been delivered by staff from CCASA. However, the agency was experiencing some problems with relying solely upon their own staff to deliver the program, in that the demands of the program were too great to meet on a continual basis. Consequently, it was difficult for the agency to retain sufficient staff willing to deliver the program.

As a possible solution to this problem, CCASA partnered with agencies in several Alberta centres, training their staff to deliver the "Who Do You Tell?" ™ program. CCASA wished to assess the impact of this new change in service delivery, and approached RESOLVE Alberta to conduct the evaluation.

The current chapter provides background to the evaluation, describing the problem of child sexual abuse and the prevention programs developed over the decades to prevent its occurrence. The "Who Do You Tell?"™ program has been well evaluated over the years (Tutty, 1997; 2004). The details of these evaluations are also presented.

The Problem of Child Sexual Abuse

In a document prepared for Health Canada, Hay (1997) defines child sexual abuse as follows:

> Child sexual abuse occurs when an adult or youth uses a child for sexual purposes. Sexual abuse includes fondling, intercourse, incest, sodomy, exhibitionism, and commercial exploitation through prostitution or the production of pornographic materials. Child sexual abuse is a serious social problem that cuts across all income, racial, religious and ethnic groups, as well as rural, suburban and urban communities.

The extent of child sexual abuse in Canada first became highlighted in 1984 with the publication of the Report of the Committee of Sexual Offenses against Children and Youth (Badgley). This retrospective study suggested that many more Canadian children are sexually assaulted than was previously believed. By the time they are 15 years of age, 6 per cent of boys and 15 percent of girls have been the subject of a sexual assault which violates the criminal code of Canada.

In Calgary, several prevalence studies (Bagley, 1991, $N = 750$; Bagley & Young, 1990, $N = 620$) estimated that from one-fifth to one-third of Calgary women have been sexually abused at least once during childhood. In the recent Canadian National Incidence Study of Reported Child Abuse and Neglect (Trocmé et al., 2005), an estimated 217,219 child maltreatment cases were investigated in 2003. Only 23% of the sexual abuse investigations were substantiated (3,958 investigations), 16% remained suspected, and 61% were unsubstantiated. In the 2001 national study, of child sexual abuse victims, 69% were girls and 31% were boys.

Researchers have also detailed the effects of sexual abuse on children (Browne, & Finkelhor, 1986). Trocmé and colleagues (2005) reported that the most common child problems after sexual abuse are depression or anxiety (29%), age-inappropriate sexual behaviour (17%), behaviour problems (14%), negative peer involvement (13%) and irregular school attendance

(10%) at the time that the reports of child sexual abuse were substantiated. Similar short term negative consequences of childhood sexual abuse, have been documented by numerous researchers (Daignault, Vézina, & Hébert, 2002; Hébert, Parent, Tremblay & Daignault, 2002). Other short term effects of sexual abuse include physical trauma, venereal disease, night terrors, bedwetting, and low self-esteem (Dubé & Hébert, 1988). Finkelhor and Browne (1985) conceptualize the trauma as not only reflected in sexual distress, but in difficulties with trust, feelings of stigmatization and powerlessness.

Research has also shown that the effects of such victimization can be severe and long-reaching, even into adulthood (Bagley & Young, 1990; Westbury & Tutty, 1999). Long-term effects may include chronically poor mental health such as depression, anxiety and suicidal ideation (Bagley & Young, 1989; Briere & Runtz, 1986). Children with a physical or mental disability are especially vulnerable to sexual abuse (Hay, 1997).

The costs of violence against Canadian women are enormous, not only in personal costs to well-being, self-esteem and safety, but in monetary terms as well. In 1995, Greaves, Hankivsky and Kingston-Riechers, researchers from the London Ontario Centre for Research on Violence Against Women and Children, focusing on just three forms of violence (child sexual assault, sexual assault of women and woman abuse in intimate partnerships), estimated an annual cost of $4.2 billion Canadian dollars for the social services/education, criminal justice, labour/employment and health/medical service systems to address such abuse. Similarly, a US study of the costs of the rape and sexual abuse of children (Miller, Cohen & Wiersema, 1996) estimated 1.5 billion dollars in medical expenses and 23 billion dollars total annually.

Despite the high rates of child sexual abuse for both males and females, including very young children, there are low identification rates of abuse by adults. Furthermore, few children reveal abuse. In Ontario, 1993 provincial statistics indicated that of 12,000 investigations for sexual abuse, 29% were substantiated and another 27% suspected (Hay, 1997).

School-based Sexual Abuse Education / Prevention Programs

As long ago as the early 1980's, the Badgley Commission Report (1984) recommended that a national program of public education be developed in Canada focusing on the needs of young children and youth in relation to the prevention of sexual offenses (p. 193). Although a national program has not been forthcoming, during the past few years many communities have developed school-based sexual abuse prevention programs, mainly for presentation at the elementary school level.

School-based sexual abuse prevention and intervention programs began in the 1970s when public awareness about the extent of child sexual abuse became heightened (Tutty, Bradshaw, Thurston, Barlow, Marshall, Tunstall, et al., 2005). The programs were primarily developed and funded by community organizations (Kohl, 1993). The 1980s was a decade of intense development of school-based sexual abuse prevention programs and research into their effectiveness, a direct response to disclosures of past and present abuse to social service agencies and parents' concern for protecting their children from sexual abuse (Plummer, 1993). What we know about child sexual abuse prevention today is based on 30 years of experience and research (Tutty & Bradshaw, 2004).

Several reviews of the research literature on the effectiveness of school-based programs suggest that elementary school-aged children are able to learn and to remember at least half of the prevention concepts taught (Tutty, 1990; 1992; 1996; Wurtele, 1987; Wurtele & Miller-Perrin, 1992). However, given the nature of some of these concepts, it is questionable whether children, especially younger children, can integrate ideas that may not fit with their developmental level or which may differ from their family customs.

Research on Child Sexual Abuse Education / Prevention Programs

In the past decade, over 40 research articles on child-directed prevention programs have been published (for reviews see Daro, 1994; Reppucci & Haugaard, 1993; Tutty, 1990; 1993; 1996; Wurtele & Miller-Perrin, 1992; Wurtele, 1997). Of these, at least 16 focused on the more controversial programs for preschool and kindergarten-aged children, while another 16 assessed programs directed to elementary school-aged children.

The results of the research on prevention programs for elementary school-aged children have yielded consistent findings, although, as befits a new area of research, some of the early studies on the efficacy of such programs were exploratory in nature and did not utilize research designs that included large samples, control groups or the statistical analysis of total test scores. Twelve well-designed outcome studies of programs developed for elementary school-aged children that included control groups (Blumberg, Chadwick, Fogarty, Speth, & Chadwick, 1991; Conte, Rosen, Saperstein & Shermack, 1985; Dhooper & Schneider, 1995; Fryer, Kraiser & Miyoshi, 1987; Harvey, Forehand, Brown, & Holmes, 1988; Hazzard, Webb, Kleemeier, Angert, & Pohl, 1991; Oldfield, Hays & Megel, 1996; Saslawsky & Wurtele, 1986, Tutty, 1992; 1997; Wolfe, MacPherson, Blount, & Wolfe, 1986) all found statistically significant gains in knowledge and/or skills. Nevertheless, these improvements are typically an increase in only one or two prevention concepts. Notably though, a meta-analysis conducted by Rispens, Aleman and Goudena (1997) found significant effect sizes both at posttest ($\underline{d}$ = .71) and at follow-up ($\underline{d}$ = .62) across 16 evaluations, suggesting that the few items that children learn on average appear to have a powerful effect.

One of the greatest concerns about child-directed prevention programs, especially on the part of parents, has been whether children would experience negative side-effects such as fear or nightmares. While researchers have consistently found that only a small minority of children show negative reactions after participating in a child abuse prevention program (Nibert, Cooper & Ford, 1989; Tutty, 1990; Tutty, 1997; Wurtele & Miller-Perrin, 1987), these concerns persist (Finkelhor, 2003, personal communication).

In a U.S. national incidence phone survey of 2000 10-16 year-olds, Finkelhor, Asdigian and Dziuba-Leatherman (1995) reported that, across programs, the more comprehensive the material or the more programs attended, the higher the child scored on a short test of knowledge of prevention concepts. The authors note that, "This is the first study to suggest that, when children with prevention training do actually get victimized or threatened after their program exposure, they can behave to some extent in ways envisioned by prevention educators" (p. 150). Although this research was not program-specific, taken in conjunction with the previously reviewed research, the question of whether child-directed school-based programs result in children's learning, may be considered by some as receiving initial support.

Program Objectives

School-based sexual abuse prevention programs have become the mainstay of prevention efforts responding to the high rates of sexual abuse of children and the detrimental short- and long-term effects on children (Tutty, 1990). The goal of such programming is to reduce the incidence of child sexual abuse through arming children with the knowledge and skills to resist inappropriate touching or what to do if abuse has occurred. Recent revisions of some programs have expanded these objectives to include learning other personal safety knowledge and skills (e.g., stranger-danger).

Finkelhor and colleagues (1995) identified twelve elements considered necessary to be a *comprehensive* sexual abuse prevention program:

- Content about sexual abuse, bullies, good and bad touch, confusing touch, incest, screaming and yelling to attract attention, telling an adult, and abuse is never the child's fault;
- A chance to practice in class;
- Information to take home;
- A meeting for parents; and
- Repetition of material over more than a single day (p.143).

Across programs, the more comprehensive the material or the more programs attended, the higher the child scored on a short test of knowledge of prevention concepts.

Program Content

Developmental and age-appropriate materials are essential. Many sexual abuse programs begin their efforts in the early school years (Preschool and/or Kindergarten to Grade 3). Tutty (1995) identified a common set of core concepts that is included in most of these programs: labelling of body parts; 'good', 'bad' and 'confusing' touches; body ownership; permission to say 'No;' secrets about touching should not be kept; and to tell and keep telling until an adult believes them. Recommendations about core content that have emerged over time include stressing positive or negative feelings about a touch rather than that a touch is either good or bad, and using anatomically correct names for body parts such as a penis or breasts.

Not all concepts are easily learned. Tutty (2000) noted that, across studies, before participating in a prevention program, elementary school students had difficulty with items about four issues: saying no to authority figures, understanding the possibility that trusted adults might act in ways that are unpleasant, rules about breaking promises and keeping secrets and that children are not to blame if they are touched in ways that feel uncomfortable (Wurtele, 1997). Several studies have noted that children have difficulty understanding the concept of "strangers". The fact that these items were particularly trying for the youngest children to learn and that a number at follow-up forgot some suggests that these may be more sensitive to developmental or to family beliefs.

Age affects what knowledge and skills children learn (Tutty, 2000). For example, children in Grade 1 and higher are better able to grasp concepts about family members or known acquaintances touching inappropriately and about saying 'no' to being touched in ways that are uncomfortable – key prevention concepts. Though young children this age are vulnerable to abuse, they seem less able to grasp the varied and complex concepts and decision making

involved with identifying potentially abusive situations. Daro (1994) concluded, after reviewing the outcomes of 38 studies, the strongest beneficial effects of prevention programming are for children aged 7 to 12.

Some programs now include sexual abuse prevention information and training for children and youth from Kindergarten through to Grade 12. The content in the older grades is expanded to include learning about bullies, problem-solving skills, as well as a legal and rights based approach to sexual harassment and sexual assault. Some programs have high school students learn the concepts through preparing performances for presentation to the younger grades.

Presentation Methods

These programs generally target children in the general population and use group-based instruction (Daro, 1994; Tutty 1996). In a review of 19 sexual abuse programs, MacMillan and colleagues (1994) identified various modes of presentation of prevention materials that contained one or more of the following elements: verbal instructions; film or videotape; behavioural training; skits, mimes or role-plays; use puppets or dolls, and a theatre production produced by adults or older students. Most of the programs reviewed use multiple strategies over time. Those that provide a single presentation method (e.g., plays, assemblies, books, videotapes, games and comic books) usually suggest that their program needs to be combined with other longer programs to provide more opportunities for knowledge development and skill-building.

It is generally agreed that prevention education should include an experiential component. While children may learn concepts by passive observation, listening and discussion, skills are best learned through active participation. Behavioural skills training approaches are more effective than passive learning procedures (Wurtele, & Miller-Perrin, 1992). In contrast to cognitive approaches such as films, books, and pure instruction, skill training involves instruction, modelling appropriate behaviours by the instructor and other students, rehearsal, social reinforcement, shaping and feedback. While children's knowledge levels are similar whether instructors use active or passive teaching, their ability to apply personal safety skills to "what if" situations is significantly improved with behavioural skills training (Wurtele, et al., 1987).

Teacher Training

Most programs provide or encourage teacher training via video, manual, or in-service. Training usually includes background information about sexual abuse, teaching techniques used in the program and how to handle disclosures.

Parent Involvement

Researchers have examined parental knowledge of sexual abuse and their interest in receiving more education on the topic (Elrod & Rubin, 1993). The main source of knowledge about sexual abuse for parents was the media, but this resource left parents with some significant deficits. The parents surveyed lacked knowledge about the incidence and prevalence of child sexual abuse, and at what age children typically disclose abuse. Overwhelmingly, parents looked to the school as the ideal place to educate parents to speak about these difficult issues with their children.

Most prevention programs encourage parent involvement. They provide parents with background knowledge of sexual abuse and techniques to reinforce the knowledge and skills that the children learn at school. Videos, manuals, parent meetings, letters and homework assignments engage parents in the learning process with their children.

However, prevention programs routinely have difficulty attracting more than about 10% of children's parents to information and training sessions (Tutty, 2000). Tutty (1993) found that parents underestimated the knowledge of the older children, and overestimated what their youngest children (in Grades 1-3) knew of sexual abuse prevention concepts after having participated in a prevention program. However, higher levels of parental knowledge of sexual abuse issues were associated with increased accuracy in predicting the child's level of knowledge. This supports the importance of encouraging parents to attend the parent training programs.

Did They Work?

Reviews suggest at least initial support for child sexual abuse prevention programs with children learning a statistically significant number of concepts after participation (Tutty, 1996; Wurtele & Miller-Perrin, 1992). The increases are typically very small, on average only one or two concepts. A recent meta-analysis conducted by Rispens, Aleman and Goudena (1997) found significant effect sizes both at post-test ($\underline{d}$ = .71) and at follow-up ($\underline{d}$ = .62) across 16 evaluations, suggesting that the few items that children learn on average appear to have a powerful effect.

Educational programs may increase the conceptual awareness of school-age children about sexual abuse and teach children how to report actual or potential abuse (Daro, 1994). However, not all children learn from these programs nor is the learning all-inclusive (Daro, 1994). As noted by Tutty (2000), the few studies that compared children from different developmental stages consistently found statistically significant differences in knowledge, with younger children demonstrating lower levels of learning. In contrast, in a recent meta-analysis of 16 studies, Rispens et al. (1997) declared that, "children younger than 5.5 years benefit more than older children from the programs, although the difference tends to disappear during the follow-up interval ... it suggests that there should be more opportunity for repeated learning" (p. 983).

Tutty's review (1996) noted that five studies evaluating the effects of gender in learning sexual abuse prevention concepts found no significant differences in the average knowledge of boys and girls after seeing programs. Another two studies reported that girls learned and maintained more concepts. Finkelhor et al. (1995) found that girls reported more client satisfaction with the programs.

Another question is whether children remember the concepts over time. Tutty's 1996 review described nine studies that collected follow-up information on periods longer than 2 months. Overall, the children retained their knowledge of abuse prevention concepts for up to a year.

Whether the information is retained in the long-term, is generalizable, and whether informed children are truly capable of resisting abusive behaviour are difficult to demonstrate. Finkelhor and colleagues (1995) tackled these questions in a U.S. national telephone survey with 2000 children aged 10 to 16. Children who participated in comprehensive prevention programs performed significantly better on knowledge of child sexual abuse, were significantly more

likely to use self-protection strategies when threatened or victimized and reported abuse when it occurred compared to children with no sexual abuse prevention programming or those with a less comprehensive program. Furthermore, the children and caretakers were consistently positive about the programs, with 40% of the youngsters saying that it had helped. The authors noted that, "This is the first study to suggest that, when children with prevention training do actually get victimized or threatened after their program exposure, they can behave to some extent in ways envisioned by prevention educators" (p. 150).

In a study by Gibson and Leitenberg (2000), 825 college women were surveyed about their sexual experiences and whether they recalled having participated in a child sexual abuse prevention program when younger. Specifically, participants were asked if they remembered instruction in a 'good-touch, bad-touch' program during elementary or preschool. The participants were also asked whether they had experienced childhood or adolescent sexual abuse and whether their first experience of intercourse was consensual. Of the total, 507 women remembered participating in some form of sexual abuse prevention programming as children, most in elementary school. Eight percent of the women that had participated in a sexual abuse prevention program were subsequently abused at some point, whereas 16% of women who had not participated in any prevention programming were sexually abused before the age of sixteen. As such, women who had not had sexual abuse prevention programming were twice as likely to have been sexual abused as those who had participated. Although there were no differences in disclosure rates between those who had been in a program versus those that had not. Program participants tended to disclose abuse sooner. These results provide limited support for sexual abuse prevention programming.

Researchers have assessed two types of unintended consequences of sexual abuse prevention programs: negative reactions and disclosures. One of the greatest concerns about child-directed prevention programs, especially on the part of parents, has been whether children would experience negative side effects such as fear or nightmares. Research has consistently found that only a small minority of children show negative reactions after participating in a child abuse prevention program (Tutty, 1997; Wurtele, 2009; Wurtele & Miller-Perrin, 1992).

The Previous Evaluations of the "Who Do You Tell?"™ Program

The "Who Do You Tell?"™ Program was evaluated previously by Tutty (1997; 2000) using quantitative methodology. Knowledge levels of abuse prevention concepts were tested using the 33-item Children's Knowledge of Abuse Questionnaire - Revised (CKAQ-R), a standardized measure with established psychometric properties (Tutty, 1995). The scale was developed to test the major sexual abuse prevention concepts offered by the range of programs rather than being program specific. The revised scale consists of Inappropriate and Appropriate Touch subscales. The former includes concepts that represent the major focus of most abuse prevention programs: different kinds of touch and permission for children to tell if they are uncomfortable, to name a few.

A total of 231 children were randomly assigned (matched by age) to participate in the program (N = 117) or in a wait-list control condition (N = 114). An analysis of covariance showed that children who received the program increased their knowledge levels of both Inappropriate Touch ($p = .000$) and Appropriate Touch ($p = .012$) to a significantly greater degree than children in the control group. Age also significantly differentiated the knowledge levels regarding Inappropriate

Touch, with younger children knowing fewer concepts both at pre-test and post-test ($p = .000$). Parallel results apply to the Appropriate Touch subscale ($p = .04$).

With the proliferation of prevention programs and materials from numerous sources including books, videos and television, it was of interest to examine what children of different grade levels know of abuse prevention concepts *before* they participated in a program. The results suggest some commonality between what have been described as very difficult items in previous research (Oldfield *et al.,* 1996: Tutty, 1994) and items that children found difficult in the current research before program participation.

At pretest, children had the most difficulty with items from the Inappropriate Touch subscale, contrary to the research of Blumberg *et al.* (1991) who found high levels of understanding of Inappropriate Touch at pretest but more problems with concepts of Appropriate Touch. Children in the youngest developmental group scored less than 50% on a number of such items, confirming that these are appropriate targets for educational programs. Interestingly, however, older children had more difficulty with items on the Appropriate subscale. This may reflect an over-generalization of ideas about when touch is acceptable or when it is acceptable to talk to strangers, but has been a concern expressed by parents and teachers as a possible negative consequence of prevention programs. It is important to emphasize that after participating in the prevention program, children of neither developmental groups lost ground on items in the Appropriate Touch subscale.

Children across developmental levels who participated in the "Who Do You Tell?"™ program had significantly higher overall levels of knowledge of both Inappropriate and Appropriate Touch than children in the wait-list control condition at post-test. There were significant differences in these subscale scores in the youngest as compared to the oldest developmental group irrespective of condition, again suggesting the importance of understanding that younger children may interpret some of these ideas differently, or may have difficulty with some concepts (Tutty, 2000). However, contrary to the conclusions of the meta-analysis of Rispens *et al.,* (1997), the younger children did not learn more overall than the older children.

In comparison to children who had not yet been in the "Who Do You Tell?"™ program, participants learned more concepts about secrets, permission to tell and that it is permissible at times to say "no" to an adult. These are not inconsequential ideas and do reflect central themes for the majority of prevention programs. The Cramer phi coefficients of these items are in the mild to moderate range, suggesting their importance.

Although not across the board, there were significant differences between the developmental groups on a relatively large proportion of items (15 of 33 or 45.5%) that did not change more for children in the treatment as compared to the experimental condition. This suggests the strong impact of development and provides evidence that, with the extent to which the youngest children experience difficulty, programs should be targeted differently to younger as compared to the older elementary school-aged children. Given that three of the items that were more difficult for the youngest children were about strangers and another five were about saying no to authority figures, these topics should be given an expanded emphasis, especially since they have been noted as being difficult by other authors (Briggs, 1991; Wurtele, 1997).

Finally, a large number of items were not different at post-test based either on treatment condition or age. These included all nine items from the Appropriate Touch subscale, the only items on which younger children sometimes scored higher than older children although not to

statistically significant levels. Children from both developmental levels received high scores on all the items from the Appropriate Touch subscale except one, both before and after the program. This raises the possibility of ceiling effects in the pre/post comparison. However, given that this subscale was constructed to assess whether children who participated in a sexual abuse prevention program develop misconceptions about appropriate touch, the lack of an increase is not as important as would be a significant decrease on these items. This pattern did not occur, and provides further support for the efficacy of the program.

Children did not make gains on a number of difficult concepts, even after participating in the prevention program, suggesting that program developers should re-assess how such ideas are being taught. One might wonder why there was no change on items that are thought to reflect key prevention concepts such as the fact that even familiar adults might touch children's private parts, or assertiveness issues such as if you are feeling uncomfortable in a situation that you should protest. However, it is easy to under-estimate the complexity and the number of prevention concepts incorporated into most programs. Ultimately one or two concepts may be emphasized, especially when programs are relatively short and there is little repetition. The meta-analysis conducted by Rispens *et al.* (1997) concluded that the amount of instruction time and explicit training in self-protection skills are more effective. The "Who Do You Tell?"™ program may be improved by increasing both of these components.

One limitation to the research is the fact that children in the control condition also improved on some items. This may have been caused by a testing effect, such that the pretest sensitized children to the post-test, although this did not occur in past research using the same measure (Tutty, 1995). Another explanation is that, after providing permission for their child to be involved in both the program and the research, parents might have talked to them about sexual abuse prevention. Additionally, the small percentage of parents who attended the parent information night (20%) might also have discussed some of the program content with their child. Parents often express anxiety about how their children may interpret some of the more uncomfortable concepts such as the fact that even a care-giver might touch a child in inappropriate ways. Finally, the siblings of children in the wait-list control condition may have participated in "Who Do You Tell?"™ and mentioned the program content at home.

Parent Perspectives

Of the 126 parents who completed the Parent Questionnaire, only 27 (21.4%) had attended the parent evening that described the "Who Do You Tell?"™ program. The majority of the parents (82 or 65%) noted that they felt good about the program, although 48 (38%) liked the idea but were somewhat worried about their child's reaction. Four parents (3.2%) noted that they had strong reservations but allowed their child to participate. Fewer than half of the parents (58 or 46%) had talked to their child about the possibility of sexual abuse by a familiar person (68 or 54%), while somewhat more had discussed the possibility of sexual abuse by a stranger (72 or 57%). Most parents had talked with their children about not going with strangers (123 or 97.6%), or not going with other grown-ups without parental permission (113 or 89.7%). Ten parents (4.2%) had provided their children materials about sexual abuse in the form of books or videos.

When asked about any changes that they had noted in their child's behaviour after the "Who Do You Tell?"™ program, few mentioned any, with the exception that from a quarter to half of the children talked to their parents either about the program or about being careful with strangers. Extreme negative reactions such as nightmares or crying more easily were rare, with only four

children becoming worried and one child saying no more often to parental requests. Eleven children brought up sexual topics, but it is unclear whether these were requests for information, a positive reaction, or sexual innuendo or discomfort, a negative reaction. A small proportion of parents noted identifiable positive reactions to the program such as increased confidence or standing up to bullies.

Focus Groups with "WDYT?"™ Participants

While previous evaluations provided strong support that the children learned the core material provided by the "WDYT?"™ program, the quantitative methodology gave little flexibility for the children to comment on what aspects of the program were working well and what could be improved. In a subsequent evaluation (Tutty, 2004), focus groups were conducted in two elementary schools in Calgary: one in the North East, and one in the Northwest. In all, ten focus groups were held with numbers of students ranging from 6 to 12. Groups were conducted with all grades, from kindergarten through Grade 6. In total, 116 students participated: 51 boys and 65 girls.

The focus group interviews included questions about what they learned from the "Who Do You Tell?"™ Program, what the students liked and did not like about the program, and whether they had participated in other similar prevention programs. The focus groups varied in length, but typically lasted about ten to twenty minutes. The discussions were audio-taped and verbatim transcripts were prepared. The analysis of the interview transcripts employed established qualitative methods (Coleman & Unrau, 1996).

Unquestionably, the children recalled the "Who Do You Tell?"™ program and the core sexual abuse prevention concepts. When asked what they had learned several of the groups spontaneously began singing the program song. Children in the younger grades were quite up-front about listing the key prevention concepts. Older students were more reserved and embarrassed when recalling some of the sexual content of the program, as is appropriate for their developmental stage. Nevertheless, they contributed their ideas openly and sincerely.

In the previous quantitative evaluation of "Who Do You Tell?"™ (Tutty, 2000), the participants learned concepts about secrets, body ownership, permission to tell and that if they were abused it would not be their fault as compared to children who had not yet been in the program. These ideas reflect the central themes for the majority of prevention programs.

In response to the focus groups' open-ended question about what they learned, students similarly mentioned information about appropriate touches, private parts, strategies used by perpetrators (such as secrets and bribes) and that they could tell another if touched inappropriately. While not identical, these responses are similar to the previous correct responses to the standardized questionnaire. Since answering open-ended questions is more difficult than responding to true-false items, the focus group results support the idea that children learn the key abuse prevention concepts after participating in the program.

Similar to other research on elementary school-aged children, very few of the students mentioned that they had received prior information about sexual abuse. Notably, several students whose parents were social workers, nurses and police officers mentioned prior exposure to books or programs. For the majority, these ideas were new. These findings validate the continued provision of the program from the perspective that children are not typically receiving information from their parents about safeguarding themselves with respect to sexual abuse.

Across grades, the students enjoyed most aspects of the programs including the staff, pictures, videos, role plays and submitting questions anonymously. The song received mixed

reviews. Younger children enjoyed it: some students in Division II were very vocal about disliking it yet, notably, remembered the words and the tune. From the perspective of bad advertising being as powerful as good advertising, the song is certainly making an impression. Program staff could consider engaging students in creating a new song that fits their developmental level better: perhaps based on a more contemporary song or a rap.

Some students across all grade levels admitted feeling uncomfortable in response to some aspects of the program, most notably the skits or videos that portrayed children being touched inappropriately. Some described feeling better in response to knowing that there was something the child could do to either protect (say no) or support themselves (tell a trusted adult). Others put their discomfort into the perspective of believing that, even if some aspects of the program were uncomfortable or embarrassing, they needed the information.

While most research, including the previous evaluation of "WDYT?"™ (Tutty, 1997), documents few negative after-effects of sexual abuse programs on the majority of children, if the programs created no anxiety, especially in the short-term, little learning might result. One of the most surprising concepts for the students was that someone they knew, even a family member, might touch them inappropriately. Clearly, most had never considered this possibility and some had mentally reviewed their relationships with other adults and relations. None seemed worried about their current risk.

When asked whether they would recommend the "WDYT?"™ program for other children, most said yes, although several of the older students mentioned they thought it more appropriate for younger students. The students made several suggestions for changes to the program in addition to the previously mentioned opinions about the song.

Girls in two focus groups from one school (Grade 4 and Grade 6) suggested presenting the program in separate gender groups, especially for the Division II students. They noted that it was embarrassing to hear the sexual content when boys were present, and noted that they did not ask or respond to staff members at time because of this dynamic. While a potentially useful suggestion, it would be complicated to implement. As an external program, "Who Do You Tell?"™ already creates significant disruption on a school's daily routines. Splitting into separate gender groups would entail either using more staff (and perhaps taking two classrooms at a time) or interrupting one classroom twice (once to take the boys and once the girls).

The suggestion from one student to have teachers present the program has been debated for many years. One advantage of externally offered programs is that the program is presented by professionals that know the material well and are comfortable with the topic. The program can be presented more uniformly; even trained teachers may emphasize "stranger-danger" rather than focusing on the more common abuse by caretakers or relatives. Staff from external programs can comfortably discuss the violence education concepts with children, thus relieving teachers of some of the responsibility to handle disclosures and potentially embarrassing material. Teachers are often reluctant to take a major role in violence prevention programs, feeling that such duties are beyond the scope of their jobs.

The student's point about feeling more comfortable with teachers in discussing such sensitive material is well-taken, although other students might feel less comfortable with teachers they know well. Nevertheless, in Calgary the external program model for sexual abuse prevention is widely endorsed.

In summary, students in the focus groups provided strong positive feedback about the "Who Do You Tell?"™ program. They learned the key abuse prevention concepts, enjoyed most aspects of the programs despite feeling embarrassed about some of the sexual content and mildly anxious on learning that someone they know, rather than a stranger, might attempt to touch them inappropriately. Importantly, the students stated that the information is critical and they recommend the program for children at other schools.

Summary

Continuing to investigate the efficacy of various child sexual abuse prevention programs and the manner in which they are offered is important. Although a beginning body of evidence that supports prevention programs as useful is developing, the opportunity to improve existing programs and to learn more about how to teach young children this culturally sensitive material is valuable. Each new program should be assessed on core questions, different modalities of offering the programs should be compared, and we must ensure that children do not react with fear or anxiety to the material. Finally, care should be taken that children do not misinterpret positive touches as inappropriate.

Chapter Two: Research Methods and Results

The evaluation of CCASA's pilot project was accomplished by conducting semi-structured interviews with both agency staff and CCASA staff who had been involved in the new service delivery format. Two separate semi-structured interview schedules were developed for the newly trained facilitators (see Appendix One) and CCASA staff (see Appendix Two).

The interviews were approximately 30 minutes long and were audio-taped. The interviews were all conducted by Sarah Anne LeDrew by telephone. This research was reviewed and approved by the University of Calgary Conjoint Ethics Review Committee. Consent forms and written notes will be filed in the locked offices of the principal investigator (RESOLVE Alberta office) at the University of Calgary and will be destroyed five years after completion of the research project, as required by the Faculty of Social Work.

The analysis of the qualitative interviews followed accepted practices of social work qualitative research methods including identifying prominent themes and sub-themes (Tutty, Rothery & Grinnell, 1996).

Overall, it was anticipated that the information from the evaluation will increase understanding of how sexual abuse prevention programs can effectively be delivered to school children. If the evaluation finds this new structure of service of delivery to be effective, it may help to address problems related to staff retention, critical to effective programming.

Evaluation Results

In all, 12 interviews were conducted for the current study: eight with new facilitators in Medicine Hat and Grande Prairie and four with CCASA staff. In addition, three suggested respondents were not reachable, one individual declined to participate, and one other person left their position during the middle of the study. The responses from the CCASA staff members are first presented; then the perceptions of the newly trained facilitators. The CCASA staff provide some important background in terms of the rationale for utilizing agency staff to offer the "WDYT?"™ Program.

The Perceptions of the CCASA Trainers

The trainers were first asked about their roles with the "Who Do You Tell?"™ Program and/or CCASA. Two of the respondents were team leaders focusing on the clinical and the outreach programs for CCASA. Respondents who had been part of the "Who Do You Tell?"™ program for a long time were also responsible for training others in delivering the program. Several of the four respondents were also responsible for program planning and outreach presentations. Two respondents had been involved with the program for almost six years and the other two for about two years.

The staff members were asked to articulate their understanding of the rationale for CCASA partnering with other agency professional staff to deliver the "Who Do You Tell?"™ Program and what they think of this initiative. All four agreed that major rationale for partnering with other agency professional staff in delivering the program was to reach as many schools and children as possible. Currently, with only two staff funded to deliver the program, only a fraction of the schools in the city are being reached and the waitlist was

years long. The participants suggested that, with other trained professionals, this program could be delivered to additional schools. The following quotes highlight this point clearly.

> *There's a really long waitlist for the program to be delivered to the schools in Calgary. It's about a 4 year waitlist, maybe a bit longer. Because we only have funding for two people to go out and do the program at a time, and those two people go out together, the waitlist just doesn't get any shorter. We know that there are many schools missing out, many kids missing out on the program. So we wanted to partner with other agencies so that we could get this program that we believe so strongly in out to more kids and the only way we can do that is to market it and have other people deliver the program as well.*

> *The "Who Do You Tell?"™ program has such a long waiting list and we can only do so many schools a year because there's only two funded "Who Do You Tell?"™ positions, so we can only do so many schools a year because we can only do one school at a time. Also so we can reach a larger area within Alberta to all of the communities that don't have the program. So if we train other staff to deliver it then obviously more kids can be reached.*

All four respondents commented that partnering with other agency staff in delivering the program was a very good idea. They had witnessed the effectiveness of the program on children and their families when they were delivering it. Therefore, if there were more trained professionals, more children and families would be able to benefit from the program. As several commented:

> *"Who Do You Tell?"™ offers so much to children and their families in terms of information and empowerment that the more children and families can get that information, the better.*

> *It's excellent because we know we have got something good and I think it's an excellent thing to do to share a good thing with other people.*

One of the trainers remarked on the need to follow-up on the program and repeat the messages because some of the children might not remember all of the messages and forget over a period of time.

The CCASA trainers were asked how the training prepares the new facilitators to deliver the "Who Do You Tell?"™ Program to children, parents and teachers, the three main audiences. With respect to the children, the trainers clarified that the two-day training program focused mainly on providing some basic understanding of child sexual abuse including the dynamics, statistics on incidence and prevalence and the different kinds of abuse; principles and philosophy of the "Who Do You Tell?"™ program.

A key aspect was how to respond to disclosures. The training aimed at providing the program facilitators with a strong understanding of components of child sexual abuse to develop a strong foundational knowledge with which to deliver the program. This comment from one of the CCASA staff sums up how the training prepared the new facilitators to deliver the program to children:

> *In the training we went over the philosophy of the "Who Do You Tell?"™ program, child sexual abuse information, responding to disclosures and lots of scenarios on how to receive disclosures. It was really extensive training.*

With respect to dealing with parents, the CCASA staff discussed what the main messages to parents should be. They videotaped a mock parent night, which helped in visualizing what an actual parent night would look like, and the kinds of questions that parents might pose to the facilitators about the program. One trainer commented that the main rationale for the parent night was to make the parents realize that "they had to be the primary teachers of their children for sexual abuse, but in order to do that, they needed tools."

Finally, with respect to teachers, one rationale for delivering the program to the teachers and parents was that the program could not be delivered to the children without letting the administration and the parents know about it. Therefore, the presentation to the teachers included the importance of having the school administration's support for the program. Basic information on child sexual abuse is also provided to the teachers and administration staff in case such disclosures occur.

Since disclosures are such an important potential issue, the trainers were asked how the workshop prepares the new facilitators to handle disclosures of sexual abuse from children. The CCASA trainers clarified that the new facilitators were educated about the different forms of disclosures from children. They are provided a handout with sample questions that they might ask a child who discloses sexual abuse, some sample responses to the answers and different ways of approaching the issue. They were also trained in helping the child feel comfortable and how to open up conversations. The training also consisted of large group discussion on issues such as some legal ramifications of reporting, and what to do once they hear about that, how to call a parent after a disclosure.

The trainers were asked what they considered the most helpful aspect of the workshops. According to the respondents, this was the role-plays. The following comments capture this point:

> *The role-plays -- actually going through situations that might arise with disclosures, or during the program, or with parents or teacher and being able to put it into real examples was the most helpful.*

> *I remember really going over the role plays and how to handle disclosures. That was really helpful. As well, I got the sense that people were anxious about that and going through it lessened their anxiety and nervousness about having to do that.*

Another helpful aspect of the training was the information on child sexual abuse. One respondent considered this was a very helpful aspect because:

> *If you've got the knowledge and that understanding, even if you haven't learned every logistical situation and how to answer every question, you have the basics to fall back on. That's really important in helping people with the program.*

The trainers also considered the in-person training in addition to the manual practical, so that the trainees could hear firsthand about how the program works and ask questions. One of their comments was as follows:

> *The most helpful aspect of the training was to have a conversation about the values and the philosophy that underpin the program. It's really helpful to have a dialogue around it and for people to be able to ask questions, to really think through some of that stuff.*

The trainers were asked whether any information or processes could be added to improve the training. One trainer suggested that the training could have been improved if there were more visuals in the training manual/package. According to her:

> *I really found a need for more visuals. We had some brief discussions around integrating pictures, quotes from children in the program, as well as video of the program to really give them a more concrete taste of what they're dealing with to make it more experiential.*

Two trainers suggested that the training would have been considerably more productive if the new facilitators had been asked to review the manual and the videos prior to the actual training. If they had, it would have been easier to follow the training because they would know more about what was actually happening. One trainer suggested:

> *Stressing the importance of having a look through the manual, at least a skim through, prior to training. Lots of times we referred to the manual but they didn't really know what we were talking about because they hadn't looked at it yet.*

Another addition to the program could be having the trainers do a demonstration of the classroom presentations.

The trainers were also asked what changes, if any, they would recommend for the training. All four respondents agreed that there should have been more time for role plays, and more information on situations that could arise from disclosures. One trainer also suggested that it could be more beneficial if the training could be tailored to individual facilitators by recognizing their backgrounds and training. This could also be time-saving as certain parts of the training could be skipped if the trainees already knew about it.

A final aspect of the materials was asking the trainers how the manual was received. The main concern that everyone had about the manual was that each agency had only one copy for the entire office, which prevented the new facilitators from having an opportunity to review the manual prior to the actual training. The trainers found that the trainees were asking them many questions, the answers for which, could be easily found in the manual. Therefore, the biggest barrier was the scarcity of copies of the manual.

The CCASA staff trainers were asked to comment on their experiences with the new facilitators in training them to deliver this program to children. None of the four CCASA trainers had seen the new facilitators since the training, therefore, they could not comment about their experiences. Also, as none of them had done any follow-up, they could not say much about any problems or what had worked well, although, one trainer did mention an issue was that only two educators had actually delivered the program post-training.

A further question to the trainers asked them to anticipate the benefits / challenges for the new facilitators in delivering this program to children (considering the impact on the new facilitators, CCASA and children in schools).

One of the major benefits that the trainers anticipated for the new facilitators was their understanding of sexual abuse issues and the increase in their comfort level in talking about this sensitive topic. The training intends to remove the facilitator's awkwardness in talking about and dealing with any disclosure of child sexual abuse. The following quotes highlight additional benefits identified by the various respondents:

I think it will strengthen their skill base; give them more professional experience in this area.

In general, people who deliver the Who Do You Tell program strongly say that they gained a great deal of insight into the issue. It really builds your skills working with children; presentation skills as well as one-on-one skills with children. The impact on CCASA is just that we know that more children are receiving this information, more communities are being talked to about the issue. That's always a good thing.

All four respondents raised concerns about the fact that, when the new facilitators begin offering the program, they have no support from an individual who has already delivered the program at least a few times. Ideally, there should be at least one person who has delivered the program once, in the event that unforeseen situations arise. Several of the trainers mentioned their own experiences as novice program deliverers and how they had had to rely on more experienced facilitators who knew more about the program:

One of the challenges will be not having the opportunity to go out and deliver it with someone who's had the opportunity to do that before.

The challenges definitely could be that they're kind of out there on their own. We are not with them when they are actually delivering the program so, we're not accessible to them when they have questions.

One challenge that I could anticipate would be consistency with their program and the way it is being delivered. Also, the fact that every community is different will likely present a different challenge in the way the information is received or perceived.

The trainers were also asked to comment on the support needs of new facilitators including in what areas they might need support (children's, parents, or teachers program delivery/ or system issues (police/child welfare). One of the greatest support needs of new facilitators according to the trainers was the availability of someone who could answer questions concerning the different kinds of disclosures. One of the respondents commented on how most of the disclosures were very grey and not clear, "*you think they are going to be black and white, but a lot of them are very very grey and it's helpful to have somebody to talk to about how you proceed from there."* Again, the need for an experienced facilitator to learn from cropped up. Also, the question arose as to whether the training facilitators could provide information and contact addresses for some of the authorities such as the Calgary School Board.

Phone and e-mails were mentioned as the means of communication that most of the respondents had used. Several trainers suggested that CCASA staff could offer support to the new facilitators by observing the new facilitators deliver the program the first couple of times so, that they could answer questions if any unforeseen issues are raised. Also after observing the program delivery, the CCASA staff members could provide feedback to the new facilitators. Another helpful support would be to have the CCASA staff to go to the locations where the program is going to be delivered to have a better idea of the environment and to inform the new facilitators what to expect.

The Views of the Newly Trained Facilitators

The new facilitators consisted of eight staff members from various agencies including one sexual assault educator, one mental health educator, one person each from the women's shelter and Safety Alliance and three staff members from PACE, the sexual assault centre in Grande Prairie. All of the respondents had received the training for the "Who Do You Tell?"[TM] Program between December 2007 and February 2008.

The interviewees were asked about their understanding of the rationale for CCASA partnering with outside agencies to deliver the "Who Do You Tell?"[TM] Program Everyone agreed that the main rationale for CCASA partnering with other agencies was to avail the benefits of the "Who Do You Tell?"[TM] program to as many schools and children as possible so that more children could be empowered and gain knowledge about sexual abuse. As one individual also commented:

> *This could also publicize what CCASA is about and what effect we can have on our communities and the future of our children-- even adults who have been abused.*

Another respondent mentioned that one positive rationale behind this initiative could be to build community capacity, including the opportunity for CCASA to raise funds by selling this program to the various agencies.

Every new facilitator agreed that the initiative was a good idea as is apparent in the following comments:

> *It's really good, very much needed because there is such a lack of information and such a stigma. Nobody wants to talk about it. If they talk about it, then they'll have to admit that it's a problem, right? I think it's great that they involve the teachers, and the parents, and students all collaboratively.*

> *It's a great initiative. Children everywhere need to know that sexual abuse and physical abuse is never their fault and it's really important for them to have people identified that they can go and talk to.*

> *I believe in it 100% because I am a sexual abuse survivor. If something like this was around when I was a kid, it would have saved a lot of money and counselling.*

> *It's a great idea. Lots of times the rural areas don't get an opportunity to participate in good programs or, if they are, it's just kind of piecemeal.*

The respondents were asked their impressions of how effective the two-day training was in preparing them for delivering the "Who Do You Tell?"[TM] Program to children, to parents and to teachers.

With respect to training the children, the majority of the trainees commented that the training that they received was very helpful, informative and provided them with all of the tools they needed in order to deliver the program effectively. They stated that the training was very well-organized and easy to follow. They also considered the trainers (CCASA staff) very helpful and knowledgeable about the topic and noted they were able to clearly answer questions posed to them. They also appreciate the role-playing because it was a chance to look at what an actual disclosure could look like and how to respond. One of the trainees commented:

Understanding where the abusers' minds are at and being trained to be able to really help the child or children understand that it is not their fault and what they can do about it, and just be able to keep telling and keep telling. The training was very well planned and organized, and the women who trained us were very sensitive, very understanding, very open and very matter of fact.

With respect to dealing with teachers and parents**,** few facilitators thought that the manual and the training prepared them well enough or explained how to approach teachers or parents and how to respond to their potential questions. On a positive note, because the pilot had been offered and proper consent had been received from the concerned authorities, it was easier for them to go out to schools and deliver the program without having to answer to board level administrators such as the Catholic Board of Education.

However, several new facilitators considered the training repetitive for them because they already knew half of the material taught during the training. One person stated that the information was repetitive and he/she already knew about it as they worked in this field. Another respondent rather bluntly stated that:

The training wasn't effective at all. They gave us some ideas but didn't really show is how they did it. That's really beneficial for us to see how they do it, and what works for them.

The trainees were also asked what was most helpful about the workshop. From their perspectives, the most helpful aspect of the training was the role playing, as it provided the opportunity to experience being in that position and discuss how to handle disclosures. The video was also deemed valuable since watching the trainers deliver the program provided a clearer idea of what to expect when they went out on their own. The background information on sexual abuse was also regarded as being informative and helpful. As one individual commented:

I would say how they handled disclosures because they handled disclosures way differently than we do. I think there are different mandates for each one of us. But hearing their side of how they handle disclosures was pretty beneficial. It gave us some insight to something we should change a little bit or pairing up with some of our agencies here to find out exactly how they would like us to handle disclosures.

Parallel to what the trainers were asked, the trainees were also asked whether there was anything more that the training could have covered. The respondents suggested a stronger emphasis on the actual facilitating and delivering of the program. One person also suggested that a follow-up could provide them with an opportunity to discuss and talk about issues that came up while delivering the program.

The trainees were also asked how well the training prepared them (or their staff) to handle disclosures of sexual abuse from children. Several respondents were confident that they already had all that they needed to handle disclosures even without the training because they did it on a daily basis. However, several others believed that the training greatly assisted them in preparing for disclosures, especially the various role-plays and being informed about the types of questions they could ask the child to encourage them to reveal more details.

One individual was concerned about the way that disclosures are handled in Calgary as being different from their experience:

The way Calgary handles disclosures is not standard. We have to have a different kind of system. So as for the information, like the background or handling disclosures, it was good. But the actual process and questions we ask and the relationships with related agencies, was not for our area. Information wise, yeah; procedure-wise, no.

Another respondent commented that the fact that they handle disclosures differently from the way that the training suggested, made them rethink their approach. In a way, this was helpful because it meant that they had more tools.

Another important question was what changes, if any, the respondents would recommend for the training. Everyone commented that the training was very well-organized and provided good information. They agreed that the trainers were very knowledgeable and approachable.

However, they also made several recommendations. Videotaping an actual presentation of the program, adding a formal follow-up opportunity, and making sure that the trainees had access to and had previewed the training manual and videos before the actual training were suggested. One participant commented the training should have been tailored to specific agencies in order to save valuable time spent on educating and not providing information that the participants already knew.

With respect to the manual, everyone mentioned that the document was a valuable tool, with great content and a format that was very easy to follow. Several mentioned that it was very well organized and a good reference. One facilitator noted that the manual could be generalized and that it was very easy to personalize it to the needs of the community.

However, almost everyone suggested minor edits and additions to the manual. One individual recommended organizing the format of the manual so that programs instructions for grades 1 to 4 are separated from grades 5 to 6. This would decrease confusion because in the current manual all of the instructions are together. Another respondent suggested that the amount of background information on sexual abuse could be decreased, if the presentation is being made in agencies that deal already with these issues. Another recommendation was regarding the DVD:

The DVD has all the letterheads. The formatting was really hard to switch. So finding a computer program that everybody can download to add in their own letterhead.

Only two of the new facilitators had delivered the program to children in schools at the time of the research interviews. Both reported that the delivery went smoothly and that it was very easy. They found the manual a great tool to go through looking for scripts. In addition to the manual, the training and the videos assisted these facilitators greatly in actually delivering the program. One mentioned that the teachers and the school principal of were very helpful and non intrusive. They were present but only to maintain discipline.

When asked about the benefits and challenges to their agency in delivering this program, several benefits included the awareness provided to teachers, parents and the children about sexual abuse, the opportunity of partnering with people from different agencies, the fact that the program is ready to be delivered with no additional need for a pilot and, because the program had been proven to work, there were few problems going in to the schools and conducting the program, which gave their agencies more credibility. Another

participant mentioned that it gave their agency the reassurance of knowing that the teachers would be talking about sexual abuse to the students openly after the program. Several comments regarding other benefits to the agencies follow:

> *The benefits are that we're already going into the schools to offer other programming, so we have foot in the door.*
>
> *We had three disclosures out of that classroom and just to know that they trusted us so quickly. They didn't end up being serious disclosures, it was just the point that they felt comfortable enough to come and let it off their chest. It's really rewarding to know that we made a difference in those kids' lives; to know that someday they might see us in the community and either have more to say or just thank you.*

As for challenges, the most significant was that staff members from different agencies had to pair up because so few people were trained to deliver the program, which requires two facilitators. This proved inconvenient and it was very difficult to coordinate schedules between individuals from different agencies. Another challenge was access to some schools, since sexual abuse it such a sensitive topic.

One respondent who had been abused as a child mentioned that the government should be more supportive of these kinds of initiatives because, in her opinion, early education and intervention would prove to be considerably more helpful and cost effective (expenditure on counselling etc.) for victims. Another respondent suggested that it would be helpful to ensure that enough well-educated professionals are available to handle disclosures, especially in the event of a surge of disclosures. Another significant concern was that because very few agencies in Medicine Hat could partner, and because they were not working together, providing the "Who Do You Tell?"™ program remained a challenge.

The new facilitators were also asked what they consider the benefits and/or/ challenges for CCASA staff in partnering with their agency in delivering this program. From their perspective, one of the greatest benefits for CCASA is the resources from marketing the program, and the advertising for CCASA as a resource center for information on child sexual abuse. Another benefit was that having trained staff from other agencies delivering the program would save CCASA staff from traveling from Calgary to Medicine Hat. The underlying benefit for the CCASA staff would be that they would know that this message is being spread to a bigger audience and that they have the moral as well as the professional support.

Several challenges for CCASA that were mentioned by the new facilitators were the distance (the fact that they are in Calgary and that the new facilitators were in Medicine Hat), and how CCASA staff are overloaded with the responsibilities of not only providing training but also delivering the program. One individual was concerned about whether the program was really going to be implemented:

> *I'm not sure where we're at right now. I won't know any of that until Friday of whether we're going to be using it… There had been confusion among communication between people in our agency so we need to clarify that.*

With respect to other aspects of the programs, none of the new facilitators had delivered the program to parents at the time of the interview. Only one of the new facilitators had delivered the program to teachers and this individual had only connected with one

teacher. The experience had been positive and the teacher very appreciative of the information provided to her. The teacher had even mentioned that she felt more confident about being able to handle a disclosure if there was one and to recognize any signs of sexual abuse in her students. This new facilitator, however, mentioned that she would have preferred to have had more time to talk to more teachers.

An important question for the experienced facilitators was whether they had had to deal with any disclosures of abuse. Neither of the new facilitators had abuse disclosures, although several students had asked to speak to them privately. Subsequently, it turned out that they simply had a few questions not real disclosures. The facilitators commented that the "almost" disclosures went very well. One respondent felt honoured knowing that the children who came up to him/her trusted her/him enough to share the concerns.

Everyone who went through the training felt very confident about dealing with abuse disclosures. Several of the new facilitators commented that they dealt with disclosures at a daily basis, therefore, it was not something new to them. Nevertheless, they added that the training and the program reinforced what they did in a more methodical way.

With respect to follow-up support from CCASA, none of the facilitators had asked for any kind of follow-up support from "WDYT?"™ staff at the time of the interview. Several responses for ways that CCASA staff might offer support are presented below:

> *We are having difficulties getting into schools, approaching them (CCASA) to say "do you have any other ideas?" Is there anything that can be done and maybe writing letters of support may help us get into schools.*

> *Having some formalized follow up meeting for it.*

In summary, all of the respondents were optimistic about the outcome of the training and all considered "Who Do You Tell?"™ to be a great program, one that would have a huge positive impact on children, parents and teachers alike. One trainee commented that the trainers from CCASA were particular very knowledgeable, approachable and that they did a great job of training them.

> *I believe that this program is going to be very successful as long as it falls in the right hands; people who are passionate about it being successful and working with a new organization in Medicine Hat… It might take a year or two to take it off the ground but once it is established it'll be a really great program. It's going to make a big difference for future generation.*

Chapter Three: Discussion and Recommendations

The "Who Do You Tell?"™ child sexual abuse education program of the Calgary Communities Against Sexual Abuse has been offered for over two decades within the city of Calgary. Evaluations of the program (Tutty, 1997; 2004) have been positive, identifying that elementary school-aged children learn the concepts taught and retain this knowledge over at least several months (Tutty, 1997). Further, children interviewed in focus groups commented that the program information is relevant and important to them (Tutty, 2004) and recommend that it be available to other students.

Despite its successes, the "WDYT?"™ program, as with other school based education/prevention efforts, has experienced a number of implementation challenges. Beyond funding, which is an ever-present and ongoing problem for the small non-profit agencies that generally administer prevention efforts, the role of program facilitator can be repetitive and retaining staff a challenge. Moreover, offering and maintaining the program has its own unique challenges. The current waitlist for the program in Calgary is about four or five years. How, then, can the agency best address requests from other Alberta communities to provide "WDYT?"™ to their students?

The first step was pulling together the materials into a manual, including a video that had previously been prepared. Then last year, for the first time, CCASA staff trained facilitators from agencies in Medicine Hat and Grande Prairie to deliver the "WDYT?"™ program. This report documents a qualitative evaluation of that training based on in-depth interviews with 12 respondents: four CCASA staff and eight newly trained facilitators.

This chapter summarize the results and presents several recommendations for the agency to consider with respect to the training.

Summary of the Evaluation Findings and Recommendations

In general, both the CCASA program staff and the newly trained facilitators found the training and materials very helpful and subsequently felt prepared to deliver the "Who Do You Tell?"™ program. In reality, only two of the facilitators interviewed had the opportunity to offer the program to students. These two individuals were pleased with both the manual and their training to deal with possible disclosures of abuse. Their presentations went well and their interactions with teachers and principals were also positive.

Both the CCASA staff and the trainees made recommendations to improve the training. Interestingly, the same suggestions often came from both constituent groups: The CCASA staff had a good sense of how they might improve the training suggesting several strategies that were also validated by their "students."

Recommendation 1: That CCASA continue to offer training to Alberta community representative in agencies outside of Calgary. Overall, the training was viewed positively, with the remainder of the recommendations highlighting some minor suggested improvements.

Recommendation 2: Ask new facilitators to review the manual and the videos prior to the actual training. Both CCASA staff and the newly trained facilitators suggested that this would enhance the training since the recipients would be better prepared.

Recommendation 3: Provide two manuals in the training package. Although the agencies had copies of the manual, it was difficult for both trainers to preview the document. Since the program requires two facilitators, having two manuals only makes sense.

Recommendation 4: Allot more training time for role plays and scenarios. This point was mentioned by both the CCASA staff and the newly trained facilitators. From the perspectives of the staff members, if the trainees had had the opportunity to preview the manual, this would have allowed more time for doing role plays, and instructions on how to handle sensitive situations, including disclosures. The agency facilitators also noted the utility of the role-plays and would have liked more time to be spent on these,

Recommendation 5: Tailor the training to better fit the participants. The trainees were from diverse agencies. In one instance, the agency was a sexual assault centre and the trainees were well aware of statistics with respect to child sexual abuse and assault. These individuals would have preferred to spend more time on other aspects such as disclosures and role-plays.

Recommendation 6: Explore ways to make the program presentation more concrete. Several of the newly trained facilitators suggested that having a video of actual "WDYT?"™ presentations or offering the opportunity to shadow the CCASA staff as they provide the program would be useful additional options.

Recommendation 7: Add a training component with respect to community collaboration that suggests how to connect with schools to offer the program. Prevention is more than just a program: It entails trust between agency and school and considerable time up-front to forge these relationships.

Recommendation 8: Determine ways to more adequately support new facilitators after the training. While continued contact after the training through emails and phone-calls was suggested, this did not ease the anxiety of some of the trainees. Perhaps a slightly more formal follow-up, scheduling a teleconference meeting three months or so after training for example, would address some of the staff worries.

Recommendation 9: CCASA could continue to mentor the agencies after the staff training. CASSA staff members have a wealth of experience in key issues such as how to connect with schools to offer the program and how to continue the collaboration beyond the "WDYT?"™ program proper. Rather than the training being a "one-shot" enterprise, providing ongoing mentorship and dialogue would benefit all parties.

In summary, disseminating CCASA's "Who Do You Tell?"™ child sexual abuse prevention program seems viable using the comprehensive training model utilized in this pilot project. The two newly trained facilitators who, in fact, put their skills and knowledge to the test were pleased with the results. The other trained staff were hopeful that they would have similar opportunities in the near future.

.

References

Badgley, R., Chairman. (1984). *Sexual offenses against children. Volume 1: Report of the Committee on Sexual Offenses against Children and Youth*. Ottawa, Canada: Ministry of Supply and Services.

Bagley, C. (1991). The prevalence and mental health sequels of child sexual abuse in a community sample of women aged 18 to 27. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 10*(1), 103-116.

Bagley, C. & Young, L. (1990). Depression, self-esteem, and suicidal behavior as sequels of sexual abuse in childhood: Research and theory. In M. Rothery & G. Cameron (eds.) *Child maltreatment: Expanded conceptions of helping*. Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Blumberg, E., Chadwick, M., Fogarty, L., Speth, T., & Chadwick, D. (1991). The touch discrimination component of sexual abuse prevention training: Unanticipated positive consequences. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 6*(1), 12-28.

Briere, J. & Runtz, M. (1986). Suicidal thoughts and behaviors in former sexual abuse victims. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 18*(4), 413-423.

Briggs, F. (1991). Child protection programs: Can they protect young children? *Early Child Development and Care, 67*(1), 61-72.

Briggs, F., & Hawkins, R. (1994). Follow-up data on the effectiveness of New Zealand's national school based child protection program. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 18*, 635-643.

Browne, A., & Finkelhor, D. (1986). Impact of child sexual abuse: A review of the literature. *Psychological Bulletin, 99*, 66-77.

Coleman, H., & Unrau, Y. (1996). Analysing your data. In L. Tutty, M. Rothery, & R. Grinnell, Jr. (Eds.), *Qualitative research for social workers: Phases, steps, & tasks* (pp. 88-119). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Conte, J., Rosen, C., Saperstein, L., & Shermack, R. (1985). An evaluation of a program to prevent the sexual victimization of young children. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 9*, 319-328.

Daignault, I., Vézina, J., & Hébert, M. (August, 2002). *The academic performance of sexually abused girls: A preliminary evaluation of potential predictive factors*. Victimization of Children and Youth Conference, Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

Daro, D. (1994). Prevention of child sexual abuse. *The Future of Children: Sexual Abuse of Children, 4*(2), 198-223.

Dhooper, S., & Schneider, P. (1995). Evaluation of a school-based child abuse prevention program. *Research on Social Work Practice, 5*(1), 36-46.

Dubé, R. & Hébert, M. (1988). Sexual abuse of children under 12 years of age: A review of 511 cases. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 12*, 321-330.

Elrod, J.M. & Rubin, R.H. (1993). Parental involvement in sexual abuse prevention education. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 17*, 527-538.

Finkelhor, D., & Browne, A. (1985). The traumatic impact of child sexual abuse: A conceptualization. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 55*(4), 530-541.

Finkelhor, D., Asdigian, N., & Dziuba-Leatherman, J. (1995). Victimization prevention programs: A national survey of children's exposure and reaction. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 19*(2), 129-139.

Fryer, G., Kerns Kraiser, S., & Miyoshi, T. (1987). Measuring actual reduction of risk to child abuse: A new approach. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 11*, 173-179.

Gibson, L. E., & Leitenberg, H. (2000). Child sexual abuse prevention programs: Do they decrease the occurrence of child sexual abuse? *Child Abuse & Neglect, 24*(9), 1115-1125.

Greaves, L., Hankivsky, O. & Kingston-Riechers, J. (1995) *Selected estimates of the costs of violence against women.* London, ON: Centre for Research on Violence against Women and Children.

Harvey, P., Forehand, R., Brown, C., & Holmes, T. (1988). The prevention of sexual abuse: Examination of the effectiveness of a program with kindergarten-age children. *Behavior Therapy, 19*, 429-435.

Hay, T. (1997). *Child sexual abuse - Overview paper*. Ottawa, ON: National Clearinghouse of Family Violence. Available on-line at http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/hppb/familyviolence/nfntsnegl_e.html

Hazzard, A., Webb, C., Kleemeier, C., Angert, L., & Pohl, J. (1991). Child sexual abuse prevention: Evaluation and one-year follow-up. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 15*, 123-138.

Hébert, M., Parent, N., Tremblay, C. & Daignault, I. V. (August, 2002). *Patterns of behavioral difficulties following disclosures of child sexual abuse.* Victimization of Children and Youth Conference, Portsmouth, New Hampshire.

Kohl, J. (1993). School-based child sexual abuse prevention programs. *Journal of Family Violence, 8* (2), 137-150.

MacMillan, H.L., MacMillan, J.H., Offord, D.R., & MacMillan, A. (1994). Primary prevention of child sexual abuse: A critical review. Part II. *Journal of Child Psychiatry and Psychology, 35*(5), 857-876.

Miller, T. R., Cohen, M.A., & Wiersema, B. (1996). *Victim costs and consequences: A new look*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice.

Nibert, D., Cooper, S., & Ford, J. (1989). Parent's observations of the effect of a sexual abuse prevention program on preschool children. *Child Welfare, 67*(5), 539-547.

Oldfield, D., Hays, B., & Megel, M.E. (1996). Evaluation of the effectiveness of Project Trust: An elementary school-based victimization prevention strategy. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 20*(9), 821-832.

Plummer, C.A. (1993). Prevention is appropriate, prevention is successful. In R. Gelles, & D. Loseke (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence* (pp. 288-305). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Reppucci, N., & Haugaard, J. (1993). Problems with child sexual abuse prevention programs. In R. Gelles & D. Loseke (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence* (pp. 306-322). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Rispens, J., Aleman, A., & Goudena, P. P. (1997). Prevention of child sexual abuse victimization: A meta-analysis of school programs. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 21*(10), 975-987.

Saslawsky, D., & Wurtele, S. (1986). Educating children about sexual abuse: Implications for paediatric intervention and possible prevention. *Journal of Paediatric Psychology, 11*(2), 235-245.

Trocmé, N., Fallon, B., MacLaurin, B., Daciuk, J., Felstiner, C., Barter, K., … & Black, T., (2005). *Canadian Incidence Study of Reported Child Abuse and Neglect – 2003: Major Findings*. Minister of Public Works and Government Services Canada, 2005.Available on-line at http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/hppb/familyviolence/nfntsnegl_e.html

Tutty, L. (2004). Children's impressions of the "Who Do You Tell" Child Sexual Abuse prevention program. Final report to Calgary Communities Against Sexual Abuse.

Tutty, L. (2000). What children learn from sexual abuse prevention programs: Difficult concepts and developmental issues. *Research on Social Work Practice, 10*(3), 275-300.

Tutty, L. (1997). Child sexual abuse prevention programs: Evaluating "Who Do You Tell". *Child Abuse & Neglect, 21*(9), 869-881.

Tutty, L. (1996). Prevention education: An integrative review of the research. In C. Bagley & W. Thurston with L. Tutty (Eds.). *Understanding and prevention of child sexual abuse*. Volume I.

Tutty, L. (1995). The Children's Knowledge of Abuse Questionnaire-Revised: The development of a measure of children's understanding of sexual abuse prevention concepts. *Social Work Research, 19*(2), 112-120.

Tutty, L. (1994). Developmental issues in young children's learning of sexual abuse prevention concepts. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 18*(2), 179-192.

Tutty, L. (1993). Are child sexual abuse prevention programs effective? A review of the research. *Revue Sexologique/Sexological Review, 1*(2), 93-114.

Tutty, L. (1992). The ability of elementary school aged children to learn child sexual abuse prevention concepts. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 16*(3), 369-384.

Tutty, L. (1990). Preventing child sexual abuse: A review of current research and theory. In M. Rothery, & G. Cameron (Eds.), *Child maltreatment: Expanded conceptions of helping* (pp. 259-275). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Tutty, L., & Bradshaw, C. (2004). School-based violence prevention programs: How well do they work? In C. Ateah & J. Mirwalt (Eds.), *Within our reach: Policies, programs and practices to prevent abuse across the lifespan* (pp. 47-60). Halifax, NS: Fernwood and RESOLVE

Tutty, L., & Bradshaw, C., Thurston, W.E., Barlow, A., Marshall, P., Tunstall, L., Dewar, M.E., Toy-Pries, D., Thomlinson, D., Este, D., meadows, L., Josephson, W., Dobko, S., Proulx, J., Perrault, S., McDonald, M., &. Nixon, K. (2005). School based violence prevention programs: A resource manual to prevent violence against girls and young women. Calgary: AB: RESOLVE Alberta. Online at www.ucalgary.ca/resolve/violenceprevention/

Tutty, L., Rothery, M. & R. Grinnell, Jr. (Eds.) (1996), *Qualitative research for social workers: Phases, steps, & tasks*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Westbury, E., & Tutty, L. (1999). The efficacy of group treatment for survivors of childhood abuse. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 23*(1), 31-44.

Wolfe, D., MacPherson, T., Blount, R., Wolfe, V. (1986). Evaluation of a brief intervention for educating school children in awareness of physical and sexual abuse. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 10*, 85-92.

Wurtele, S. (2009). Preventing sexual abuse of children in the twenty-first century: Preparing for challenges and opportunities. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse, 18*(1), 1-18.

Wurtele, S. (1997). Child sexual abuse prevention programs: Panacea or part of the solution? In R.T. Ammerman, & M. Hersen (Eds.). Handbook of prevention and treatment with children and adolescents: Intervention in the real world context. New York: Wiley.

Wurtele, S. (1987). School-based sexual abuse prevention programs: A review. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 11*, 483-495.

Wurtele, S., & Miller-Perrin, C. (1987). An evaluation of side effects associated with participation in a child sexual abuse prevention program. *Journal of School Health, 57*(6), 228-231.

Wurtele, S. K., & Miller-Perrin, C. L. (1992). Preventing child sexual abuse: Sharing the responsibility. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Appendix One: Interview Guide for CCASA Staff Members

1. What is your role with the Who Do You Tell Program and/or CCASA?
2. How long have you been involved with the Who Do You Tell Program?
3. What is the rationale for CCASA partnering with other agency professional staff to deliver the Who Do You Tell Program? What do you think of this initiative?
4. Regarding the Training:
   - How did the training prepare the new facilitators to deliver the Who Do You Tell Program to children? To parents? To teachers?
   - How did the training prepare the new facilitators to handle disclosures of sexual abuse from children?
   - What was the most helpful aspect of the training?
   - Could any information be added to improve the training?
   - What changes, if any, would you recommend be made to the training?
   - How was the manual received?
5. Regarding follow-up with the new professional facilitators**:**
   - Please comment on your experiences with new facilitators to deliver this program to **children**? Were you aware of any problems? What worked well? Were there any problems?
   - What do you anticipate will be the benefits / challenges for the new facilitators in delivering this program to **children,** (considering the impact on the new facilitators, CCASA and children in schools)?
   - Please comment on the support needs of new facilitators. In what areas did they ask for support (children's, parents, or teachers program delivery/ or system issues (police/child welfare)/ or anything else)?
   - What means of communication did you use to support new facilitators? (phone, email)
   - Do you have any suggestions for how else CCASA staff may offer support to new facilitators?
6. Do you have any other comments?

Appendix Two: Interview Schedule for New Agency Facilitators

1. How long have you been involved with the Who Do You Tell Program?

2. What do you understand is the rationale for CCASA partnering with outside agencies to deliver the Who Do You Tell Program? What do you think of this initiative?

3. WDYT Training: Please comment on the "Who Do You Tell" Facilitator Training Program:
   - How effective was the 2 day training in preparing you (or your staff) for delivering the Who Do You Tell Program to children? To parents? To teachers?
   - What was most helpful about the training?
   - Was there anything more that the training could have covered?
   - How well did the training prepare you (or your staff) for handling disclosures of sexual abuse from children?
   - What changes, if any, would you recommend for the training?
   - How did you find the manual? Do you have any recommendations for the manual? (content, format, other)

4. Re Program Delivery to Children:
   - How did it go? What worked well, what might have gone better?
   - What do you consider the benefits/ challenges to your agency in delivering this program?
   - What do you consider the benefits/ challenges for CCASA staff in partnering with your agency in delivering this program?

5. Re Parent Nights: What have been your experiences delivering the program to parents. How did it go? What worked well, what might have gone better?

6. Re Teacher Training: What have been your experiences delivering the program to teachers. How did it go? What worked well, what might have worked better?

7. Did you have to deal with any disclosures of abuse? If yes, how did this go? If not, how confident are you that you can deal well with a disclosure?

8. Did you ask for any follow-up support from WDYT Staff? If yes, was the support helpful? What other ways might CCASA staff support you?

9. Do you have any other comments?