

FCSS

Positive child and youth development



1. The issue

Over the past 20 years there has been a growing interest in child and youth developmental outcomes; that is, the particular outcomes achieved during childhood and adolescence that are believed to be instrumental to success, health, and happiness in adulthood. A comprehensive discussion of the literature on child and adolescent development is beyond the scope of this discussion. In brief, there is general consensus about the primary pathways of development and the critical factors and conditions that foster or inhibit the achievement of important outcomes, abilities, and personal characteristics at different stages of life, although there are distinctions among the models.

Advances in prevention science have bolstered interest in developmental outcomes. Technological and other improvements in brain research over the last decade have confirmed many early speculations and have led to new insights about the relationships between exposure to risk and protective factors and physical brain development from the prenatal period to early adulthood, and between physical brain development and developmental outcomes over the entire life course. New studies documenting and explaining how this works are legion. Summary information is available from the Harvard Center on the Developing Child, <http://developingchild.harvard.edu>.

However, many children and youth do not achieve the desired developmental outcomes at the appropriate stage of life or, in some cases, at all. For example:

- As measured by the Early Development Instrument (EDI), in 2011 one in four Calgary children was not “ready to learn” in grade 1 on at least one of five dimensions.¹ School readiness is associated with reading proficiency in grade 3,^{2,3} and a low level of reading proficiency in grade 3 is associated with a much higher risk of high school dropout.⁴
- In Canada in 2010, 35 per cent of girls and 27 per cent of boys in grade 6 and 44 per cent of girls and 28 per cent of boys in grade 10 reported high levels of emotional problems, such as depression, sadness, anxiety and sleeping problems.⁵
- In Canada in 2010, 27 per cent of girls and 30 per cent of boys in grade 6 and 45 per cent of girls and 48 per cent of boys in grade 10, reported high levels of behavioural problems, such as cutting classes, getting into fights, talking back to teachers and making other people do what they want.⁵
- In 2011, there were an estimated 2,300 children in care in Calgary,⁶ more than half of whom were Aboriginal.⁷ Although some children are taken into care because their parents are unable to look after them as a result of illness or incarceration, maltreatment is the most common reason for child welfare intervention.⁸ Youth who have been in care have poorer life outcomes than those in the general population, including lower rates of high school completion and higher rates of homelessness,⁹ incarceration, unemployment and reliance on social assistance.¹
- Among students who attended public schools in Calgary, only 72 per cent of students completed high school in 2011 with a diploma, GED, or certificate of achievement in three years; 77 per cent in five years.¹⁰ Failure to complete high school is associated with lower earnings and employment levels and is the second-best predictor of incarceration (with the best predictor having been in jail previously); higher education increases labour force participation and earnings, and is associated with multiple measures of good health.¹¹

FEBRUARY 2020

Introduction to FCSS research brief

This research brief is one of a series provided for FCSS-funded organizations and others in the field of preventive social services focused on enhancing social inclusion. It provides research-based information/statistics on the issue, risk and protective factors, and guidance on programming, but is not intended to serve as a comprehensive program development toolkit.

The 2020 version of the Positive child and youth development research brief is organized into the same three sections as the 2014 version:

1. The issue
2. Risk factors
3. What works

Each section begins with the context from the 2014 version and is followed by a 2020 update. The 2020 updates provide more recent statistics and curated lists of resources/links readers can access for more detailed information on each topic.

In partnership with



Acknowledgement: The content in the original text sections was written for FCSS by Merrill Cooper, Guyn Cooper Research Associates Ltd. and was first published in 2014.

Suggested citation: Calgary Neighbourhoods. 2020. Positive child and youth development. (Calgary, AB: Family & Community Support Services, The City of Calgary).

Positive child and youth development

FIGURE 1: POSITIVE CHILD AND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT OUTCOMES

Developmental domain	Desired outcomes in middle childhood (ages 6-11) for successful transition to adolescence	Desired outcomes in adolescence (ages 12-18) for successful transition to early adulthood	Desired outcomes in early adulthood (ages 19-24) for successful transition to adulthood	Desired outcomes in adulthood (≥ age 25)
Cognitive development	Succeeds at school, engaged and motivated to succeed in school, understands cause and effect; masters language and literacy skills and physical communication skills.	High school completion, commitment to learning, and informed forward-looking strategy; critical thinking skills and use of logic, ability to solve abstract and concrete problems.	Basic and higher order skills, knowledge, habits, values and support systems needed to: • Enter and succeed at post-secondary studies and/or secure employment with opportunities for advancement.	• Economic self-sufficiency. • Healthy social relationships.
Social competence	Makes friends, helps and respects others, copes with challenges, accepts consequences for behaviour.	Clear values, positive inter-personal relationships, pro-social attitudes.	• Participate in community and civic life as voters, volunteers, advocates, decision makers and leaders.	• Healthy family relationships and good parenting skills. • Community involvement and contribution and good citizenship.
Emotional wellbeing	Distinguishes right from wrong and acts accordingly, sense of self-worth and belonging, sense of control over fate.	Positive sense of identity based on self-esteem; sense of self-efficacy, sense of purpose; sense of optimism about the future and sense of belonging, self-regulation and restraint, high levels of moral reasoning.	• Maintain a balanced personal life and be in and/or create strong families and communities.	
Physical wellbeing	Optimal health and growth, no significant illness or injuries.	Good physical health, avoidance of risky lifestyle behaviours, no early/unplanned pregnancies parenting.		

2020 update

City of Calgary Community Profiles, available at calgary.ca/communities, provide demographic, economic and housing information for each community and comparison data for Calgary as a whole. The statistics below provide updated information on children and youth, in particular.

- Among students who attended public schools in Calgary, 76.4 per cent of students completed high school in 2016 with a diploma, GED or certificate of achievement in three years; and 83.6 per cent completed in five years.¹² The three-year high school completion rate overall in Alberta in 2015-16 was 77.9 per cent, and five-year rate was 83.2 per cent.¹³
- In 2016, the rate of developmental vulnerability in one or more of the Early Childhood Development (EDI) domains among children in Calgary was 28.2 per cent. Of Calgary children, 14 per cent were vulnerable in two or more domains, compared to 12.4 per cent of children across Canada.¹⁴ These domains include physical health and wellbeing, social competence,

emotional maturity, language and cognitive development, as well as communications skills and general knowledge.

- In 2019, according to the Survey on Early Learning and Child Care Arrangements,¹⁵ 50.6 per cent of parents of children up to age five had used daycare, pre-school or a childcare centre arrangement during the previous three months, while 31.9 per cent were cared for by a relative other than a parent. Comparative figures overall for Canada were 51.9 per cent for daycare, preschool, etc. and 25.6 per cent by a relative.
- The City of Calgary Community Profiles show that in Calgary in 2015, 13 per cent of the population under 18 years of age lived in low income (using the Low Income Measure).¹⁶
- In 2014, in Canada, 9.3 per cent of 15 to 17 year-old youth reported having been bullied online during the previous five years, and about one in five youth aged 15 to 20 experienced cyberstalking, cyberbullying or both.¹⁷

- According to the World Health Organization (WHO), in 2015 the teen suicide rate in Canada was the fifth highest in the world.¹⁸
- In Canada, suicide is the second leading cause of death for children and youth aged 10 to 19 years.¹⁹
- Results from a 2012 national survey (Canadian Community Health Survey – Mental Health) found that seven per cent of youth aged 14 to 24 had experienced depression over the previous year, while six per cent of respondents had suicidal thoughts during the past 12 months.²⁰
- In 2017/18 in Alberta the incarceration rate per 10,000 young persons was 4.32, compared to 5.61 in 2014/15. In 2017/18 the probation rate was 32.85 per 10,000, compared to 43.87 in 2014/15.²¹
- In 2017/18, out of 16,664 youth admissions to correctional services in Canada, 7,194 identified as Aboriginal²² (numbers not available for Alberta).

2. Risk factors

Key risk factors for poor developmental outcomes

Research shows that the key factors that place a child at risk of poor health and developmental outcomes include:

- Family low income
- Living in a lone-parent family
- Having parents with low levels of education
- Having parents who abuse drugs or alcohol and/or have mental health problems
- Teenage pregnancy
- Negative parenting practices, among others

The more risk factors that a child experiences, the greater the likelihood that he or she will experience problems such as:

- Behavioural and conduct disorders
- Hyperactivity
- Poor school performance

- Emotional problems
- Aggression and delinquency

Such childhood problems are individually and collectively associated with negative outcomes in adolescence, including criminal involvement, poor academic achievement and decreased likelihood of completing school, and young parenthood. These adolescent outcomes are correlated with:

- Employment problems
- Poverty
- Ongoing criminal involvement
- Homelessness
- Health problems including addictions
- Perpetuation of the poor conditions and parenting practices that the young people experienced in childhood

2020 update

Recent publications addressing risk factors for developmental outcomes include:

- [Raising Canada report](#)²³
- [Advancing Early Childhood Development: from Science to Scale](#)²⁴
- [Poverty, Stress, and Brain Development: New Directions for Prevention and Intervention](#)²⁵
- [Stress and adolescent wellbeing: the need for an interdisciplinary framework](#)²⁶

3. What works to prevent problems and improve developmental outcomes

The most effective ways to prevent poor developmental outcomes are to increase the income levels of poor families and to improve parenting practices and family functioning in fragile families. These issues and ways to address them are discussed in detail in *Research Brief 2, Positive parenting and family functioning*.

This brief examines preventive interventions that focus exclusively or primarily on the child. Many of the problems children and adolescents face undermine their positive development and result in negative outcomes throughout their life course. Prevention programs that are carefully designed and implemented have been shown to be effective.

A review of reviews completed by six leading researchers in child and youth programming in 2003 identified nine characteristics of programs for children and youth that have been demonstrated to be effective in preventing the onset or intensity of problems in adolescence.²⁷ These principles do not appear to have been revised by the authors or other researchers over the past decade and, in fact, this review has been cited in 523 subsequent publications.

The nine characteristics of effective prevention programming for children and youth²⁷

1. Programs are theory-driven, meaning that they have a theoretical justification, are based on accurate information, and are supported by empirical research.
2. Programs are comprehensive, meaning that they (i) use multiple strategies to increase both knowledge and skills to address the salient precursors or mediators of the target problem, and (ii) engage the systems required to prevent the problem (e.g. school, family, community, peer group).
3. Programs use varied teaching methods that include active, skill-based learning through interactive instruction and active, hands-on experiences to learn the required skills (e.g., resistance skills, social skills, language skills).
4. A sufficient “dose” (quantity and duration) of programming is provided, with the general rule that, the greater the needs or challenges faced by participants, the greater the dosage of the program or

intervention. Effective interventions may include some type of follow-up or booster sessions.

5. Programs are appropriately timed, meaning that they are initiated early enough to have an impact on the development of the problem behaviour and align with the developmental needs of the participants.
6. Programs provide exposure to adults and peers in ways that promote strong relationships and support positive outcomes.
7. Programs are socio-culturally relevant, meaning that they are tailored to the cultural needs of the participants and make efforts to include the target group in program planning and implementation.
8. Programs track and measure outcomes, which requires clear goals and objectives and the measurement of results relative to goals.
9. Programs employ well-trained staff who can properly implement and deliver the program.

3.1 Early childhood education and programming

A full discussion of early childhood education and programming is beyond the scope of this paper and funding for such programs is not within the legal mandate of FCSS. However, the merits of such programming must be noted within a broader investigation of the best ways to prevent an array of problems in childhood and adolescence and beyond and to promote positive child and youth development.

The key objective of early childhood programs is to foster social and cognitive development, and most programs focus on at-risk children. Recent advances in research on brain development during the first five years of life and, especially, from birth to age three,²⁸ have further sharpened interest in early childhood programming, particularly programs that focus on “school readiness.” This is because there is considerable evidence that early childhood education (ECE) programs can improve both cognitive development and social and emotional skills.²⁹ For some high-quality, very intensive programs, greatly improve long-term academic and life outcomes. Evidence-based programs include well-known programs such as the Perry Preschool Project, which dramatically improved outcomes over participants’ life course up to age 40 (e.g. high school dropout, teen and unplanned pregnancy), educational attainment, employment, income, drug use, and criminal involvement.^{30,31} These outcomes stemmed not from changes in IQ, but from changes in social and emotional development and

behaviours. For boys, behavioural changes at ages three and four explained up to 74 per cent of the treatment effect. For girls, lifetime outcomes stemmed from a combination of developmental improvements in childhood.³² In Canada, few evidence-based early childhood programs exist, but evaluation of the Promoting Alternative Thinking Patterns (PATHS) Preschool — although it has not been evaluated over many years like the Perry Preschool — reported higher social and emotional skills among participants relative to the control group.³³

The research has yet to sort out the ideal combination of program elements to maximize effectiveness.²⁹ However, at a high level, it is reasonably clear that effective early childhood programs feature two critical components: (i) effective curriculum supported by effective early childhood educators;³⁴ and (ii) a positive classroom environment that increases children’s extrinsic motivation to learn.³⁴ There is strong evidence that children who attend low-quality programs are no better off than those who do not attend any program.³⁵

The optimal “dose” (intensity and duration) of early childhood programming has not been conclusively determined. Based on some of the Head Start studies and other research, it is likely that programs less than one year in duration are insufficient to affect developmental outcomes, and that two years of preschool has a cumulatively greater

impact on most outcomes than one year.³⁶⁻³⁸ However, a recent meta-analysis found no relationship between developmental outcomes and length of program participation.²⁹

Interestingly, this meta-evaluation also found that programs providing additional services to children and their families (e.g., health screening, nutrition, educational materials for home use) actually had a negative effect on cognitive development. These findings are inconsistent with other research. The researchers speculate that this outcome may have been confounded by other factors: (i) children in these programs had fewer hours of participation over longer time periods, for unknown reasons; and (ii) children in these programs received less direct instruction and class sizes were larger. The researchers further speculate that providing direct services may compete with instructional time, thereby diluting the intensity of programming.²⁹

Recent research also indicates that comprehensive, high-quality, centre-based early childhood programming followed by small classes in grades 1 to 3 is an effective approach for preventing an array of problems throughout childhood, adolescence, and adulthood among at-risk children.³⁹ The continuation of programming to grade 3 helps to prevent the “fade out” of program effects over time,⁴⁰ which has occurred for some children in some early childhood programs, such as Head Start.

3.2 Developmental programming

Research shows that sustained participation in high-quality, structured developmental programming can provide supervision and help children and youth to stay out of trouble⁴¹⁻⁴³ and achieve age-appropriate developmental milestones. The benefits of participation in developmental programming may be greatest for young people who face challenges in life, such as physical or intellectual disabilities,

dysfunctional families or negative environments, language or cultural barriers, and living in chronic low income, and for young people who feel excluded from the “mainstream” for any number of reasons. For vulnerable children and youth, participation in developmental programming can afford protective or “buffering” factors that can offset multiple risk factors.⁴⁴

The most common types of programs to improve child and youth development include:

- Mentoring programs
- After-school programs
- Social emotional learning programs

3.2.1 Mentoring programs

Mentoring is an evolving field that uses many new approaches, such as group mentoring and on-line mentoring, but the most common types of mentoring programs are one-on-one community-based mentoring, where mentors meet with mentees in community settings after school, in the evening, or on the weekend. Recently, school-based mentoring, where mentors and mentees meet at the mentees' schools at lunch time, after school or, in some programs, during school hours, has become more common. Some mentoring programs focus explicitly on providing academic supports or preventing specific problems; others have broad child and youth development goals.

As noted by many researchers,⁴⁵ despite the proliferation of mentoring programs in recent years, the evidence base and, specifically, what sorts of programs work best, for whom, and how, is still in development. Research support for mentoring as a positive youth development strategy is growing, however. DuBois and colleagues' thorough and comprehensive 2011 meta-analysis of recent research³² concluded that mentoring can both prevent and redress developmental problems from early childhood to adolescence, depending on both child and program characteristics.

The most studied developmental outcomes affected by mentoring programs are attitude and motivation, social and interpersonal skills, emotional wellbeing, conduct and behaviour, and academic outcomes (attendance, grades, achievement). Although the developmental changes are usually modest, they are comparable to those resulting from some school-based bullying intervention and violence prevention programs, programs targeting aspects of emotional wellbeing (e.g., anxiety reduction, self-esteem improvement), tutoring programs, and other youth development interventions. The evidence also indicates that many types of mentoring programs — traditional adult-child matches, school-based programs, cross-age peer mentoring, group mentoring — can be effective when delivered in accordance with best practices.⁴⁶

DuBois and colleagues concluded that, at a high level, mentoring program effectiveness was greatest when:

- There was a relatively high proportion of male youth participants.
- Participating youth had a background of relatively high individual risk (e.g., experience of abuse or neglect) or environmental risk (e.g., high crime neighbourhood).
- The program included an advocacy role for mentors.
- The program included a teaching/information provision role for mentors.
- Mentors and youth were matched based on similarity of interests.
- The program did not match mentors and youth based on similarity in race/ethnicity.⁴⁶

It should be noted that, in some cases, DuBois and colleagues' findings differ from those in previous and subsequent research, and that a wide range of factors, including but not limited to the quality of the mentor-mentee relationship and mentees' personal characteristics, can greatly influence the outcomes of participation.

For example:

- Consistent with DuBois' findings, a recent American study of a mentoring program matching girls in junior high school with women college students reported stronger outcomes for cross-race than same-race pairs.⁴⁷ However, qualitative research on Aboriginal mentoring programs indicates that Aboriginal youth may be best served by Aboriginal mentors.⁴⁸ Likewise, while youth mentoring may be a positive intervention for immigrant and refugee youth, cultural differences need to be taken into account.⁴⁹ Immigrants or children of immigrants may be better "able to relate to the experiences of immigrant youth and serve as positive bicultural role models," although "there may also be adults from the majority culture who display a sensitivity to specific issues facing immigrants, a willingness to engage in mutual learning with youth from backgrounds that differ

from their own, and the ability to act as cultural interpreters."⁵⁰ That being said, mainstream mentorship programs may require cultural adjustments to meet the needs of immigrant youth mentees.⁵¹

- A recent evaluation of a Big Brothers Big Sisters program in the U.S. found that improvements in academic performance and social behaviour were greater among youth who had moderately positive relationships with adults and peers than among those who had very positive relationships, and those who had problematic relationships and were considered "vulnerable."⁵² In other words, the program may have "worked best" for youth who were experiencing some challenges, rather than those who experienced no challenges or serious challenges.
- A large and recent Big Brothers Big Sisters study found that, among academically at-risk youth, participants' academic scores improved if they were mentored during lunch or after school, but did not change or declined if they were pulled out of class to meet with their mentors.⁵³
- Evaluations of some school-based mentoring programs have found minimal benefits and even negative outcomes.⁵⁴⁻⁵⁶
- Although Dubois' meta-analysis found that the positive effects of mentoring extended to programs of less than six months' duration, there is a considerable body of research indicating that, overall, longer relationships are better. DuBois notes that the important factor may be whether the relationship continues for the full duration of whatever time frame was previously established as an expectation. This is consistent with studies documenting the negative impacts on mentees when mentoring relationships are terminated prematurely.^{57,58}

The common cautions offered by researchers about mentoring programs in general are that few evaluations have followed participants over time to determine whether benefits are sustained. In fact, two highly publicized programs that were believed to be effective were subsequently found to

have no enduring developmental effects.⁵⁹⁻⁶¹ Also, not all youth are equally suited for mentoring: “Mentoring is neither a substitute for professional treatment among youth with serious emotional, behavioural, or academic problems nor a necessary inoculation for all youth.”⁶² Finally, like others before them, Dubois and colleagues suggest that, in their efforts to expand the reach of their programming, some organizations may not be introducing or adhering to research-supported practices. Rhodes comments:

*“Research findings tend to be complex and replete with qualifications and nuances that do not always lend themselves easily to advocacy and practice. Yet, if we are to champion this intervention strategy, we must be prepared to grapple with its complexities – even at the risk of learning that commonly deployed programs and practices do not always improve youth outcomes.”*⁶¹

Yet a 2013 study commissioned by Big Brothers Big Sisters of Canada followed mentored participants over time to determine whether benefits were sustained in four categories of differential life outcomes: employment, philanthropy, life skills and general wellbeing.

Former mentees attribute much of their life successes to Big Brothers Big Sisters in the areas of education, employment, general happiness and wellbeing. The program

showed significant causal benefits, along multiple dimensions for participants, and a high social return on investment. For example former mentees showed increased lifetime earnings and a greater propensity to give back to the community (money and service).⁶³

Additional considerations for children and youth with disabilities

Mentoring programs are also considered to be a positive child and youth development strategy or, more commonly, a social support intervention, for youth with disabilities. Although the academic research base is very limited, a few studies have indicated that young people with physical disabilities can become more independent as a result of mentorship by adults with the same disabilities.⁶⁴ However, students with learning disabilities or impairments are more likely to achieve particular life goals⁶⁵ or improve their quality of life⁶⁴ through mentorship by adults without disabilities. Two older evaluations reported improvements in self-esteem, academic performance, and academic engagement among junior high school students with mild intellectual disabilities;⁶⁶ and improvement in ability to overcome disability-related barriers, self-reliance, and interest in working, going to college, and living in their own

homes.⁶⁶ “E-mentoring” has emerged in the research as a powerful vehicle for mentoring youth with disabilities,^{67,68} but some types of disabilities might preclude use of the internet as a communications tool.

Most of the published research on mentoring for youth with disabilities, as sparse as it is, has focused on the need for mentoring programs to help youth with disabilities transition to post-secondary education or the world of work.⁶⁹ An example of such a program is Disabilities, Opportunities, Internetworking & Technology (DO-IT), a large American e-mentoring program that matches mentors and mentored individuals with similar disabilities.⁷⁰ With the exception of one very small study,⁷¹ it does not appear that any of the large mentoring programs for youth with disabilities have been evaluated.

A comprehensive publication, Elements of Effective Practice for Mentoring, is available at no cost from MENTOR at https://www.mentoring.org/images/uploads/Final_Elements_Publication_Fourth.pdf.

A Best Practices Guide for Mentoring Youth with Disabilities, along with mentor training materials, is available at no cost from Partners for Youth with Disabilities at <https://www.miusa.org/sites/default/files/documents/resource/Best%20Practices%20Guide%20for%20mentoring%20youth-%202005.pdf>.

3.2.2 After-school programs

Some after-school programs do not seek to improve developmental outcomes. Rather, they exist to provide children and youth with an opportunity to participate in supervised recreational or other non-structured activities while their parents are at work. The primary purpose of such programs is to provide a safe haven for children and an alternative to hanging around in the community or at the mall. The vast majority of the research on recreational programming has focused on sports and/or physical activity programming, which overwhelmingly reveal positive impacts in such areas as physical health, psychological wellbeing, social status and socialization, inter-group relations, and educational attainment.⁷²⁻⁷⁷

In addition, highly-structured sports programs built on youth development principles and with specific features have resulted in improved outcomes on an array of development indicators.⁷⁸⁻⁸⁰ In his review of the research, Bailey stresses that some positive outcomes of recreational programming may “*not necessarily result from participation, per se; the effects are likely to be mediated by the nature of the interactions between students and their teachers, parents, and coaches who work with them. Contexts that emphasize positive experiences, characterized by enjoyment, diversity, and the engagement of all, and that are managed by committed and trained teachers and coaches, and supportive and informed parents, significantly influence the character of these physical activities and increase the likelihood of realizing the potential benefits of participation.*”⁷⁴

That being said, many after-school programs are now required to have a developmental focus. This means they seek to improve participants’ developmental outcomes in one or more aspects within one or more of the four domains of child and youth development. The importance of program structure and program intentionality for improving developmental outcomes, discussed further below, cannot be overstated. Research shows that good intentions do not guarantee good outcomes, and unstructured programs can actually promote negative outcomes. In one large study, for example, and consistent with a large body of research on peer influence in adolescence, frequency of participation at a youth centre was associated with a significant increase in antisocial behaviour over time for boys and girls. The researchers

commented that “[a]ctivities that lack structure and skill-building aims appear to attract high-risk adolescents and the resulting social environment is conducive to the development of antisocial behaviour.”⁸¹ In addition to increasing structure in recreational programming, another recommendation arising from this body of research is that programs give consideration to what participants are up to before and after the program, with a view to reducing opportunities for problem behaviour.⁸²

Likewise, a recent review of the effects of 35 after-school programs in the U.S. found that 23 programs produced either a mix of positive and negative outcomes or negative outcomes alone.⁸³ Negative outcomes included conduct problems, such as drug use and drug dealing and being unable to resolve conflicts properly. Analysis of program effects by program characteristics revealed that these negative effects were occurring in large, unstructured programs, especially when program staff responded neutrally to undesirable behaviours. The researchers suggest that, in large, unstructured programs, participants spend a great deal of time socializing, and a group of participants with negative behaviours can engage in “deviancy training,” (i.e. reinforcing each other’s bad behaviours).

In addition, some research has reported negative outcomes (problem behaviours, fewer positive peer influences, lower academic achievement) resulting from participation in after-school recreational programs that include sports, although the researchers speculate that this may have been attributable to the participation of high numbers of at-risk youth.⁸⁴ It was not clear, however, why outcomes worsened for these youth as a result of participation.

One exception to these general findings about unstructured programming was a Boys and Girls Clubs of America (BGCA) study⁸⁵ that focused on the outcomes of participation in unstructured, drop-in BGCA programs. The study reported mixed outcomes from participation in this type of programming as compared with targeted, structured programming. Younger participants who attended regularly demonstrated good outcomes; older youth who attended regularly demonstrated some negative outcomes (increased acceptance of cheating, decreased enjoyment of and effort in school,

increased alcohol use). However, increased attendance mitigated these negative outcomes, suggesting that participation may have afforded some developmental protective factors. The researchers suggest that increasing participation in structured, along with unstructured, programming may have additional benefits for participants, noting that “the motivators of recreation, sport, and friends are essential program strategies necessary to especially engage harder-to-reach adolescent populations.”⁸⁵

After-school program elements and practices for success

Program quality: Intentionality and the SAFE principles

Research shows that programs must be intentional to be effective. Program “intentionality” means that a program includes specific components intended to bring about one or more particular outcomes and uses an evidence-based skills-training approach to develop particular competencies or attributes associated with those outcomes. For example, a program to improve school performance may be of the highest quality and engage participants over a number of years, but it is unlikely to improve participants’ math or reading ability if it doesn’t include a specific academic component, such as tutoring.

The importance of program intentionality was first identified in the early 2000s in evaluations of programs intended to improve school performance,⁸⁶ social competence,⁸⁷ physical health,⁸⁸ and mental health.⁸⁹ However, it was not broadly recognized in the after-school community, at least in Canada, until the later part of the decade. This recognition followed the release of a ground-breaking meta-analysis on the effectiveness of programs that sought to improve social competence and/or emotional wellbeing (sometimes referred to as “social and emotional learning” (SEL) programs).^{91,91} Of the 68 programs included in the analysis, the 41 that were effective were evidence-based and clearly intentional, as their programming reflected what have been coined the “SAFE” principles (sequenced, active, focused, and explicit). The 41 effective programs clearly featured a sequenced, step-by-step set of activities to achieve skill objectives (sequenced); used active, experiential forms of learning to practice new skills or behaviours and receive

feedback on their performance (active); focused specific time and attention on skill development (focused); and identified which social or personal skills they intended to improve (explicit). The SAFE programs were associated with significant improvements in self-concept, positive social behaviours, school bonding, school grades, and achievement test scores, and with significant reductions in conduct problems. However, programs that featured only some of the SAFE principles were not effective; all four principles had to be in place to improve social or personal skills.

Sufficient “dose” of participation

In all kinds of social programming, “dose” refers to the quantity of time spent in a program. Dose is usually measured in terms of intensity (hours of participation over a period of time) and duration (weeks, months, or years) of participation. We still don’t know for certain what dose of programming is required to effect change. This is probably because many of the comprehensive evaluations of large after-school programs have had trouble collecting reliable attendance and attrition data. The research is clear that:

1. (With one dissenting study)⁹² occasional participation, even in a high-quality program, is unlikely to be effective.⁹³⁻⁹⁷
2. The developmental outcomes of children and youth who participate in high-quality after-school programming four or five days a week are generally better than those of children and youth who regularly spend time with no adult supervision after school.⁹⁸
3. Intensity of participation might matter more than duration of participation.⁹⁹

There is also some anecdotal evidence that short-term participation in very intensive after-school programming might improve some specific outcomes (e.g., self-confidence). However, it does not appear that any programs of this type have been thoroughly evaluated.

A general rule of thumb from the research for after-school programs is somewhere between 50 and 100 days of participation¹⁰⁰ (or at least 100 hours of programming) over at least one year is required to significantly effect change, but this should not be considered a hard and fast directive. Required dose most likely depends in part

Positive child and youth development

on the outcomes targeted by the program, participants' pre-program competencies, and the nature and intensity of the program itself. In addition, most of the after-school evaluations have not taken into account participation in multiple programs or activities, meaning that the collective dose of participation and the collective impact of program components and activities have not been measured. It should also be noted that, in some ways, the participants' perceptions about the quality of the experience may be as important as the quantity of the experience. For example, research indicates that after-school programs that are demanding and offer challenging, relevant activities are most likely to yield positive outcomes.¹⁰¹

Additional considerations for children and youth with disabilities

A large body of research has identified many barriers to participation of children and youth with all types of disabilities in all kinds of mainstream developmental and recreational programming, including after-school programming. Very briefly, with respect to sports-related programs, in addition to common financial, transportation, language, and cultural barriers, young people with disabilities may be excluded due to programmers' concerns about liability, program capacity, required program or facility modifications, and lack of knowledge about how to accommodate various types of disabilities. Also parents' concerns about injury, lack of supports within the program, and negative social experiences,¹⁰²⁻¹⁰⁴ may also result in exclusion.

Promising practices in programming for children and youth with disabilities have been identified for sports and recreation programs and for out-of-school time programs. And yet, inclusive programming has not become standard operation in most child- and youth-serving organizations in the U.S.,^{105,106} and the same is likely true in Canada.

Promising practices for programs that appear to be directed toward individuals with physical disabilities of all ages have been summarized:

- Identify or employ a staff member who is responsible for facilitating and coordinating inclusive service delivery.¹⁰⁵
- Ensure physical and programmatic accessibility, meaning that all participants can "approach, enter, and use facilities and services in unimpeded ways."¹⁰⁵
- Provide adaptive equipment and other accommodations.¹⁰⁵
- Ensure that program marketing materials reflect inclusive practices and welcoming language and include photos of persons with disabilities.¹⁰⁵

For children and youth, research indicates that support staff are essential in assisting participants with disabilities to acquire social and physical skills and to acquire and use adaptations, providing physical assistance, and promoting successful social interactions with peers.¹⁰⁷

Zambo has identified five steps to help adolescents with disabilities to fit into groups:¹⁰⁸

1. Conceptualize current groups and networks:
 - Create a socio-netgram, an extended sociogram that shows a student's groups and their connections.
2. Understand the adolescent's perspective:
 - Interview the student (privately) with targeted, developmentally appropriate questions.
3. Help the adolescent fit into the group and understand the group and others:
 - Does the student know each group's mission? If not, set aside some private time and explain the group's history, how it began, its length in existence, its mission/goals, and members.
 - Does the student know the members in each group? If not, provide time for all group members to talk about themselves, their roles in the group, and how they contribute to the group.
 - Does the student understand the group's rules, procedures, or norms? If not, explain these to the student in clear, concrete language. Model the rule or procedure and ask the student to describe it, how it looks, and how it feels to oneself and others.

4. Help the adolescent become a contributing group member:
 - Rearrange the environment.
 - The student's personal goals and group goals should be high enough to be challenging but achievable if the student persists and puts forth effort.
 - Provide feedback about goal attainment that is specific, informative, and focused.
5. Allow the student time to develop an identity:
 - Respect the adolescent's unique developmental path.

A useful resource entitled *A Community for All Children: A Guide to Inclusion for Out-of-School Time* from the University of North Carolina and partners is available at no cost from https://www.academia.edu/29583458/A_community_for_ALL_children_A_guide_to_inclusion_for_out-of-school_time

3.2.3 Social emotional learning programs

In recent years, the term “social emotional learning” (SEL) has been coined to summarize the process of acquiring age-appropriate competencies in two developmental domains: social competence and emotional wellbeing. Research indicates that various forms of programming and interventions can help young people, especially those in early and middle childhood,¹⁰⁹ to master these competencies and thereby prevent a host of problems throughout life. For example, research shows that lacking emotional self-regulation in childhood can predict a wide range of consequential life outcomes, including income and financial security, occupational prestige, physical and mental health, criminality¹¹⁰ and gambling problems,¹¹¹ even when family background and other factors are controlled for. (It should be stressed that SEL programs are not a substitute for counselling or therapy for children who are experiencing mental health problems.)

In addition, some SEL programs have been demonstrated to improve cognitive development, as evidenced by academic outcomes. This is because students who can pay attention, persevere with tasks, solve problems, and work well with others generally do better in school than those who do not have these abilities or whose abilities are compromised by stress, anxiety, depression or anger. Advances in neuroscience are clarifying the complex relationships between emotional self-regulation and the brain’s executive functions (e.g., reasoning and memory), and shedding light on how promoting social and emotional competence can facilitate cognitive skills and the development of self-regulation and, ultimately, learning.¹¹²

A wide range of developmental programs, usually but not necessarily delivered in schools by teachers, have now been coined “SEL programs.” SEL programs fall into three categories — violence prevention, mental health, and character education — with each type of programming targeting one or more core social and emotional competencies.¹¹³ SEL programs can be “universal” (provided to all children through school-wide implementation to promote mental health and prevent emotional or behavioural

problems); “selective” (provided to groups of children with similar risk factors to prevent emotional or behavioural problems); or “indicated” (provided to individual children or groups of children experiencing emotional or behavioural problems).¹¹⁴

Three large meta-analyses of SEL programs in the U.S. reported the following:

- Analysis of 180 studies of school-based, “universal” SEL programs involving 277,977 students found that programs improved participants’ outcomes in six areas: social-emotional skills in test situations, attitudes toward self and others, social behaviours, conduct, emotional wellbeing, and academic performance.¹¹⁵
- Analysis of 80 studies of “indicated” SEL programs for 11,337 children with signs of emotional, social, or behavioural problems found (i) no change with respect to drug use; (ii) significant and sustained improvements in SEL skills, attitudes, social behaviours, conduct and emotional wellbeing; and (iii) significant improvements in academic performance, but these gains were not sustained over time.¹¹⁶
- The findings from the analysis of 57 studies of “universal” after-school programs for 34,989 students were mixed, partly due to the variety of programs offered and, also, to differences in the quality and types of studies reviewed. Considering all programs together, the analysis found improvements in self-perceptions, school bonding, social behaviours, conduct, and achievement tests but these changes were either not sustained over time or the participants were not followed longitudinally so longer-term impacts could not be identified. The programs did not influence school achievement, with the exception of those programs that used evidence-based practices.⁹¹

Most of the evidence-based SEL programs are delivered in schools by trained teachers. This is because effective SEL programs are grounded in developmental psychology and follow a specific curriculum, usually over a period of months or years, with each lesson building upon the learnings of the last.¹³⁷ Research indicates that, to be effective, programs must:

1. Be delivered in “safe, caring, participatory and well-managed learning environments,”¹¹⁷ which generally involves intentional, systematic changes to classroom and school climate, SEL training for teachers, and community and parental involvement.
2. Provide “sequenced, developmentally-appropriate, classroom-based instruction in five major areas of social and emotional competence,”¹¹⁷ where SEL is infused into the regular school curriculum and continues over several years, with the instructional content in each grade building upon that in the last.

A handful of high-profile SEL programs have been evaluated and, under scrutiny, have failed to deliver on their promises. Those programs that have demonstrated to be effective align with the above criteria. Examples of such programs that are well known in Canada include Promoting Alternative Thinking Strategies (PATHS), 4Rs, The Fourth R, Roots of Empathy, and Lions Quest. While thousands of programs in Canada might be described as SEL programs, few have been empirically evaluated. The Mental Health Commission of Canada has expressed concern that scarce resources – and opportunities to make a difference – might be wasted on short-term SEL programs that have been developed in response to a local need, are not evidence-based, do not include the features for effectiveness, and have not been empirically evaluated. An additional concern is the implementation of evidence-based programs without fidelity to the model, which can mean that the program is not effective any more.¹¹⁸

Additional considerations for children and youth with disabilities

Children and youth with physical and/or intellectual disabilities are often socially isolated by peers, adults, and society as a whole, who see them as “less able,” and exclude them from group activities and may be reluctant to befriend them.^{108,109} Research also indicates that children with disabilities (especially non-physical disabilities, such as psychological disorders, developmental delays, intellectual disabilities, ADHD¹²⁰) are at increased risk of being bullied

and victimized at school and in the community.¹²¹⁻¹²³ A review of the research on discrimination against children and youth with disabilities and how it might be combated is beyond the scope of the current discussion. However, for the purposes of this paper, it is important to recognize that these problems exist and can contribute to poor developmental outcomes for children and youth with disabilities. As for all young people, friendships and a broad range of inter-personal connections are crucial to the positive social, emotional, cognitive, and physical development and wellbeing of children and youth with disabilities.^{124,125}

A large body of research shows that children and youth with intellectual disabilities often have poor social skills and demonstrate behavioural problems, which further contributes to their social isolation.¹²⁶⁻¹²⁹ In addition, children and youth with emotional and behavioural disorders may be more likely than their peers to engage in aggressive and violent behaviours.¹³⁰ Thousands of studies, many of them using small samples, have been conducted on strategies and programs in a range of settings to improve the social skills of children and youth of all ages and with various types of disabilities, most often autism spectrum disorder. The good news is that a range of interventions have been demonstrated to be effective in improving social skills and behaviours, communication skills, and social connections with peers, and these improvements persist over time.

Overall, social skills training appears to be more effective than other interventions, such as augmentative and alternative communication and stand-alone conversation skills training in improving social and communication skills among youth (aged 12 years and above) across a range of disabilities. The effects of various forms of training on reducing behavioural problems across disability types is less clear.¹³¹ Of course, there are many types of disabilities and generic meta-analyses provide limited guidance in determining how to best address the needs of specific groups of children or youth.

For young children with autism or intellectual disability, there is some indication that peer training, where peers

serve as conversational partners and provide opportunities to practice skills with feedback, may be more effective than the more common method of having an adult provide social skills instruction to a small group of students.¹³² Research on effective interventions for older children and youth has been less comprehensive, but a recent meta-analysis indicates that it is also effective for older children and youth with these disabilities. The keys to success appear to be teaching youth how to communicate effectively and providing ongoing support and opportunities to practice newly acquired skills, so that they can learn to generalize the new skills in a variety of situations and with different types of people.¹³²

Social skills training also appears to be effective for youth with emotional and behavioural disorders. A “mega-analysis” of meta-analyses representing 77 high-quality studies on social skills training for youth (ages 11 years and older) identified positive and noticeable effects overall among youth with these disabilities.¹³³ One of the meta-analyses included in this study suggested that, for youth in mid- to late adolescence, programs that used social learning strategies (e.g., modeling, coaching) resulted in larger behavioural changes than operant learning (which stresses positive reinforcement) and cognitive learning (which stresses problem solving and coping skills) programs. The results were somewhat inconclusive, however, partly because most programs use multiple approaches and strategies.¹³³

There is no clear guidance from the research about whether social skills instruction for children and youth with developmental disabilities is more effective in programs or settings that target those with disabilities exclusively or in programs that include children without such disabilities. It appears that most programs that specifically target social skills development for children with developmental disabilities are stand-alone programs, although they sometimes involve peer mentors without disabilities. What works to improve social skills appears to depend in part on the type of developmental disability experienced by participants. For example, the most effective intervention for children with autism appears to be video

modeling, which is a one-to-one intervention with individual children.¹³⁴

The inclusion of children with developmental disabilities in mainstream programming is a human right and is widely advocated as a way of helping children with developmental disabilities to develop friendships and social skills and to become socially integrated in the broader community. The research on the effectiveness of this approach has produced mixed results. Some studies reported improvements in social competence among children with disabilities. Others identified no benefits or negative outcomes, primarily because children with developmental disabilities have difficulty building and maintaining relationships with other children, whether they have disabilities or not, and because children without disabilities are not always accepting of those with developmental disabilities. This leads to social rejection of the children with developmental disabilities.¹³⁴

Overall, little is known about how children with developmental disabilities form peer relationships and friendships in educational and community environments.¹³⁵ It is clear, however, that “achieving social integration for children with developmental disabilities involves more than merely providing these children with opportunities to interact with nondisabled peers.”^{136,137}

3.3 Treatment for mental health problems

Although funding for mental health treatment is not within the legal mandate of FCSS, the merits of such programming must be noted within a broader investigation of the best ways to prevent an array of problems in childhood, adolescence, and beyond. Without treatment, childhood mental health problems can lead to school failure, substance abuse, violence, suicide, and other serious problems. Half of all lifetime cases of mental illness begin by age 14, although the roots of the illness may begin much earlier.¹³⁸ The United States Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) estimates there are over 400 different mental health treatment approaches for children and adolescents. SAMHSA stresses that not all approaches are effective. The Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies and the Society of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology has reviewed and summarized the research on evidence-based mental health treatment for children and adolescents. The American Psychological Association has published this online.¹³⁹

Brief summary information on effective treatments for the mental health disorders most commonly experienced by children and youth

Anxiety problems and disorders

Research generally supports Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) for the treatment of general symptoms of anxiety in both children and adolescents. This treatment can be administered in a variety of different formats, including group CBT with and without parents, each of which has varying levels of research support. Social skills training and exposure treatment can also be effective in treating anxiety.^{139,140}

Individual CBT and individual CBT with medication can be effective in treating obsessive compulsive disorders. Again, some types of CBT appear to be more effective than others.^{141,142}

Research strongly supports trauma-focused CBT for the treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD); group CBT can also be effective. There is some research support for a range of other treatments such as child-centred therapy.^{143,144}

Depression and related disorders

For children, research strongly supports group CBT with and without parents for the treatment of depression. Behaviour therapy can also be effective. The effectiveness of family therapy and group psychoeducation with a parent intervention is unknown. For adolescents, group CBT without parents and interpersonal psychotherapy (IPT) are preferred therapies. Group CBT with a parent component, individual CBT, and individual CBT with a parent/family component can also be effective. The effectiveness of other treatments including group interpersonal psychotherapy and family therapy is unknown.^{145,146}

Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD)

Research strongly supports three types of behaviour therapy for the treatment of ADHD: Behavioural Parent Training (BPT), Behavioural Classroom Management (BCM), and Behavioural Peer Interventions (BPI) for the treatment of ADHD in both children and adolescents.^{147,148}

Disruptive behaviour problems

Behaviour therapy is well supported by research for the treatment of disruptive behavior problems (including oppositional defiance disorder and conduct disorder) in both children and adolescents. This treatment can be administered in a variety of different formats, each of which has varying levels of research support. The most effective type of behaviour therapy is individual parent management training. Other behaviour therapies that can be effective are problem-solving skills training, with or without parent management training, and counsellor-led or peer-led group assertiveness training. Individual CBT, Multidimensional Treatment Foster Care, and Multisystemic Therapy can also be effective. Group CBT and group Parent Management Training might also be effective.^{149,150}

Substance abuse and dependence

The research supports Group CBT, Multidimensional Family Therapy, and Functional Family Therapy for the treatment of adolescent substance abuse. Brief Strategic Family Therapy, Behavioural Family Therapy, and Multisystemic Therapy can also be effective. Individual CBT, Transitional Family Therapy, Strength-oriented Family

Therapy (SOFT), and the Minnesota Model 12 Step Program might be effective.^{151,152}

Eating disorders

The research strongly supports family therapy (Brief Strategic Family Therapy, Multisystemic Therapy, Multidimensional Family Therapy, Functional Family Therapy) for the treatment of anorexia nervosa. The effectiveness of cognitive therapy for this disorder is unknown. No treatments are strongly supported by research for bulimia, although guided self-care for binge eating CBT and family therapy, as above, might be effective.^{153,154}

Bipolar Disorder

Family therapy can work for the treatment of bipolar disorder in children and adolescents; Child-focused CBT, Family-focused CBT, and Individual Family Psychoeducation might be effective.¹⁵⁵⁻¹⁶⁰

Autism Spectrum Disorders

For young children, behaviour therapy appears to be the only effective treatment for autism spectrum disorders, and there appear to be no effective treatments for older children and adolescents.^{161,162}

Additional considerations for children and youth with intellectual disabilities

Children and youth with intellectual disabilities and developmental disabilities experience significantly more emotional and behavioural problems than their peers without intellectual disabilities. It is generally recognized that their needs are complex, persistent, and costly, and that they are not adequately met.¹⁶³ The diagnosis of some mental health problems in children and youth with intellectual disabilities can be very challenging, with some disorders (e.g., schizophrenia) easier to detect than others (e.g. emotional disturbance), depending on the nature and severity of the disability.¹⁶⁴ Limited research has been completed on the effectiveness of counselling, treatment, and medications for both children and adults with intellectual disabilities. There appears to be a high level of disagreement among researchers about which approaches are most effective.¹⁶⁵

3.4 Community-based educational supports

Please note that this section of the report does not address the learning needs of children and youth with intellectual disabilities. Although they may exist, no programs that were both evidence-based and community-based were identified in the literature search.

3.4.1 Community-based tutoring programs

The majority of both school- and community-based tutoring programs have not been evaluated. However, repeated evaluations of large-scale school-based programs such as Reading Recovery in the U.S. have reported modest improvements in reading ability, and greater improvements when the program is enriched with systemic phonics enhancement.¹⁶⁶ An intervention provides one-on-one tutoring in schools by a specially trained teacher to struggling readers. One evaluation has shown that a similarly enriched version of Reading Recovery, Reading Rescue, is effective with low socio-economic status grade 1 ESL students relative to those who received a small group intervention.¹⁶⁷

On the other hand, outcomes of Supplemental Educational Services in the U.S., a component of the No Child Left Behind Act intended to improve student achievement in reading and math, have been mixed. Most studies report no statistically significant improvements in achievement.^{168,169} As summarized by Viadero, “[w]hile most parents report satisfaction with the services, the studies find that the added hours of tutoring have so far produced only small or negligible gains on state reading and mathematics tests.”¹⁷⁰ Clearly, some school-based tutoring programs are effective, while others are not.

The research on smaller programs that might be delivered during the after-school hours, possibly by volunteers, has also produced mixed findings. Most programs that have been rigorously evaluated have only been evaluated once, using a small sample. However, these initial findings are still encouraging, suggesting that several different approaches, as long as they adhere to best practices, can be effective. These programs typically target either math skills or, more commonly, reading skills. In addition, the research is clearly focused on students in elementary school. While programs exist for adolescents who struggle

with reading, it appears that all of the research is on programs delivered in schools, by teachers, providing little guidance for community-based programmers.

Overall, the research supports peer tutoring, cross-age tutoring, tutoring by volunteers, one-on-one tutoring and, in some cases, small group tutoring.

Program elements and practices for success

Several reviews of the research on tutoring programs have been written in the past few years, each with a slightly different focus. Collectively, these reviews identify some program elements and practices that appear to improve program effects, but some areas require further research.

For after-school programs in particular, effective practices include:

- Housing the program in the school and having the program taught by teachers. With some exceptions, students in these types of programs tend to outperform those in off-site programs taught by non-teachers.^{171,172}
- Communication with the classroom teacher.¹⁷³
- Longer-term engagement. A “threshold” number of hours has not been clearly established. Some effective programs last only a few months;^{174,175} others require two years or more, or at least 160 hours of participation.¹⁷⁶ It is clear, nonetheless, that changes don’t happen quickly and may not happen even over a long time period if the program is not sufficiently intensive or does not provide the right kind of curriculum or instruction. Overall, some researchers suggest that a minimum of 30 hours of tutoring is required to show student improvement.¹⁷³

Power and Cummings’ recent review of 25 high-quality studies on the effectiveness of one-on-one tutoring in reading for elementary students identified the

following factors as key contributors to the effectiveness of reading tutoring programs for elementary students:¹⁷⁷

- Volunteers from all backgrounds and age groups, from high school students to seniors, can be successful in helping children learn to read. There is no trend in the data to suggest that any particular type of volunteer is preferable. However, training and close supervision of the volunteers is crucial to positive outcomes. Successful programs provide an on-site coordinator to oversee the program, continuous feedback to the tutors on their tutoring sessions, high-quality training for the tutors, and structured tutoring sessions. Quality training programs involve modeling of best practices before, during and after the scheduled tutoring sessions for volunteers.
- Volunteers must use evidence-based tutoring strategies, such as strong reinforcement of progress, a high number of reading and writing experiences in which the student moved from being fully supported to working independently, explicit demonstration of appropriate reading and writing processes; a focus on reading comprehension; and cognitive scaffolding.
- Programs should assess reading ability before and after program participation.
- Required quantity and duration of participation are unclear, but it appears that sessions over 60 minutes in length do not necessarily result in better outcomes. Rather than the time spent in any one tutoring session, effects seem to be more highly related to the total amount of time the child spends with the tutor. Lauer’s synthesis of research on out-of-school-time programs with a tutoring component reported that programs that provided at least 45 hours of participation were more effective overall.¹⁷⁸
- A wide range of reading materials can be used effectively.

3.4.2 Family literacy programs

Repeated studies have shown that parents greatly influence children's learning, literacy levels, and academic success.¹³⁹ Children's educational attainment is highly correlated with that of their parents, particularly their mothers.¹⁷⁹⁻¹⁸¹ Reading skills are a key pillar of the foundation of success in school and beyond.¹⁸⁶ When parents find reading challenging, it is often difficult for children in that family to engage in, learn to love, and succeed at reading. Children who experience difficulties with reading in the early grades often continue to struggle throughout the educational process.¹⁸⁶

The latest International Adult Literacy Survey revealed that about 40 per cent of Albertans have insufficient literacy skills and 50 per cent have insufficient numeracy skills to participate in today's economy.¹⁸⁷ Poor adult literacy skills are associated with a range of problems including but not limited to health problems (often associated with the inability to read labels and instructions),¹⁸⁸⁻¹⁹¹ low levels of social capital,¹⁹² high school dropout, low levels of employment, and low income.¹⁹³ These problems will grow as the economy becomes increasingly knowledge based. Therefore, literacy programs for children (and for adults) should be included as a pillar of any long-term poverty prevention strategy.

Family literacy programs are one approach to improving children's literacy skills to afford them a better chance in life. Family literacy programs seek to help children develop language and literacy skills with the support of their parents, who have the opportunity to improve their own skills.

Family literacy programs usually target pre-school-aged children or elementary school-aged children and they may be school-based, community-based, or offered in schools via school-community partnerships. In Canada, programs grouped under the family literacy banner range from reading circles to school-community partnerships to Parents and Children Together programs.¹⁹⁴ Most Canadian family literacy programs tend to focus specifically on increasing the literacy of at-risk children by encouraging parents to support reading in the home. As described by Thomas, "Canadian family literacy intervention has been characterized

by relatively short-term low intensity programs."¹⁹⁵ Alberta's Parent-Child Literacy Strategy takes a "soft" intergenerational approach, targeting oral and early and emergent literacy development for at-risk children from birth to six years of age and their parents via adult literacy and parenting instruction.¹⁹⁶

Because the nature of family literacy programs is so varied and most programs are run on minimal budgets by non-profit organizations, "the level of program evaluation in family literacy often amounts to little more than testimonials."¹⁹⁵ There are a few exceptions to this sweeping statement, however. For example, an experimental evaluation of Learning Together: Read and Write With Your Child, which consists of 90 hours of instruction over 12 weeks, revealed significant and sustained improvements in the reading scores of children with the lowest pre-test scores, i.e., the ones with the furthest to go. The researchers concluded that the program should target only those children with the lowest literacy levels. They also suggested that the most effective means of increasing young children's literacy levels would be to increase the educational levels of their parents, since many parents are unable to read to and with their children.¹⁹⁷ Likewise, several quasi-experimental evaluations of the very intensive Families Learning Together program in Atlantic Canada, some of which were provided to Aboriginal families only, have demonstrated large and significant improvements in children's reading abilities.^{198,199}

In the U.S., an in-depth intergenerational approach to family literacy programs has been adopted into federal legislation.²⁰⁰ Even Start, a comprehensive, federally-funded American program, targets the most at-risk children and includes significant adult education among its components. The overriding objective of Even Start is to "break the cycle of illiteracy and poverty in low-income and low-literate families."²⁰¹ Early evaluations of Even Start and several other intensive, long-term, multi-component family literacy programs showed very positive results for both children and adults. For example, adults who participated in family literacy programs increased their reading, writing, and math proficiency; oral

communication skills; and their job skills and employment prospects.²⁰² Likewise, some evaluations found that pre-school children increased their literacy skills.²⁰² However, subsequent experimentally-designed evaluations of Even Start have been less encouraging. They showed that Even Start families did not improve more than control group families, many of whom received other early childhood education or adult education services.²⁰³ Family literacy advocates have questioned the methodology of this evaluation.²⁰⁴

Overall, there is good evidence that some family literacy programs can be effective but, in general, effective programs are structured and intensive, and include a focus on adult literacy instruction.^{205,206}

3.4.3 Academic after-school programs

Studies indicate that to be effective, after-school programs that seek to improve participants' academic performance must include direct instruction, one-on-one academic support, and many hours of participation. Recent evaluations of a large after-school program in the U.S. targeting academic performance revealed that regular attendance (over 100 days per year) improved students' math performance but not their language arts performance. There were no academic improvements among students who attended less frequently,²⁰⁷⁻²¹¹

but there was also no relationship between attendance and self-efficacy, collaboration skills, or communication skills.²¹²

Evaluations of other large, multi-site, after-school programs have found that educational and behavioural improvements were associated, in one program, with at least 80 days of attendance over the course of a year;²¹³ and, in another program, with 100 days of attendance for elementary school students and 50 days for junior high students.²¹⁴ Lessons have also been drawn

from evaluation of an intensive summer learning program for low-income elementary school children in the U.S. In this program, participants' literacy skills improved, but apparently not their math skills, social skills or behaviour. The program provided six weeks of programming that included 48 hours of direct instruction and tutoring in math and reading toward a total of 240 hours of participation (including field trips artistic and recreational activities, guest speakers, community service).²¹⁵

3.5. Transition to adulthood for vulnerable youth

The transition to adulthood is challenging for all adolescents. It can be extremely difficult for youth who are also identified as vulnerable. Youth can be vulnerable for the many reasons:

- Family dysfunction
- Social, emotional, and/or behavioural challenges
- Learning or cognitive difficulties
- Language or cultural barriers
- Lack of life and employment skills

And, at the further end of the risk spectrum:

- Aging out of or otherwise leaving the care of child welfare
- Homelessness
- Substance abuse issues.
- Teen pregnancy or parenting
- Criminal involvement²¹⁶

Many youth who experience these serious challenges lack maturity, life skills, and parental guidance and support, which make it very difficult for them to successfully live on their own.²¹⁷

The most effective ways of preventing such problems to intervene earlier in the life course through:

- Home visitation programs
- Early childhood education programs
- Family strengthening programs
- Counselling programs and therapy
- Developmental programs
- Supports for school success and completion
- A range of improvements to the child welfare system
- Other prevention initiatives

However, with a view to preventing the same cycle of poverty, criminality, poor parenting, family dysfunction, and poor child and youth development in the next generation, a brief review of the research is provided below.

Compared to research on interventions for younger children and youth, little rigorous research has been completed on interventions to assist older youth, defined here to include young people aged 18 to 25 years, to successfully transition to adulthood. Experimental evaluations of interventions in the areas of education, employment, and substance abuse indicate that there is no "magic bullet". Some programs are effective for some youth, under some circumstances. It appears that few interventions of any kind for homeless and street-involved youth have been evaluated at all and fewer still have been evaluated using an experimental or quasi-experimental design. This is likely because the transient lifestyles of homeless youth often make it impossible to retain contact with members of a control or comparison group over a period of time.

Learnings from experimental evaluations of large-scale American education and employment programs for vulnerable youth in transition, such as National Guard Youth ChalleNGe, Youth Build, and Job Corps, indicate that more successful programs are high intensity and feature case management and wraparound supports, are of long duration (18 months or more), include many hours of participation (200 to 500 hours), provide childcare, and include specific skills training. Some programs specifically geared toward employment, featuring vocational training, career counselling, and/or job

placement assistance have at least a short-term positive effect. Some have no effect.²¹⁸

The majority of the substance abuse prevention/intervention programs that have been evaluated have been shown to be ineffective or to be effective only for some substances. The few exceptions include the Alcohol Skills Training Program, which has been successful with college students in the United States,²¹⁸⁻²²⁰ and Brief Strategic Family Therapy (although BSFT targets adolescents).^{218,221,222}

The most consistent and, probably, important finding from the research on all programming to assist at-risk youth to successfully transition to adulthood is that, to be effective, interventions must be very intensive, multi-faceted, and allow for repeated failure. And, youth must be "ready" to participate. As observed by Public/Private Ventures, youth who join programs often describe an "awakening" process that prompts them to want change their lives. Youth have to come to a point where they want to "get their lives together" and, often, to identify a specific goal, such as a particular skill or educational achievement that is important to their future, and to be ready to accept help in achieving that goal.¹⁷⁰ Even then, retaining the interest of vulnerable youth in an intervention can be very difficult. "Youth who historically experience a lack of motivation or disillusionment resulting from previous negative exposures often need immediate engagement so that any period of initial optimism can be cultivated, and not wasted."²²⁴

Key principles for effective service delivery to vulnerable youth

In an extensive recent review from Australia, Barker identified some key principles that underlie effective service delivery.²²⁵ Although these principles were identified for youth who are homeless or at risk of homelessness, they appear to be applicable for all highly vulnerable youth.

- **Relationships:** The importance of a relationship between worker and service user(s) cannot be over-emphasized.
- **Collaboration:** Collaboration among service users, their families, other support networks and workers and other service providers, including schools and health services, is vital to understanding and meeting the needs of young people.
- **Strengths-based:** This approach builds on young people's capacity to address risk factors while enhancing resilience. Strength-based approaches "focus on the strengths already possessed by the client and those found within their environment." Best practice evidence articulates that this approach enhances the effectiveness of interventions at any level of intervention.
- **Participation and inclusion:** To be effective in achieving outcomes, including being effective in engaging young people in the first place, interventions need to recognize young people's agency, choice, and self-directive capacities. To engage young people effectively at any level, there needs to be meaningful opportunities, sufficient resources, well informed staff, friendly spaces and flexibility for young people to participate for varying lengths of time.
- **Individually responsive and flexible:** Knowledge of trajectories into homelessness highlights the fact that young people at risk of homelessness are not a homogeneous group for whom one type of intervention will fit all. They are a diverse group with diverse needs.
- **Capacity building:** Capacity building applies not only to building resilience in young people but also to strengthening the workforce established to support young people. Building resilience is an important goal if we are to strengthen capacity and promote skills that help to reduce young

people's vulnerability; developing young people's skill and knowledge to negotiate life transitions and facilitate young people to adapt successfully to change and stressful events.

- **Continuity of care:** To achieve effective transition into "independence" (or out of homelessness), youth may require services into their twenties. This may require flexibility and resources to ensure that young people who need more support do not slip through the cracks.

Additional considerations for youth with disabilities transitioning to adulthood

The myriad publications on transition to adulthood for youth with disabilities generally fall into three main categories:

- The identification of barriers to transition for these youth and the need for better supports and programming.^{226,227}
- Descriptions of programs or guides for parents to assist youth with disabilities to transition.
- Research, usually qualitative, on programs to assist transition in a specific area, such as transition within the health or education systems, or acquiring skills for daily living to increase independence. A paucity of research on evidence-based programs and practice is widely noted.

Drawing on the limited quantitative research in conjunction with feedback obtained via focus groups and meetings with young people with disabilities, parents, community members, service providers, and policy analysts in Ontario, Stewart, et al., produced best practice guidelines for the transition to adulthood for youth with disabilities.^{228,229}

Six key themes: Transition to adulthood for youth with disabilities

1. Collaborative initiatives and policies are necessary supports for the transition to adult life.
2. Building capacity of people and communities will enhance transition process.
3. The role of the "Navigator" within communities facilitates capacity building.
4. Information and resources are available to all involved in the transition process.

5. Education is a critical component of any transition strategy.
6. Ongoing research and evaluation provides the evidence needed for success.

The full, comprehensive guidelines, *The Best Journey to Adult Life For Youth with Disabilities: An Evidence-based Model and Best Practice Guidelines for the Transition to Adulthood for Youth with Disabilities*, are available at McMaster University's CanChild website, at <https://canchild.ca/system/tenon/assets/attachments/000/000/688/original/BJAmodelandbestpracticeguidelinespdf2009.pdf>

2020 update

The original brief described ten types of programs focused on preventing problems and improving developmental outcomes for children and youth. The table below includes the original ten and adds three more types of programs: suicide prevention; substance abuse prevention; and mental health promotion, prevention and resiliency. The table is organized alphabetically by type of intervention. The links provide access to full-text resources as they are available. The table is a curated list of resources relevant to positive child and youth development, it is not a comprehensive catalogue of all research on each topic.

Best practice reviews

At the top of each section we list websites that provide Best Practice Reviews. These are program-overviews and concise summaries of program research/evaluation. Many rate or rank programs using high-level categories like "model plus/model/promising." These sites provide examples of programs that have a strong evidence base. To be included here, organizations that produce the best-practice review have to operate independently from private interests and have a clearly articulated process and quality control. All best-practice review organizations were US-based, although some Canadian-based programs are included in the reviews. No comparable Canadian sites were located.

Additional information

Below the Best Practice Reviews, we provide more detailed information including best-practice guidelines and toolkits, which focus on program implementation, as well as several types of research summaries. These

Positive child and youth development

summaries include literature reviews, which are narrative summaries of existing research on a specific topic, and systematic reviews, which use more rigorous methods to collect and assess studies and synthesize findings. Meta-analyses, which are also included, use a type of statistical analysis that combines the

results of multiple similar scientific studies to determine whether the overall effect is positive or negative. In some sections, examples of new programs with strong published evaluation results are included. Resources included in this section come from peer-reviewed journal articles as well as

well-documented grey literature including that from government agencies, best practice sites, and systematic review organizations (e.g. Cochrane Library, Campbell Collaboration) published since 2013.

What works by type of intervention

Type of intervention	Best practice reviews and additional resources
After-school	<p>Best practice review: Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development²³⁰</p>
	<p>Additional resources: Afterschool Programs: A Review of Evidence Under the Every Student Succeeds Act²³¹ Out-of-School-Time Academic Programs to Improve School Achievement: A Community Guide Health Equity Systematic Review²³² Effects of After-School Programs with At-Risk Youth on Attendance and Externalizing Behaviors: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis²³³ What Works After School? The Relationship Between After-School Program Quality, Program Attendance, and Academic Outcomes²³⁴ Effectiveness of After-School Interventions at Increasing Moderate-to-Vigorous Physical Activity Levels in 5- To 18-Year Olds: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis²³⁵ Aftercare Programs for Reducing Recidivism Among Juvenile and Young Adult Offenders: A Meta-Analytic Review²³⁶ The Value of Out-of-School Time Programs²³⁷</p>
Community-based tutoring	<p>Best practice review: Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development²³⁰</p>
	<p>Additional resource: Improving the Implementation and Effectiveness of Out-of-School-Time Tutoring²³⁸</p>
Early childhood education and programming	<p>Best practice review: Social Programs That Work²³⁹</p>
	<p>Additional resources: Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development²³⁰ California Evidence Based Clearing House for Child Welfare²⁴⁰ Early Childhood Education Projects and Publications (Research for Action, USA)²⁴¹ Early Childhood Development Coming of Age: Science Through the Life Course²⁴² Head Start Cares Demonstration: National Evaluation of Three Approaches to Improving Preschoolers' Social and Emotional Competence, 2009-2015²⁴³ The Tools of the Mind Curriculum for Improving Self Regulation in Early Childhood: A Systematic Review (Campbell Collaboration)²⁴⁴ A Critical Look at Trauma-Informed Care Among Agencies and Systems Serving Maltreated Youth and their Families²⁴⁵ Is the Preschool PATHS Curriculum Effective? A Review²⁴⁶</p>

Positive child and youth development

Type of intervention	Best practice reviews and additional resources
<p>Family literacy</p>	<p>Best practice review: Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development²³⁰</p> <p>Additional resources: The Impact of Family Involvement on the Education of Children Ages 3 To 8: A Focus on Literacy and Math Achievement Outcomes and Social-Emotional Skills (literature review)²⁴⁷ Parent-Mediated Reading Interventions With Children Up To Four Years Old: A Systematic Review²⁴⁸ The Determinants of Father Involvement and Connections to Children’s Literacy and Language Outcomes: Review of the Literature²⁴⁹</p>
<p>Mental health promotion, prevention and resilience</p>	<p>Best practice reviews: California Evidence Based Clearing House for Child Welfare²⁴⁰ Crime Solutions²⁵⁰</p> <p>Additional resources: Systematic Review of Universal Resilience-Focused Interventions Targeting Child and Adolescent Mental Health in the School Setting²⁵¹ A Whole Community Approach Toward Child and Youth Resilience Promotion: A Review of Resilience Literature²⁵² School-Based Mental Health in Canada: A Final Report²⁵³ A Systematic Review of Online Youth Mental Health Promotion and Prevention Interventions²⁵⁴ The Effects of Childhood Maltreatment on Brain Structure, Function and Connectivity²⁵⁵ Preventing the Onset of Child Sexual Abuse by Targeting Young Adolescents with Universal Prevention Programming²⁵⁶ Effectiveness of Psychological and/or Educational Interventions to Prevent the Onset of Episodes of Depression: A Systematic Review of Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses²⁵⁷ A Systematic Review of Strengths and Resilience Outcome Literature Relevant to Children and Adolescents²⁵⁸ Systematic Review of Universal Resilience-Focused Interventions Targeting Child and Adolescent Mental Health in the School Setting²⁵¹ School-Based Programs for Increasing Connectedness and Reducing Risk Behavior: A Systematic Review²⁵⁹ A Systematic Review of the Psychological and Social Benefits of Participation in Sport for Children and Adolescents: Informing Development of a Conceptual Model of Health Through Sport²⁶⁰ Cost-Effectiveness and Affordability of Interventions, Policies, and Platforms for the Prevention and Treatment of Mental, Neurological and Substance Use Disorders²⁶¹ Common Elements of Adolescent Prevention Programs: Minimizing Burden While Maximizing Reach²⁶² A Meta-Analysis of Universal Mental Health Prevention Programs for Higher Education Students²⁶³ Lessons from Iceland: Developing Scalable and Sustainable Community Approaches for the Prevention of Mental Disorders in Young Australians²⁶⁴</p>

Positive child and youth development

Type of intervention	Best practice reviews and additional resources
<p>Mental health treatment (included for informational purposes only as mental health treatment is not within the FCSS mandate)</p>	<p>Best practice reviews: California Evidence Based Clearing House for Child Welfare²⁴⁰ Crime Solutions²⁵⁰</p> <hr/> <p>Additional resources: National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) USA²⁶⁵ Evidence Summaries from National Institute for Health and Care Excellence²⁶⁶ (NICE, UK) Canadian (CANMAT) Guide to Treatment of Depression²⁶⁷ Psychological Treatment of Depression in College Students: A Metaanalysis²⁶⁸ Interventions for Preschool Children at High Risk for ADHD: A Comparative Effectiveness Review²⁶⁹ ADHD in Children and Young People: Prevalence, Care Pathways and Service Provision²⁷⁰ Psychosocial Treatment Efficacy for Disruptive Behavior Problems in Very Young Children: A Meta-Analytic Examination²⁷¹ Assessment and Management of Anxiety Disorders in Children and Adolescents²⁷² Evidence-Based Psychosocial Treatments for Child and Adolescent Bipolar Spectrum Disorders²⁷³ Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists Clinical Practice Guidelines for the Treatment of Eating Disorders²⁷⁴ Emotion Regulation Strategies in Depressive and Anxiety Symptoms in Youth: A Meta-Analytic Review²⁷⁵ Current Issues in Mental Health in Canada: Child and Youth Mental Health²⁷⁶ Interventions for Adolescent Mental Health: An Overview of Systematic Reviews²⁷⁷</p>
<p>Mentoring</p>	<p>Best practice reviews: Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development²³⁰ Crime Solutions²⁵⁰</p> <hr/> <p>Additional resources: Elements of Effective Practice for Mentoring™ (2015)²⁷⁸ LGBTQ²⁷⁹ and STEM²⁸⁰ supplements are also available Mentoring Best Practices Toolkit (YWCA Vancouver)²⁸¹ Literature Review of Mentoring Models for Youth at Risk/Involved in the Justice System²⁸² Mentoring Interventions to Affect Juvenile Delinquency and Associated Problems: A Systematic Review²⁸³ Mentoring Programs to Affect Delinquency and Associated Outcomes of Youth at Risk: A Comprehensive Meta-Analytic Review²⁸⁴ Mentoring Relationships and the Mental Health of Aboriginal Youth in Canada²⁸⁵</p>

Positive child and youth development

Type of intervention	Best practice reviews and additional resources
Substance abuse prevention	<p>Best practice reviews: Social Programs That Work²³⁹ Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development²³⁰ California Evidence Based Clearing House for Child Welfare²⁴⁰ Crime Solutions²⁵⁰</p>
	<p>Additional resources: National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) USA)²⁶⁵ Effectiveness of School-Based Preventive Interventions on Adolescent Alcohol Use: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials²⁸⁶ Text Messaging Interventions for Adolescent and Young Adult Substance Use: A Meta-Analysis²⁸⁷ Implementing the Icelandic Model for Preventing Adolescent Substance Use²⁸⁸ Prevention of Alcohol and Drug Misuse in Adolescents: An Overview of Systematic Reviews²⁸⁹</p>
Suicide prevention	<p>Best practice review: Social Programs That Work²³⁹</p>
	<p>Additional resources: Program for Canada: A Systematic Review of Reviews²⁹⁰ Suicide Prevention Strategies Revisited: 10-Year Systematic Review²⁹¹ Gender Differences in Suicide Prevention Responses: Implications for Adolescents Based on an Illustrative Review of the Literature²⁹² Comparison of the Effects of Telephone Suicide Prevention Help by Volunteers and Professional Paid Staff: Results from Studies in the USA and Quebec, Canada²⁹³ A Systematic Review of School-Based Suicide Prevention Programs²⁹⁴</p>
Transition to adulthood for vulnerable youth	<p>Best practice review: California Evidence Based Clearing House for Child Welfare²⁴⁰</p>
	<p>Additional resources: Promoting Youth Mental Health Through the Transition from High School – Literature Review and Environmental Scan²⁹⁵ Mental Health and Transitions from Adolescence to Emerging Adulthood: Developmental and Diversity Considerations²⁹⁶ Natural Mentoring Among Older Youth In and Out of Foster Care: Systematic Review²⁹⁷ A Systematic Review of Effective Interventions for Reducing Multiple Health Risk Behaviors in Adolescence²⁹⁸ ‘Scared Straight’ and Other Juvenile Awareness Programs for Preventing Juvenile Delinquency (Cochrane Review)²⁹⁹ Effectiveness of Positive Youth Development Interventions: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials³⁰⁰ Practitioner Review: Effective Ingredients of Prevention Programs for Youth at Risk of Persistent Juvenile Delinquency – Recommendations for Clinical Practice³⁰¹ Systematic Reviews of the Effectiveness of Developmental Prevention Programs in Reducing Delinquency, Aggression and Bullying³⁰²</p>

Positive child and youth development

Type of intervention	Best practice reviews and additional resources
Youth with disabilities	<p>Best practice review: What Works Clearinghouse³⁰³</p> <p>Additional resources: Campbell Collaboration Systematic Review: Individualised Funding has Positive Effects on Health and Social Care Outcomes³⁰⁴ Systematic Review of Interventions to Promote Social–Emotional Development in Young Children With or at Risk for Disability³⁰⁵ A Systematic Review of Mentorship Programs to Facilitate Transition to Post-Secondary Education and Employment for Youth and Young Adults with Disabilities³⁰⁶ Transition to Adulthood for Individuals with Autism Spectrum Disorder: Current Issues and Future Perspectives³⁰⁷ Social Skills Training for Youth with Autism Spectrum Disorders: A Follow-Up³⁰⁸ Interventions for Mental Health Problems in People with Learning Disabilities – NICE Pathways³⁰⁹</p>

In this document:

- “Evidence-based” means that a program or practice has been tested in a well-designed and methodologically sound experimental (randomized controlled trial (RCT)) or quasi-experimental study (and, ideally, multiple studies and replicated in more than one site), and has been shown to produce significant reductions in poor outcomes or associated risk factors or significant increases in positive outcomes or associated protective factors.
- “Best practices” refer to programs or components of programs or delivery methods that have been identified as effective (i.e., produce significant reductions in poor outcomes or associated risk factors or significant increases in positive outcomes or associated protective factors) by repeated methodologically sound studies using an experimental (RCT) or quasi-experimental design.
- “Promising practices” refer to programs or components of programs or delivery methods that have been identified as effective (“effective” as defined above) in at least one well-designed and methodologically sound study using at least a pre-post design with a large sample of participants that has been subject to peer review.
- “Prevention” means creating conditions or personal attributes that strengthen the healthy development, wellbeing, and safety of individuals across the lifespan and/or communities, and prevent the onset or further development of problems in each of these domains. In the research-based risk and protection prevention paradigm, prevention occurs by reducing risk factors and increasing protective factors.

Reference list

- ¹ *Early Childhood Development (ECD) Community Information*. Government of Alberta; 2012. www.ecmap.ca/ECMapCommunityResults/CIP_CityofCalgary_Round1_web_20120424.pdf. Accessed December 17, 2012.
- ² Fiester L. *Early Warning! Why Reading by the End of Third Grade Matters*. *KIDS COUNT Special Report*. Annie E Casey Foundation; 2010. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED509795>. Accessed October 22, 2019.
- ³ *Does Readiness Matter?: How Kindergarten Readiness Translates into Academic Success: A Data Report*. San Jose, CA: Santa Clara County Partnership for School Readiness, Applied Survey Research; 2008. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/14717>. Accessed October 22, 2019.
- ⁴ Hernandez DJ. *Double Jeopardy: How Third-Grade Reading Skills and Poverty Influence High School Graduation*. Annie E Casey Foundation; 2011. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED518818>. Accessed October 22, 2019.
- ⁵ Freeman JG, King M, Pickett W, et al. The health of Canada's young people: A mental health focus. 2011. doi:10.1037/e614952012-001
- ⁶ *Calgary and Area Child and Family Services Authority Annual Report 2010-2011*; n.d. www.calgaryandareacfsa.gov.ab.ca/home/621.cfm. Accessed April 5, 2013.
- ⁷ Office of the Child and Youth Advocate. *Child and Youth Advocate Annual Report 2011-12*. Alberta; 2012:52.
- ⁸ Knoke D, Goodman D, Leslie B, Trocmé N. Differences in the Factors Associated with Out-of-Home Placement for Children and Youth. *Canadian Social Work*. 2007:23.
- ⁹ Worthington C, MacLaurin B, Huffey N, et al. *Calgary Youth, Health and the Street – Final Report | The Homeless Hub*. Calgary, Alberta, Canada: The Alberta Homelessness Research Consortium; 2008. <https://www.homelesshub.ca/resource/calgary-youth-health-and-street-%E2%80%93-final-report>. Accessed October 24, 2019.
- ¹⁰ Calgary Board of Education. *High-School-Completion-Rate-for-2011-12.pdf*. <https://www.cbe.ab.ca/about-us/provincial-tests-and-reports/Documents/High-School-Completion-Rate-for-2011-12.pdf#search=completion%20rate>. Accessed October 24, 2019.
- ¹¹ Hankivsky O. *Cost Estimates of Dropping Out of High School in Canada*. Canadian Council on Learning; 2008:85.
- ¹² Calgary Board of Education. *High-School-Completion-Rate-2015-16.pdf*. Calgary Board of Education. <https://cbe.ab.ca/about-us/provincial-tests-and-reports/Documents/High-School-Completion-Rate-2015-16.pdf>. Accessed June 26, 2019.
- ¹³ Alberta Education. *Alberta High School Completion Rate*. Government of Alberta; 2018. <https://open.alberta.ca/dataset/80968b69-c17e-4f26-92c5-eae3b7793ce0/resource/321401a9-85f1-4892-a596-7673157feeb8/download/highschoolcompletionrateonepage-03-28-2018.pdf>. Accessed September 19, 2019.
- ¹⁴ Alberta Health. *Alberta Early Development Instrument Community Profile Report 2016 Data Collection*; 2018:10. https://ecdcoalitions.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/08/EDI_CALCARY-CITYWIDE.pdf.
- ¹⁵ *Type of Child Care Arrangement, Household Population Aged 0 to 5 Years*. Government of Canada Statistics Canada; 2019. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/tv.action?pid=4210000501>. Accessed November 6, 2019.
- ¹⁶ City of Calgary. *Community Profiles*. <http://calgary.ca/communities>. Published 2016. Accessed December 5, 2019.
- ¹⁷ Hango D. *Cyberbullying and Cyberstalking among Internet Users Aged 15 to 29 in Canada*. Government of Canada, Statistics Canada; 2016:17.
- ¹⁸ OECD Social Policy Division. *Teenage suicides (15-19 years old)*. http://www.oecd.org/els/family/CO_4_4_Teenage-Suicide.pdf. Published October 2017.
- ¹⁹ Public Health Agency of Canada. *Suicide in Canada Current Context*. <http://healthycanadians.gc.ca/publications/healthy-living-vie-saine/suicide-canada-infographic/alt/infographic-infographique-eng.pdf>. Accessed September 13, 2019.
- ²⁰ Findlay L. Depression and suicidal ideation among Canadians aged 15 to 24. *Health Reports*. 2017;28(82):11.
- ²¹ Government of Canada SC. *Average counts of young persons in provincial and territorial correctional services*. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/tv.action?pid=3510000301&pickMembers%5B0%5D=1.9>. Published December 27, 2017. Accessed September 9, 2019.
- ²² Government of Canada SC. *Youth admissions to correctional services, by Aboriginal identity and sex*. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/tv.action?pid=3510000701>. Published December 27, 2017. Accessed September 9, 2019.
- ²³ O'Brien Institute for Public Health. *Raising Canada: A Report on Children in Canada, Their Health and Wellbeing*. O'Brien Institute for Public Health; 2018:24. O'Brien Institute for Public Health.
- ²⁴ Black MM, Walker SP, Fernald LCH, et al. Advancing Early Childhood Development: from Science to Scale 1. *Lancet*. 2017;389(10064):77-90. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(16)31389-7
- ²⁵ Blair C, Raver CC. Poverty, Stress, and Brain Development: New Directions for Prevention and Intervention. *Academic Pediatrics*. 2016;16(3):S30-S36. doi:10.1016/j.acap.2016.01.010

- ²⁶ Sigfusdottir ID, Kristjansson AL, Thorlindsson T, Allegrante JP. Stress and adolescent wellbeing: the need for an interdisciplinary framework. *Health Promot Int*. May 2016:daw038. doi:10.1093/heapro/daw038
- ²⁷ Nation M, Crusto C, Wandersman A, et al. What works in prevention: Principles of effective prevention programs. *American Psychologist*. 2003;58(6-7):449-456. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.58.6-7.449
- ²⁸ Street ZTT 1255 23rd, Washington NS 350, Dc 20037638-1144899-4301. Healthy Minds: Nurturing Your Child's Development. ZERO TO THREE. <https://www.zerotothree.org/resources/series/healthy-minds-nurturing-your-child-s-development>. Accessed October 24, 2019.
- ²⁹ Camilli G, Vargas S, Ryan S, Barnett. Meta-Analysis of the Effects of Early Education Interventions on Cognitive and Social Development. *Teachers College Record*. 2010;112(3):579-620.
- ³⁰ Schweinhart LJ, Barnes HV, Weikart DP. *Significant Benefits: The High-Scope Perry Preschool Study through Age 27*. Ypsilanti, MI: High/Scope Press; 1993.
- ³¹ Schweinhart LJ, Montie J, Xiang Z, Barnett WS, Belfield CR, Nores M. The High/Scope Perry Preschool Study Through Age 40. High/Scope Educational Research Foundation; 2005:21. <http://www.peeearlyyears.com/pdf/Research/INTERNATIONAL%20Early%20Years/Perry%20Project.pdf>.
- ³² Heckman J, Pinto R, Savellyev P. Understanding the Mechanisms Through Which an Influential Early Childhood Program Boosted Adult Outcomes. *American Economic Review*. 2013;103(6):2052-2086. doi:10.1257/aer.103.6.2052
- ³³ Domitrovich CE, Cortes RC, Greenberg MT. Improving Young Children's Social and Emotional Competence: A Randomized Trial of the Preschool "PATHS" Curriculum. *J Primary Prevent*. 2007;28(2):67-91. doi:10.1007/s10935-007-0081-0
- ³⁴ Tremblay R, Boivin M, Peters Rd, Melhuish E, eds. Preschool Programs. In: *Encyclopedia on Early Childhood Development*. ; 2012. <http://www.child-encyclopedia.com/preschool-programs>. Accessed October 24, 2019.
- ³⁵ Sylva K, Melhuish E, Sammons P, Siraj-Blatchford I, Taggart B. Pre-school quality and educational outcomes at age 11: Low quality has little benefit. *Journal of Early Childhood Research*. 2011;9(2):109-124. doi:10.1177/1476718X10387900
- ³⁶ Wen X, Leow C, Hahs-Vaughn DL, Korfmacher J, Marcus SM. Are two years better than one year? A propensity score analysis of the impact of Head Start program duration on children's school performance in kindergarten. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*. 2012;27(4):684-694. doi:10.1016/j.ecresq.2011.07.006
- ³⁷ Skibbe LE, Connor CM, Morrison FJ, Jewkes AM. Schooling effects on preschoolers' self-regulation, early literacy, and language growth. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly*. 2011;26(1):42-49. doi:10.1016/j.ecresq.2010.05.001
- ³⁸ Nelson G, Westhues A, MacLeod J. A Meta-Analysis of Longitudinal Research on Preschool Prevention Programs for Children. *Prevention & Treatment*. 2003;6(1). doi:10.1037/1522-3736.6.1.631a
- ³⁹ Reynolds AJ, Magnuson KA, Ou S-R. Preschool-to-third grade programs and practices: A review of research. *Children and Youth Services Review*. 2010;32(8):1121-1131. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2009.10.017
- ⁴⁰ Tout K, Halle T, Daily S, Albertson-Junkans L, Moodie S. *The Research Base for a Birth through Age Eight State Policy Framework*. Alliance for Early Success; 2013:74. <https://www.childtrends.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/2013-42AllianceBirthto81.pdf>.
- ⁴¹ Apsler R. After-school programs for adolescents: a review of evaluation research. *Adolescence*. 2009;44(173):1-19.
- ⁴² Gottfredson DC, Gottfredson GD, Weisman SA. The Timing of Delinquent Behaviors and its Implications for After-School Programs. *Criminology Public Policy*. 2001;1(1):61-86. doi:10.1111/j.1745-9133.2001.tb00077.x
- ⁴³ Education USD of, Justice USD of. *Working for Children and Families: Safe and Smart After-School Programs*. U.S. Department of Education; 2000. https://books.google.ca/books?id=Gir7JTyE_esC.
- ⁴⁴ Feldman AF, Matjasko JL. The Role of School-Based Extracurricular Activities in Adolescent Development: A Comprehensive Review and Future Directions. *Review of Educational Research*. 2005;75(2):159-210.
- ⁴⁵ Tolan P, Henry D, Schoeny M, Bass A. Mentoring Interventions to Affect Juvenile Delinquency and Associated Problems. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*. 2008;4(1):1-112. doi:10.4073/csr.2008.16
- ⁴⁶ DuBois DL, Portillo N, Rhodes JE, Silverthorn N, Valentine JC. How Effective Are Mentoring Programs for Youth? A Systematic Assessment of the Evidence. *Psychol Sci Public Interest*. 2011;12(2):57-91. doi:10.1177/1529100611414806
- ⁴⁷ Leyton-Armakan J, Lawrence E, Deutsch N, Lee Williams J, Henneberger A. Effective Youth Mentors: The Relationship Between Initial Characteristics of College Women Mentors and Mentee Satisfaction and Outcome. *J Community Psychol*. 2012;40(8):906-920. doi:10.1002/jcop.21491
- ⁴⁸ Klinck J, Cardinal C, Edwards K. Mentoring Programs For Aboriginal Youth. *Pimatisiwin: A Journal of Aboriginal and Indigenous Community Health*. 2005;3(2):109-130.
- ⁴⁹ Cole A, Blythe BJ. Mentoring as an Alternative to Therapy for Immigrant and Refugee Youth. *Social Work Review*. 2010;9(3):149-156.

- ⁵⁰ Roffman JG, Suárez-Orozco C, Rhodes JE. Facilitating Positive Development in Immigrant Youth: The Role of Mentors and Community Organizations. In: *Community Youth Development: Programs, Policies, and Practices*. 2455 Teller Road, Thousand Oaks California 91320 United States: SAGE Publications, Inc.; 2003:90-117. doi:10.4135/9781452233635.n5
- ⁵¹ Pryce J, Niederkorn A, Goins M, Reiland M. The development of a youth mentoring program in the south of India. *International Social Work*. 2011;54(1):51-65. doi:10.1177/0020872810372559
- ⁵² Schwartz SEO, Rhodes JE, Chan CS, Herrera C. The impact of school-based mentoring on youths with different relational profiles. *Developmental Psychology*. 2011;47(2):450-462. doi:10.1037/a0021379
- ⁵³ Schwartz SEO, Rhodes JE, Herrera C. The influence of meeting time on academic outcomes in school-based mentoring. *Children and Youth Services Review*. 2012;34(12):2319-2326. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2012.08.012
- ⁵⁴ McQuillin S, Smith B, Strait G. Randomized evaluation of a single semester transitional mentoring program for first year middle school students: a cautionary result for brief, school-based mentoring programs. *J Community Psychol*. 2011;39(7):844-859. doi:10.1002/jcop.20475
- ⁵⁵ Berstein L, Rappaport CD, Olsho L, Hunt D, Levin M. *Impact Evaluation of the U.S. Department of Education's Student Mentoring Program Final Report*. National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education; 2009:295. <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/20094047/pdf/20094047.pdf>.
- ⁵⁶ Karcher MJ. The Study of Mentoring in the Learning Environment (SMILE): A Randomized Evaluation of the Effectiveness of School-based Mentoring. *Prev Sci*. 2008;9(2):99-113. doi:10.1007/s11121-008-0083-z
- ⁵⁷ Rhodes J, Liang B, Spencer R. First do no harm: Ethical principles for youth mentoring relationships. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*. 2009;40(5):452-458. doi:10.1037/a0015073
- ⁵⁸ Rhodes J, Lowe SR. Youth Mentoring and Resilience: Implications for Practice. *Child Care in Practice*. 2008;14(1):9-17. doi:10.1080/13575270701733666
- ⁵⁹ Herrera C, Grossman JB, Kauh TJ, Feldman AF, McMaken J. *Making a Difference in Schools*. Philadelphia, PA: Public/Private Ventures; 2007:142.
- ⁶⁰ Aseltine RH, Dupre M, Lamlein P. Mentoring as a Drug Prevention Strategy: An Evaluation of Across Ages. *Adolescent and family health*. 2000;1(1):11-20.
- ⁶¹ Rhodes JE. Improving Youth Mentoring Interventions Through Research-based Practice. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 2008;41(1-2):35-42. doi:10.1007/s10464-007-9153-9
- ⁶² Rhodes JE, Spencer R. Structuring mentoring relationships for competence, character, and purpose. *New Directions for Youth Development*. 2010;2010(126):149-152. doi:10.1002/yd.356
- ⁶³ *BBBS Social Return on Investment Study Preliminary Results*. The Boston Consulting Group; 2013. <http://www.malhotrafoundation.org/uploads/bbbs-social-return.pdf>.
- ⁶⁴ Fraas M, Bellerose A. Mentoring programme for adolescent survivors of acquired brain injury. *Brain Injury*. 2010;24(1):50-61. doi:10.3109/02699050903446781
- ⁶⁵ Ryerson-Espino S, Ritzler T, Keys C, Balcazar F, Garate-Serafini T, Hayes E. An exploration of employment transition goal pursuing and helping processes among ethnic minority youth with disabilities. 2003.
- ⁶⁶ Powers LE, Sowers J-A, Stevens T. An Exploratory, Randomized Study of the Impact of Mentoring on the Self-Efficacy and Community-Based Knowledge of Adolescents with Severe Physical Challenges. *The Journal of Rehabilitation*. 1995;61(1):33-41.
- ⁶⁷ Shpigelman C-N, (Tamar) Weiss PL, Reiter S. E-Mentoring for All. *Computers in Human Behavior*. 2009;25(4):919-928. doi:10.1016/j.chb.2009.03.007
- ⁶⁸ Shpigelman C-N, Reiter S, Weiss PL. A conceptual framework for electronic socio-emotional support for people with special needs: *International Journal of Rehabilitation Research*. 2009;32(4):301-308. doi:10.1097/MRR.0b013e32831e4519
- ⁶⁹ Stumbo NJ. Evidence-based Practices in Mentoring Students with Disabilities: Four Case Studies. *Journal of Science Education for Students with Disabilities*. 2009;14(1):33-54. doi:10.14448/jksesd.03.0003.
- ⁷⁰ Burgstahler S, Crawford L. Managing an e-mentoring community to support students with disabilities: A case study. *ACE Journal*. 2007;15(2):97-114.
- ⁷¹ Shpigelman C-N, Gill CJ. The Characteristics of Unsuccessful E-Mentoring Relationships for Youth With Disabilities. *Qual Health Res*. 2013;23(4):463-475. doi:10.1177/1049732312469115
- ⁷² Motta RW, McWilliams ME, Schwartz JT, Cavera RS. The Role of Exercise in Reducing Childhood and Adolescent PTSD, Anxiety, and Depression. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*. 2012;28(3):224-238. doi:10.1080/15377903.2012.695765
- ⁷³ Fedewa AL, Ahn S. The Effects of Physical Activity and Physical Fitness on Children's Achievement and Cognitive Outcomes: A Meta-Analysis. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*. 2011;82(3):521-535. doi:10.1080/02701367.2011.10599785

- ⁷⁴ Bailey R. Physical Education and Sport in Schools: A Review of Benefits and Outcomes. *J School Health*. 2006;76(8):397-401. doi:10.1111/j.1746-1561.2006.00132.x
- ⁷⁵ Kirkcaldy BD, Shephard RJ, Siefen RG. The relationship between physical activity and self-image and problem behaviour among adolescents. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*. 2002;37(11):544-550. doi:10.1007/s00127-002-0554-7
- ⁷⁶ Williamson D, Dewey A, Steinberg H. Mood Change through Physical Exercise in Nine- to Ten-Year-Old Children. *Percept Mot Skills*. 2001;93(1):311-316. doi:10.2466/pms.2001.93.1.311
- ⁷⁷ Calfas K. The relationship between physical activity and the psychological wellbeing of youth. In: Rippe JM, ed. *Lifestyle Medicine*; 1999:967-979.
- ⁷⁸ Wells MS, Arthur-Banning SG. The Logic of Youth Development: Constructing a Logic Model of Youth Development through Sport. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*. 2008;26(2). <https://js.sagamorepub.com/jpra/article/view/1330>. Accessed October 24, 2019.
- ⁷⁹ Fraser-Thomas JL, Côté J, Deakin J. Youth sport programs: an avenue to foster positive youth development. *Physical Education & Sport Pedagogy*. 2005;10(1):19-40. doi:10.1080/1740898042000334890
- ⁸⁰ Gould D, Carson S. Life skills development through sport: current status and future directions. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*. 2008;1(1):58-78. doi:10.1080/17509840701834573
- ⁸¹ Mahoney JL, Stattin H, Lord H. Unstructured youth recreation centre participation and antisocial behaviour development: Selection influences and the moderating role of antisocial peers. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*. 2004;28(6):553-560. doi:10.1080/01650250444000270
- ⁸² Osgood DW, Wilson JK, O'Malley PM, Bachman JG, Johnston LD. Routine Activities and Individual Deviant Behavior. *American Sociological Review*. 1996;61(4):635. doi:10.2307/2096397
- ⁸³ Gottfredson DC. Deviancy training: understanding how preventive interventions harm: The Academy of Experimental Criminology 2009 Joan McCord Award Lecture. *J Exp Criminol*. 2010;6(3):229-243. doi:10.1007/s11292-010-9101-9
- ⁸⁴ Wilson DM, Gottfredson DC, Cross AB, Rorie M, Connell N. Youth Development in After-School Leisure Activities. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*. 2010;30(5):668-690. doi:10.1177/0272431609341048
- ⁸⁵ Anderson-Butcher D, Newsome WS, Ferrari TM. Participation in Boys and Girls Clubs and relationships to youth outcomes. *J Community Psychol*. 2003;31(1):39-55. doi:10.1002/jcop.10036
- ⁸⁶ Redd Z, Brooks J, McGarvey A. *Background for Community-Level Work on Educational Adjustment, Achievement and Attainment in Adolescence: A Review of Antecedents, Programs, and Investment Strategies*. Washington, D.C.: John S. and James L. Knight Foundation; 2002.
- ⁸⁷ Hair E, Jager J. *Background for Community-Level Work on Social Competency in Adolescence: A Review of Antecedents, Programs, and Investment Strategies*. Washington, D.C.: John S. and James L. Knight Foundation; 2002.
- ⁸⁸ Hatcher J, Scarpa J. *Background for Community-Level Work on Physical Health and Safety in Adolescence: A Review of Antecedents, Programs, and Investment Strategies*. Washington, D.C.: John S. and James L. Knight Foundation; 2001.
- ⁸⁹ Zaff JF, Calkins J. *Background for Community-Level Work on Mental Health in Adolescence: A Review of Antecedents, Programs, and Investment Strategies*. Washington, D.C.: John S. and James L. Knight Foundation; 2001.
- ⁹⁰ Durlak JA, Weissberg RP. *The Impact of After-School Programs That Promote Personal and Social Skills*. Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning; 2007. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED505368>. Accessed October 25, 2019.
- ⁹¹ Durlak JA, Weissberg RP, Pachan M. A Meta-Analysis of After-School Programs That Seek to Promote Personal and Social Skills in Children and Adolescents. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 2010;45(3-4):294-309. doi:10.1007/s10464-010-9300-6
- ⁹² Roth JL, Malone LM, Brooks-Gunn J. Does the Amount of Participation in Afterschool Programs Relate to Developmental Outcomes? A Review of the Literature. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 2010;45(3-4):310-324. doi:10.1007/s10464-010-9303-3
- ⁹³ Borman GD, Dowling NM. Longitudinal Achievement Effects of Multiyear Summer School: Evidence From the Teach Baltimore Randomized Field Trial. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*. 2006;28(1):25-48. doi:10.3102/01623737028001025
- ⁹⁴ Goerge R, Cusick GR, Wasserman M, Gladden M. *After-School Programs and Academic Impact: A Study of Chicago's After School Matters*. Chapin Hall Center for Children; 2007.
- ⁹⁵ Pearson LM, Russell CA, Reisner ER. *Evaluation of OST Programs for Youth: Patterns of Youth Retention in OST Programs, 2005-06 to 2006-07*. Washington, D.C.: Policy Studies Associates; 2007:23.
- ⁹⁶ Simpkins-Chaput S, Little PMD, Weiss HB. *Understanding and Measuring Attendance in Out-of-School Time Programs*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Family Research Project; 2004. <http://www.statewideafterschoolnetworks.net/understanding-and-measuring-attendance-out-school-time-programs>. Accessed October 25, 2019.

- ⁹⁷ Wong R, Go C, Murdock S, Ed M. Best Practices for Outreach and Retention of Middle School Youth in After-School Programs. April 2002. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228459935_Best_Practices_for_Outreach_and_Retention_of_Middle_School_Youth_in_After-School_Programs.
- ⁹⁸ Vandell DL, Reisner ER, Pierce KM. *Outcomes Linked to High-Quality Afterschool Programs: Longitudinal Findings from the Study of Promising Afterschool Programs*. Irvine, CA and Washington, DC: University of California and Policy Studies Associates; 2007:9.
- ⁹⁹ Egeren LAV, Wu H-C, Yang N-K, Reed CS. Considering Dosage in After-School Programs: Linking Activity Types to Outcomes. Presented at the: American Evaluation Association Meeting; November 2007; Baltimore, MD. <https://cerc.msu.edu/upload/documents/AEA2007Dosage.pdf>.
- ¹⁰⁰ Dietel R. After-School Programs: Finding the Right Dose. *Phi Delta Kappan*. 2009;91(3):62-64. doi:10.1177/003172170909100313
- ¹⁰¹ Shernoff DJ. Engagement in After-School Programs as a Predictor of Social Competence and Academic Performance. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 2010;45(3-4):325-337. doi:10.1007/s10464-010-9314-0
- ¹⁰² Moran TE, Block ME. Barriers to Participation of Children with Disabilities in Youth Sports. *Teaching Exceptional Children Plus*. 2010;6(3):1-13.
- ¹⁰³ Shields N, Synnot AJ, Barr M. Perceived barriers and facilitators to physical activity for children with disability: a systematic review. *Br J Sports Med*. 2012;46(14):989-997. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2011-090236
- ¹⁰⁴ Abells D, Burbidge J, Minnes P. Involvement of adolescents with intellectual disabilities in social and recreational activities. *Journal on Developmental Disabilities*. 2008;14:88-94.
- ¹⁰⁵ Schleien S, Miller K, Shea M. Search for best practices in inclusive recreation: Preliminary findings. *Journal of Park & Recreation Administration*. 2009;27:17-34.
- ¹⁰⁶ Scholl KG, Glanz A, Davison A. Importance-Performance Analysis of Supportive Recreation Inclusion Services: Community Agency Perspective. *Journal of Park and Recreation Administration*. 2006;24(2). <https://js.sagamorepub.com/jpra/article/view/1410>. Accessed October 25, 2019.
- ¹⁰⁷ Miller KD, Schleien SJ, Bowens F. Support Staff as an Essential Component of Inclusive Recreation Services. *Therapeutic Recreation Journal*. 2010;44(1):35-49.
- ¹⁰⁸ Zambo DM. Strategies to Enhance the Social Identities and Social Networks of Adolescent Students with Disabilities. *TEACHING Exceptional Children*. 2010;43(2):28-35. doi:10.1177/004005991004300203
- ¹⁰⁹ Cunha F, Heckman JJ. Formulating, Identifying and Estimating the Technology of Cognitive and Noncognitive Skill Formation. *J Human Resources*. 2008;43(4):738-782. doi:10.3368/jhr.43.4.738
- ¹¹⁰ Moffitt TE, Arseneault L, Belsky D, et al. A gradient of childhood self-control predicts health, wealth, and public safety. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2011;108(7):2693-2698. doi:10.1073/pnas.1010076108
- ¹¹¹ Slutske WS, Moffitt TE, Poulton R, Caspi A. Undercontrolled Temperament at Age 3 Predicts Disordered Gambling at Age 32: A Longitudinal Study of a Complete Birth Cohort. *Psychol Sci*. 2012;23(5):510-516. doi:10.1177/0956797611429708
- ¹¹² Blair C, Diamond A. Biological processes in prevention and intervention: The promotion of self-regulation as a means of preventing school failure. *Dev Psychopathol*. 2008;20(3):899-911. doi:10.1017/S0954579408000436
- ¹¹³ Schonert-Reichel K (University of BC. Personal communication with Merrill Cooper (author of 2014 Research Brief). n.d.
- ¹¹⁴ CASEL - CASEL. <https://casel.org/>. Accessed October 25, 2019.
- ¹¹⁵ Durlak JA, Weissberg RP, Dymnicki AB, Taylor RD, Schellinger KB. The Impact of Enhancing Students' Social and Emotional Learning: A Meta-Analysis of School-Based Universal Interventions: Social and Emotional Learning. *Child Development*. 2011;82(1):405-432. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01564.x
- ¹¹⁶ Payton J. *The Positive Impact of Social and Emotional Learning for Kindergarten to Eighth-Grade Students: Findings from Three Scientific Reviews*. Chicago, IL: Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning; 2008:50.
- ¹¹⁷ Schonert-Reichl K, O'Brien M. Social and emotional learning and prosocial education: Theory, research, and programs. In: Higgins-D'Alessandro A, Corrigan M, Brown P, eds. *The Case for Prosocial Education: Developing Caring, Capable Citizens*. Vol 1. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield; 2012:311-345.
- ¹¹⁸ *School-Based Mental Health and Substance Abuse: A Review of Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses* |. Calgary, Alberta, Canada: Mental Health Commission of Canada, School-based Mental Health and Substance Abuse Consortium (SBMHSA); 2012. <https://www.mentalhealthcommission.ca/English/media/3149>. Accessed October 25, 2019.
- ¹¹⁹ Elksnin LK, Elksnin N. The Social-Emotional Side of Learning Disabilities. *Learning Disability Quarterly*. 2004;27(1):3-8. doi:10.2307/1593627
- ¹²⁰ Turner HA, Vanderminden J, Finkelhor D, Hamby S, Shattuck A. Disability and Victimization in a National Sample of Children and Youth. *Child Maltreat*. 2011;16(4):275-286. doi:10.1177/1077559511427178

- ¹²¹ Jones L, Bellis MA, Wood S, et al. Prevalence and risk of violence against children with disabilities: a systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. *The Lancet*. 2012;380(9845):899-907. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60692-8
- ¹²² Rose CA, Espelage DL, Monda-Amaya LE. Bullying and victimisation rates among students in general and special education: a comparative analysis. *Educational Psychology*. 2009;29(7):761-776. doi:10.1080/01443410903254864
- ¹²³ Mishna F. Learning Disabilities and Bullying: Double Jeopardy. *J Learn Disabil*. 2003;36(4):336-347. doi:10.1177/00222194030360040501
- ¹²⁴ DiGennaro Reed FD, McIntyre LL, Dusek J, Quintero N. Preliminary Assessment of Friendship, Problem Behavior, and Social Adjustment in Children with Disabilities in an Inclusive Education Setting. *J Dev Phys Disabil*. 2011;23(6):477-489. doi:10.1007/s10882-011-9236-2
- ¹²⁵ Hurst C, Corning K, Ferrante R. Children's Acceptance of Others with Disability: The Influence of a Disability-Simulation Program. *J Genet Counsel*. 2012;21(6):873-883. doi:10.1007/s10897-012-9516-8
- ¹²⁶ Fiasse C, Nader-Grosbois N. Perceived social acceptance, theory of mind and social adjustment in children with intellectual disabilities. *Research in Developmental Disabilities*. 2012;33(6):1871-1880. doi:10.1016/j.ridd.2012.05.017
- ¹²⁷ Zion E, Jenvey VB. Temperament and social behaviour at home and school among typically developing children and children with an intellectually disability. *J Intellect Disabil Res*. 2006;50(6):445-456. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2788.2006.00790.x
- ¹²⁸ Guralnick MJ, Connor RT, Neville B, Hammond MA. Promoting the Peer-Related Social Development of Young Children With Mild Developmental Delays: Effectiveness of a Comprehensive Intervention. *Am J Ment Retard*. 2006;111(5):336-356. doi:10.1352/0895-8017(2006)111[336:PTPSDO]2.0.CO;2
- ¹²⁹ Crnic K, Hoffman C, Gaze C, Edelbrock C. Understanding the Emergence of Behavior Problems in Young Children With Developmental Delays: *Infants & Young Children*. 2004;17(3):223-235. doi:10.1097/00001163-200407000-00004
- ¹³⁰ Gumpel TP. Behavioral Disorders in the School: Participant Roles and Sub-Roles in Three Types of School Violence. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*. 2008;16(3):145-162. doi:10.1177/1063426607310846
- ¹³¹ Alwell M, Cobb B. Social and Communicative Interventions and Transition Outcomes for Youth with Disabilities: A Systematic Review. *Career Development for Exceptional Individuals*. 2009;32(2):94-107. doi:10.1177/0885728809336657
- ¹³² Hughes C, Kaplan L, Bernstein R, et al. Increasing Social Interaction Skills of Secondary School Students with Autism and/or Intellectual Disability: A Review of Interventions. *Research and Practice for Persons with Severe Disabilities*. 2012;37(4):288-307. doi:10.2511/027494813805327214
- ¹³³ Cook CR, Gresham FM, Kern L, Barreras RB, Thornton S, Crews SD. Social Skills Training for Secondary Students With Emotional and/or Behavioral Disorders: A Review and Analysis of the Meta-Analytic Literature. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*. 2008;16(3):131-144. doi:10.1177/1063426608314541
- ¹³⁴ Wang P, Spillane AP. Evidence-Based Social Skills Interventions for Children with Autism: A Meta-analysis. *Education and Training in Developmental Disabilities*. 2009;44(3):318-342.
- ¹³⁵ Gallagher PA, Floyd JH, Stafford AM, Taber TA, Brozovic SA, Alberto PA. Inclusion of Students with Moderate or Severe Disabilities in Educational and Community Settings: Perspectives from Parents and Siblings. *Education and Training in Mental Retardation and Developmental Disabilities*. 2000;35(2):135-147.
- ¹³⁶ Solish A, Minnes P, Kupferschmidt A. Integration of Children with Developmental Disabilities in Social Activities. *Journal on Developmental Disabilities*. 2003;10(1):115-121.
- ¹³⁷ Carter EW, Hughes C, Guth CB, Copeland SR. Factors Influencing Social Interaction Among High School Students With Intellectual Disabilities and Their General Education Peers. *Am J Mental Retard*. 2005;110(5):366. doi:10.1352/0895-8017(2005)110[366:FISIAH]2.0.CO;2
- ¹³⁸ Kessler RC, Chiu WT, Demler O, Walters EE. Prevalence, Severity, and Comorbidity of 12-Month DSM-IV Disorders in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2005;62(6):617. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.62.6.617
- ¹³⁹ Effective Child Therapy: Evidence based mental health treatment for children and adolescents - Anxiety Problems and Disorders. Effective Child Therapy. <http://www.effectivechildtherapy.com/content/anxiety-problems-disorders>. Accessed October 10, 2012.
- ¹⁴⁰ Silverman WK, Pina AA, Viswesvaran C. Evidence-Based Psychosocial Treatments for Phobic and Anxiety Disorders in Children and Adolescents. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*. 2008;37(1):105-130. doi:10.1080/15374410701817907
- ¹⁴¹ Effective Child Therapy: Evidence based mental health treatment for children and adolescents - Obsessions and Compulsions. Effective Child Therapy. <http://www.effectivechildtherapy.com/content/obsessions-compulsions>. Accessed October 10, 2012.
- ¹⁴² Barrett PM, Farrell L, Pina AA, Peris TS, Piacentini J. Evidence-Based Psychosocial Treatments for Child and Adolescent Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*. 2008;37(1):131-155. doi:10.1080/15374410701817956
- ¹⁴³ Effective Child Therapy: Evidence based mental health treatment for children and adolescents - Posttraumatic Stress. Effective Child Therapy. <http://www.effectivechildtherapy.com/content/posttraumatic-stress>. Accessed October 10, 2012.

- ¹⁴⁴ Silverman WK, Ortiz CD, Viswesvaran C, et al. Evidence-Based Psychosocial Treatments for Children and Adolescents Exposed to Traumatic Events. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*. 2008;37(1):156-183. doi:10.1080/15374410701818293
- ¹⁴⁵ Effective Child Therapy: Evidence based mental health treatment for children and adolescents - Depression related disorders. Effective Child Therapy. from <http://www.effectivechildtherapy.com/content/depression-related-disorders>. Accessed October 10, 2012.
- ¹⁴⁶ David-Ferdon C, Kaslow NJ. Evidence-Based Psychosocial Treatments for Child and Adolescent Depression. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*. 2008;37(1):62-104. doi:10.1080/15374410701817865
- ¹⁴⁷ Effective Child Therapy: Evidence based mental health treatment for children and adolescents - Inattention and Hyperactivity. Effective Child Therapy. <http://www.effectivechildtherapy.com/content/inattention-hyperactivity>. Accessed October 10, 2012.
- ¹⁴⁸ Pelham WE, Fabiano GA. Evidence-Based Psychosocial Treatments for Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*. 2008;37(1):184-214. doi:10.1080/15374410701818681
- ¹⁴⁹ Eyberg SM, Nelson MM, Boggs SR. Evidence-Based Psychosocial Treatments for Children and Adolescents With Disruptive Behavior. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*. 2008;37(1):215-237. doi:10.1080/15374410701820117
- ¹⁵⁰ Effective Child Therapy: Evidence based mental health treatment for children and adolescents - Disruptive behavior problems. Effective Child Therapy. <http://www.effectivechildtherapy.com/content/disruptive-behavior-problems>. Accessed October 10, 2012.
- ¹⁵¹ Effective Child Therapy: Evidence based mental health treatment for children and adolescents - Substance abuse and dependence. Effective Child Therapy. <http://www.effectivechildtherapy.com/content/substance-abuse-dependence>. Accessed October 10, 2012.
- ¹⁵² Waldron HB, Turner CW. Evidence-Based Psychosocial Treatments for Adolescent Substance Abuse. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*. 2008;37(1):238-261. doi:10.1080/15374410701820133
- ¹⁵³ Effective Child Therapy: Evidence based mental health treatment for children and adolescents - Anorexia and eating disorders. Effective Child Therapy. <http://effectivechildtherapy.com/content/anorexia-nervosa>. Accessed October 10, 2012.
- ¹⁵⁴ Keel PK, Haedt A. Evidence-Based Psychosocial Treatments for Eating Problems and Eating Disorders. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*. 2008;37(1):39-61. doi:10.1080/15374410701817832
- ¹⁵⁵ Effective Child Therapy: Evidence based mental health treatment for children and adolescents - Bipolar. Effective Child Therapy. <http://www.effectivechildtherapy.com/content/bipolar-disorder>. Accessed October 10, 2012.
- ¹⁵⁶ Fristad MA, Verducci JS, Walters K, Young ME. Impact of Multifamily Psychoeducational Psychotherapy in Treating Children Aged 8 to 12 Years With Mood Disorders. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2009;66(9):1013-1021. doi:10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2009.112
- ¹⁵⁷ Goldstein TR, Axelson DA, Birmaher B, Brent DA. Dialectical Behavior Therapy for Adolescents With Bipolar Disorder: A 1-Year Open Trial. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*. 2007;46(7):820-830. doi:10.1097/chi.0b013e31805c1613
- ¹⁵⁸ Miklowitz DJ, Axelson DA, Birmaher B, et al. Family-Focused Treatment for Adolescents With Bipolar Disorder: Results of a 2-Year Randomized Trial. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2008;65(9):1053-1061. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.65.9.1053
- ¹⁵⁹ West AE, Jacobs RH, Westerholm R, et al. Child and family-focused cognitive-behavioral therapy for pediatric bipolar disorder: pilot study of group treatment format. *J Can Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2009;18(3):239-246.
- ¹⁶⁰ Young ME, Fristad MA. Evidence Based Treatments for Bipolar Disorder in Children and Adolescents. *J Contemp Psychother*. 2007;37(3):157-164. doi:10.1007/s10879-007-9050-4
- ¹⁶¹ Effective Child Therapy: Evidence based mental health treatment for children and adolescents - Autism spectrum disorders. Effective Child Therapy. <http://www.effectivechildtherapy.com/content/autism-spectrum-disorders>. Accessed October 10, 2012.
- ¹⁶² Rogers SJ, Vismara LA. Evidence-based comprehensive treatments for early autism. *J Clin Child Adolesc Psychol*. 2008;37(1):8-38. doi:10.1080/15374410701817808
- ¹⁶³ Kolaitis G. Young people with intellectual disabilities and mental health needs. *Current Opinion in Psychiatry*. 2008;21(5):469. doi:10.1097/YCO.0b013e3283060a7b
- ¹⁶⁴ *Mental Health and Intellectual Disabilities: Addressing the Mental Health Needs of People with Intellectual Disabilities*. Mental Health Special Interest Group of the International Association for the Scientific Study of Intellectual Disabilities; 2001. <http://www.iassid.org/pdf/mh-sirg-who-final.pdf>. Accessed October 10, 2012.
- ¹⁶⁵ Brown M, Duff H, Karatzias T, Horsburgh D. A review of the literature relating to psychological interventions and people with intellectual disabilities: Issues for research, policy, education and clinical practice. *J Intellect Disabil*. 2011;15(1):31-45. doi:10.1177/1744629511401166
- ¹⁶⁶ Programs That Work. "Reading Recovery." Promising Practices Network. <http://www.promisingpractices.net/program.asp?programid=69>. Accessed January 15, 2013.
- ¹⁶⁷ Ehri LC, Dreyer LG, Flugman B, Gross A. Reading Rescue: An Effective Tutoring Intervention Model for Language-Minority Students Who Are Struggling Readers in First Grade. *American Educational Research Journal*. 2007;44(2):414-448. doi:10.3102/0002831207302175

- ¹⁶⁸ Muñoz MA, Chang F, Ross SM. No Child Left Behind and Tutoring in Reading and Mathematics: Impact of Supplemental Educational Services on Large Scale Assessment. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)*. 2012;17(3):186-200. doi:10.1080/10824669.2012.688170
- ¹⁶⁹ Chappell S, Nunnery J, Pribesh S, Hager J. A Meta-Analysis of Supplemental Educational Services (SES) Provider Effects on Student Achievement. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk (JESPAR)*. 2011;16(1):1-23. doi:10.1080/10824669.2011.554140
- ¹⁷⁰ Viadero D. Evidence Thin on Student Gains From NCLB Tutoring - Education Week. *Education Week*. 2007;26(41). <https://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2007/06/13/41ses.h26.html>. Accessed October 25, 2019.
- ¹⁷¹ Gordon EE. 5 Ways to Improve Tutoring Programs. *Phi Delta Kappan*. 2009;90(6):440-445. doi:10.1177/003172170909000614
- ¹⁷² Fashola OS. *Review of Extended-Day and After-School Programs and Their Effectiveness*. Report No. 24. Baltimore, MD: Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk; 1998. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED424343>. Accessed October 25, 2019.
- ¹⁷³ Gordon EE, Morgan RR, Ponticell JA, O'Malley CJ. Tutoring Solutions for No Child Left Behind: Research, Practice, and Policy Implications. *NASSP Bulletin*. 2004;88(638):59-68. doi:10.1177/019263650408863805
- ¹⁷⁴ Jung E, Molfese VJ, Larson AE. More than Good Intentioned Help: Volunteer Tutoring and Elementary Readers. *Mentoring & Tutoring: Partnership in Learning*. 2011;19(3):277-299. doi:10.1080/13611267.2011.597119
- ¹⁷⁵ Burns MK, Senesac BV, Symington T. The effectiveness of the hosts program in improving the reading achievement of children at-risk for reading failure. *Reading Research and Instruction*. 2003;43(2):87-103. doi:10.1080/19388070409558406
- ¹⁷⁶ Pascopella A. Signs of improvement with SES. *District Administration*. 2004;40(6):21-22.
- ¹⁷⁷ Power MA, Cummings K. *The Effectiveness of One-on-One Tutoring in Elementary School*. Tacoma Read 2 Me.org; 2011. [http://www.wera-web.org/activities/WERA_Winter11/2.8 per cent20Final per cent20Read per cent202 per cent20Me per cent20Research per cent20Report per cent204-28-2011.pdf](http://www.wera-web.org/activities/WERA_Winter11/2.8%20per%20cent20Final%20per%20cent20Read%20per%20cent20Me%20per%20cent20Research%20per%20cent20Report%204-28-2011.pdf). Accessed December 15, 2012.
- ¹⁷⁸ Lauer PA, Akiba M, Wilkerson SB, Apthorp HS, Snow D, Martin-Glenn M. *The Effectiveness of Out-of-School-Time Strategies in Assisting Low-Achieving Students in Reading and Mathematics: A Research Synthesis. Updated*. Aurora, CO: Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning; 2004. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/7eac/12b6866c419d3e793e1750a8e79cd9736b34.pdf>.
- ¹⁷⁹ van Steensel R. Relations between socio-cultural factors, the home literacy environment and children's literacy development in the first years of primary education. *J Research in Reading*. 2006;29(4):367-382. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9817.2006.00301.x
- ¹⁸⁰ Willms JD, Canada, eds. *Vulnerable Children: Findings from Canada's National Longitudinal Survey of Children and Youth*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press; 2002.
- ¹⁸¹ Purcell-Gates V. Stories, Coupons, and the TV Guide: Relationships Between Home Literacy Experiences and Emergent Literacy Knowledge. *Reading Research Quarterly*. 1996;31(4):406-428. doi:10.1598/RRQ.31.4.4
- ¹⁸² Lynch J. Print Literacy Engagement of Parents from Low-Income Backgrounds: Implications for Adult and Family Literacy Programs. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*. 2009;52(6):509-521.
- ¹⁸³ Kogut BH. Why Adult Literacy Matters. *Phi Kappa Phi Forum*. 2004;82(2):26-28.
- ¹⁸⁴ *Start Early, Finish Strong: How to Help Every Child Become a Reader*. Washington, D.C.: US Department of Education; 1999. <https://www2.ed.gov/pubs/startearly/index.html>. Accessed October 25, 2019.
- ¹⁸⁵ Kohen DE, Hertzman C, Brooks-Gunn J, Canada, Human Resources Development Canada, Applied Research Branch. *Neighbourhood influences on children's school readiness*. Hull, Quebec: Human Resources Development Canada, Applied Research Branch; 1998.
- ¹⁸⁶ McCoach DB, O'Connell AA, Reis SM, Levitt HA. Growing readers: A hierarchical linear model of children's reading growth during the first 2 years of school. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 2006;98(1):14-28. doi:10.1037/0022-0663.98.1.14
- ¹⁸⁷ Coulombe S, Tremblay J-F, Marchand S. *Literacy Scores, Human Capital and Growth across Fourteen OECD Countries*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada; 2004.
- ¹⁸⁸ Rootman I. *National Literacy and Health Research Program: Needs Assessment and Environmental Scan*. Canadian Public Health Association; 2002.
- ¹⁸⁹ Rootman I, Ronson B. Literacy and health research in Canada: where have we been and where should we go? *Canadian journal of public health = Revue canadienne de sante publique*. 2005;96. doi:10.17269/cjph.96.1495
- ¹⁹⁰ Rootman I. Critical Issues in Literacy and Health. *Literacy Across the Curriculum Focus*. 2004;17(2):8-10.
- ¹⁹¹ Gillis D, Quigley A. *Taking Off the Blindfold: Seeing How Literacy Affects Health*. Nova Scotia, Canada: Health Literacy in Rural Nova Scotia Research Project; 2004:33. <http://en.copian.ca/library/research/takngoff/takngoff.pdf>. Accessed October 25, 2019.
- ¹⁹² Balatti J, Black S, Falk I. *Reframing Adult Literacy and Numeracy Course Outcomes: A Social Capital Perspective*. Adelaide, SA, Australia: National Centre for Vocational Education Research; 2006. https://www.ncver.edu.au/__data/assets/file/0020/4934/nr4105.pdf.

Positive child and youth development

- ¹⁹³ Finnie RE, Meng R. *The Importance of Functional Literacy: Reading and Math Skills and Labour Market Outcomes of High School Drop-Outs*. Ottawa, Ontario; 2006. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/pub/11f0019m/11f0019m2006275-eng.pdf?st=fQKpcu8B>.
- ¹⁹⁴ Kennedy L. *Mapping the Field of Family Literacy in Canada*. Ottawa, Ontario: Movement for Canadian Literacy; 2008:47. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED513902.pdf>.
- ¹⁹⁵ Thomas A, ed. *Family Literacy in Canada: Profiles of Effective Practices*. Welland, Ont.: Éditions Soleil Pub.; 1998. <http://en.copian.ca/library/research/family/familit/liteng.pdf>.
- ¹⁹⁶ *The Parent-Child Literacy Strategy (PCLS) Background*. Alberta Learning; n.d. <http://learning.gov.ab.ca/other/literacy/PCLSBackgrounder.pdf>.
- ¹⁹⁷ Phillips LM, Hayden R, Norris SP. *Family Literacy Matters: A Longitudinal Parent-Child Literacy Intervention Study*. Calgary, Alberta: Detselig Enterprises; 2006.
- ¹⁹⁸ Timmons V. Challenges in researching family literacy programs. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie canadienne*. 2008;49(2):96-102. doi:10.1037/0708-5591.49.2.96
- ¹⁹⁹ Timmons V. *Families Learning Together: A Family Literacy Initiative at Cardigan Consolidated School*. Charlottetown, PEI: Prince Edward Island Department of Education; 2006:27.
- ²⁰⁰ *Literacy Involves Families Together Act*. Vol H.R.3222.; 2000.
- ²⁰¹ Logan B, Peyton T, Read C, McMaster J, Botkins R. *Family Literacy: A Strategy for Educational Improvement**. National Governors' Association Center for Best Practices; 2002:8. <https://www.bridges4kids.org/articles/2002/12-02/NGAliteracy12-02.pdf>.
- ²⁰² Padak N, Sapin C, Baycich D. *A Decade of Family Literacy: Programs, Outcomes, and Future Prospects*. Information Series.; 2002. http://archive.org/details/ERIC_ED465074. Accessed October 25, 2019.
- ²⁰³ St. Pierre R, Ricciuti A, Tao F, et al. *Third National Even Start Evaluation: Program Impacts and Implications for Improvement*. Washington, D.C.: US Department of Education; 2003. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED475962>. Accessed October 25, 2019.
- ²⁰⁴ Weirauch D. *Even Start Revisited: A Counter to the Third National Even Start Evaluation Program Impacts and Implications for Improvement*. PA: Goodling Institute for Research in Family Literacy, Pennsylvania State University; 2003.
- ²⁰⁵ Anderson J, Anderson A, Friedrich N, Ji Eun Kim. Taking stock of family literacy: Some contemporary perspectives. *Journal of Early Childhood Literacy*. 2010;10(1):33-53. doi:10.1177/1468798409357387
- ²⁰⁶ van Steensel R, McElvany N, Kurvers J, Herppich S. How Effective Are Family Literacy Programs?: Results of a Meta-Analysis. *Review of Educational Research*. 2011;81(1):69-96. doi:10.3102/0034654310388819
- ²⁰⁷ Huang D, Leon S, Harven AM, La Torre D, Mostafavi S. *Exploring the Relationships between LA's BEST Program Attendance and Cognitive Gains of LA's BEST Students*. Los Angeles, CA: University of California–Los Angeles, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST); 2009. <http://cresst.org/wp-content/uploads/R757.pdf>.
- ²⁰⁸ Huang D, Cho J, Nam HH, Oh C, Harven A, Leon S. What Works? *Common Practices in High Functioning Afterschool Programs Across the Nation in Math, Reading, Science, Arts, Technology, and Homework - A Study by the National Partnership*. University of California–Los Angeles, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST); 2010:152. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED512654.pdf>.
- ²⁰⁹ Sheldon J, Arbreton A, Hopkins L, Grossman JB. Investing in Success: Key Strategies for Building Quality in After-School Programs. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 2010;45(3-4):394-404. doi:10.1007/s10464-010-9296-y
- ²¹⁰ Yohalem N, Wilson-Ahlstrom A. Inside the Black Box: Assessing and Improving Quality in Youth Programs. *American Journal of Community Psychology*. 2010;45(3-4):350-357. doi:10.1007/s10464-010-9311-3
- ²¹¹ Pierce KM, Bolt DM, Vandell DL. Specific features of after-school program quality: associations with children's functioning in middle childhood. *Am J Community Psychol*. 2010;45(3-4):381-393. doi:10.1007/s10464-010-9304-2
- ²¹² Huang D, Leon S, Hodson C, La Torre D, Obregon N, Rivera G. *Preparing Students for the 21st Century: Exploring the Effect of Afterschool Participation on Students' Collaboration Skills, Oral Communication Skills, and Self-Efficacy*. University of California–Los Angeles, National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST); 2010. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED520429.pdf>.
- ²¹³ Welsh M, Russell CA, Williams IJ, Reisner ElizabethR, White RN. *Promoting Learning and School Attendance through After-School Programs: Student-Level Changes in Educational Performance across TASC's First Three Years*. New York: The After-School Corporation; 2002. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/14094>. Accessed October 28, 2019.
- ²¹⁴ Frankel S, Daley G. *An Evaluation of After School Programs Provided by Beyond the Bell's Partner Agencies: Executive Summary and Synopsis of Methodology and Findings*. New York, NY: Partnership for After School Education; 2007. <http://www.passetter.org/reframe/documents/RRobertsSynopsisMethodologyFindings.pdf>. Accessed December 11, 2009.
- ²¹⁵ Chaplin D, Capizzano J. *Impacts of a Summer Learning Program: A Random Assignment Study of Building Educated Leaders for Life (BELL)*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute. Urban Institute; 2006. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED493056.pdf>.

- ²¹⁶ Lerner RM, Galambos NL. Adolescent development: challenges and opportunities for research, programs, and policies. *Annu Rev Psychol.* 1998;49:413-446. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.49.1.413
- ²¹⁷ Amy. Supporting homeless youth during the transition to adulthood: Housing-based independent living programs. *The Prevention Researcher.* 2010;17(2):17-20.
- ²¹⁸ Hadley AM, Mbwana K, Hair EC. What Works for Older Youth during the Transition to Adulthood: Lessons from Experimental Evaluations of Programs and Interventions: (531372010-001). American Psychological Association; 2010. doi:10.1037/e531372010-001
- ²¹⁹ Baer JS, Marlatt GA, Kivlahan DR, Fromme K, Larimer ME, Williams E. An experimental test of three methods of alcohol risk reduction with young adults. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology.* 1992;60(6):974-979. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.60.6.974
- ²²⁰ Kivlahan DR, Marlatt GA, Fromme K, Coppel DB, Williams E. Secondary prevention with college drinkers: Evaluation of an alcohol skills training program. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology.* 1990;58(6):805-810. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.58.6.805
- ²²¹ Santisteban DA, Szapocznik J, Perez-Vidal A, Kurtines WM, Murray EJ, LaPerriere A. Efficacy of intervention for engaging youth and families into treatment and some variables that may contribute to differential effectiveness. *Journal of Family Psychology.* 1996;10(1):35-44. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.10.1.35
- ²²² Szapocznik J, Perez-Vidal A, Brickman AL, et al. Engaging adolescent drug abusers and their families in treatment: A strategic structural systems approach. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology.* 1988;56(4):552-557. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.56.4.552
- ²²³ *Serving High-Risk Youth Lessons from Research and Programming.* Public/Private Ventures; 2002. <https://hewlett.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/08/ServingHighRiskYouth.pdf>. Accessed October 28, 2019.
- ²²⁴ Piiparinen R. Towards an Evidence-Based Approach to Dropout Recovery: A Model for Community Agencies. *Journal of At-Risk Issues.* 2006;12(2):17-23.
- ²²⁵ Barker J, Humphries P, McArthur M, Thomson L. *Literature Review: Effective Interventions for Working with Young People Who Are Homeless or at Risk of Homelessness.* Australian Government Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs (FaHCSIA; 2012. https://www.dss.gov.au/sites/default/files/documents/06_2012/literature_review.pdf. Accessed October 28, 2019.
- ²²⁶ *Young Adults with Developmental Disabilities: Transition for High School to Adult Life.* Literature and Initial Program Review. Vancouver, BC: School of Social Work and Family Studies, University of British Columbia; 2006.
- ²²⁷ Beresford B. On the road to nowhere? Young disabled people and transition. *Child Care Health Dev.* 2004;30(6):581-587. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2214.2004.00469.x
- ²²⁸ Stewart D. Transition to adult services for young people with disabilities: current evidence to guide future research. *Developmental Medicine & Child Neurology.* 2009;51:169-173. doi:10.1111/j.1469-8749.2009.03419.x
- ²²⁹ Stewart D, Stavness C, King G, Antle B, Law M. A critical appraisal of literature reviews about the transition to adulthood for youth with disabilities. *Phys Occup Ther Pediatr.* 2006;26(4):5-24.
- ²³⁰ Blueprints for Healthy Youth Development. <https://www.blueprintsprograms.org/program-search/>. Accessed October 18, 2019.
- ²³¹ Neild RC, Wilson SJ, McClanahan W. Afterschool Programs: A Review of Evidence Under the Every Student Succeeds Act. Philadelphia, PA: Research for Action; 2019:396.
- ²³² Knopf JA, Hahn RA, Proia KK, et al. Out-of-School-Time Academic Programs to Improve School Achievement: A Community Guide Health Equity Systematic Review. *J Public Health Manag Pract.* 2015;21(6):594-608. doi:10.1097/PHH.0000000000000268
- ²³³ Kremer KP, Maynard BR, Polanin JR, Vaughn MG, Sarteschi CM. Effects of After-School Programs with At-Risk Youth on Attendance and Externalizing Behaviors: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Youth Adolesc.* 2015;44(3):616-636. doi:10.1007/s10964-014-0226-4
- ²³⁴ Leos-Urbel J. What Works After School? The Relationship Between After-School Program Quality, Program Attendance, and Academic Outcomes. *Youth & Society.* 2015;47(5):684-706. doi:10.1177/0044118X13513478
- ²³⁵ Mears R, Jago R. Effectiveness of after-school interventions at increasing moderate-to-vigorous physical activity levels in 5- to 18-year olds: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Br J Sports Med.* 2016;50(21):1315-1324. doi:10.1136/bjsports-2015-094976
- ²³⁶ James C, Stams GJJM, Asscher JJ, De Roo AK, der Laan PH van. Aftercare programs for reducing recidivism among juvenile and young adult offenders: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review.* 2013;33(2):263-274. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2012.10.013
- ²³⁷ The Value of Out-of-School Time Programs. <https://www.wallacefoundation.org/knowledge-center/pages/the-value-of-out-of-school-time-programs.aspx>. Accessed July 19, 2019.
- ²³⁸ Heinrich CJ, Burch P, Good A, et al. Improving the Implementation and Effectiveness of Out-of-School-Time Tutoring: Special Symposium on Qualitative and Mixed-Methods for Policy Analysis. *J Pol Anal Manage.* 2014;33(2):471-494. doi:10.1002/pam.21745
- ²³⁹ Social Programs That Work. Social Programs that Work. <https://evidencebasedprograms.org/>. Accessed October 18, 2019.

- ²⁴⁰ California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse for Child Welfare. <https://www.cebc4cw.org/registry/topic-areas/>. Accessed October 18, 2019.
- ²⁴¹ Early Childhood Education Projects and Publications. Research for Action. <https://www.researchforaction.org/work/content-areas-archive/>. Accessed October 18, 2019.
- ²⁴² Black MM, Walker SP, Fernald LCH, et al. Early childhood development coming of age: science through the life course. *Lancet*. 2017;389(10064):77-90. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(16)31389-7
- ²⁴³ Morris P. Head Start CARES Demonstration: National Evaluation of Three Approaches to Improving Preschoolers' Social and Emotional Competence, 2009-2015: Version 3. 2015. doi:10.3886/icpsr35510.v3
- ²⁴⁴ Baron A, Evangelou M, Malmberg L-E, Melendez-Torres GJ. *The Tools of the Mind Curriculum for Improving Self-Regulation in Early Childhood: A Systematic Review*. Campbell Collaboration; 2017. <https://www.researchconnections.org/childcare/resources/35610>. Accessed November 6, 2019.
- ²⁴⁵ Hanson RF, Lang J. A Critical Look At Trauma-Informed Care Among Agencies and Systems Serving Maltreated Youth and Their Families. *Child Maltreat*. 2016;21(2):95-100. doi:10.1177/1077559516635274
- ²⁴⁶ Stanley L. Is the Preschool PATHS Curriculum Effective? A Review. *J Evid Inf Soc Work*. December 2018:1-14. doi:10.1080/23761407.2018.1558141
- ²⁴⁷ Voorhis FL, Maier MF, Epstein JL, Lloyd CM, Leung T. *The Impact of Family Involvement on the Education of Children Ages 3 To 8: A Focus on Literacy and Math Achievement Outcomes and Social-Emotional Skills*. MDRC; 2013. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED545474.pdf>. Accessed June 21, 2019.
- ²⁴⁸ Sloat EA, Letourneau NL, Joschko JR, Schryer EA, Colpitts JE. Parent-Mediated Reading Interventions With Children Up To Four Years Old: A Systematic Review. *Issues in Comprehensive Pediatric Nursing*. 2015;38(1):39-56. doi:10.3109/01460862.2014.983279
- ²⁴⁹ Varghese C, Wachen J. The Determinants of Father Involvement and Connections to Children's Literacy and Language Outcomes: Review of the Literature. *Marriage & Family Review*. 2016;52(4):331-359. doi:10.1080/01494929.2015.1099587
- ²⁵⁰ Crime Solutions. <https://www.crimesolutions.gov/TopicDetails.aspx?ID=61>. Accessed October 18, 2019.
- ²⁵¹ Dray J, Bowman J, Campbell E, et al. Systematic Review of Universal Resilience-Focused Interventions Targeting Child and Adolescent Mental Health in the School Setting. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*. 2017;56(10):813-824. doi:10.1016/j.jaac.2017.07.780
- ²⁵² Khanlou N, Wray R. A Whole Community Approach toward Child and Youth Resilience Promotion: A Review of Resilience Literature. *Int J Ment Health Addiction*. 2014;12(1):64-79. doi:10.1007/s11469-013-9470-1
- ²⁵³ ChildYouth_School_Based_Mental_Health_Canada_Final_Report_ENG_0.pdf. https://www.mentalhealthcommission.ca/sites/default/files/ChildYouth_School_Based_Mental_Health_Canada_Final_Report_ENG_0.pdf. Accessed July 19, 2019.
- ²⁵⁴ Clarke AM, Kuosmanen T, Barry MM. A Systematic Review of Online Youth Mental Health Promotion and Prevention Interventions. *J Youth Adolescence*. 2015;44(1):90-113. doi:10.1007/s10964-014-0165-0
- ²⁵⁵ Teicher MH, Samson JA, Anderson CM, Ohashi K. The effects of childhood maltreatment on brain structure, function and connectivity. *Nat Rev Neurosci*. 2016;17(10):652-666. doi:10.1038/nrn.2016.111
- ²⁵⁶ Letourneau EJ, Schaeffer CM, Bradshaw CP, Feder KA. Preventing the Onset of Child Sexual Abuse by Targeting Young Adolescents With Universal Prevention Programming. *Child Maltreat*. 2017;22(2):100-111. doi:10.1177/1077559517692439
- ²⁵⁷ Bellón JÁ, Moreno-Peral P, Motrico E, et al. Effectiveness of psychological and/or educational interventions to prevent the onset of episodes of depression: A systematic review of systematic reviews and meta-analyses. *Prev Med*. 2015;76 Suppl:S22-32. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2014.11.003
- ²⁵⁸ Brownlee K, Rawana J, Franks J, et al. A Systematic Review of Strengths and Resilience Outcome Literature Relevant to Children and Adolescents. *Child Adolesc Soc Work J*. 2013;30(5):435-459. doi:10.1007/s10560-013-0301-9
- ²⁵⁹ Chapman RL, Buckley L, Sheehan M, Shochet I. School-Based Programs for Increasing Connectedness and Reducing Risk Behavior: A Systematic Review. *Educ Psychol Rev*. 2013;25(1):95-114. doi:10.1007/s10648-013-9216-4
- ²⁶⁰ Eime RM, Young JA, Harvey JT, Charity MJ, Payne WR. A systematic review of the psychological and social benefits of participation in sport for children and adolescents: informing development of a conceptual model of health through sport. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*. 2013;10(1):98. doi:10.1186/1479-5868-10-98
- ²⁶¹ Levin C, Chisholm D. Cost-Effectiveness and Affordability of Interventions, Policies, and Platforms for the Prevention and Treatment of Mental, Neurological, and Substance Use Disorders. In: Patel V, Chisholm D, Dua T, Laxminarayan R, Medina-Mora ME, eds. *Mental, Neurological, and Substance Use Disorders: Disease Control Priorities, Third Edition (Volume 4)*. Washington (DC): The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank; 2016. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK361929/>. Accessed July 19, 2019.

- ²⁶² Boustani MM, Frazier SL, Becker KD, et al. Common Elements of Adolescent Prevention Programs: Minimizing Burden While Maximizing Reach. *Adm Policy Ment Health*. 2015;42(2):209-219. doi:10.1007/s10488-014-0541-9
- ²⁶³ Conley CS, Durlak JA, Kirsch AC. A Meta-analysis of Universal Mental Health Prevention Programs for Higher Education Students. *Prev Sci*. 2015;16(4):487-507. doi:10.1007/s11121-015-0543-1
- ²⁶⁴ Hoare E, Thorisdóttir IE, Kristjansson AL, et al. Lessons from Iceland: Developing scalable and sustainable community approaches for the prevention of mental disorders in young Australians. *Mental Health & Prevention*. 2019;15:200166. doi:10.1016/j.mhp.2019.200166
- ²⁶⁵ kari.hopkins. EBP Resource Center. <https://www.samhsa.gov/ebp-resource-center>. Published January 29, 2018. Accessed August 26, 2019.
- ²⁶⁶ Overview | Depression in children and young people: identification and management | Guidance | NICE. <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng134>. Accessed June 27, 2019.
- ²⁶⁷ CHOICE-D Guide to Depression Treatment. *CAN-BIND - Improving Depression Care Together*. <https://www.canbind.ca/education-outreach/public-resources/choice-d-guide-depression-treatment-options/>. Accessed August 21, 2019.
- ²⁶⁸ Cuijpers P, Cristea IA, Ebert DD, et al. PSYCHOLOGICAL TREATMENT OF DEPRESSION IN COLLEGE STUDENTS: A METAANALYSIS. *Depress Anxiety*. 2016;33(5):400-414. doi:10.1002/da.22461
- ²⁶⁹ Charach A, Carson P, Fox S, Ali MU, Beckett J, Lim CG. Interventions for Preschool Children at High Risk for ADHD: A Comparative Effectiveness Review. *PEDIATRICS*. 2013;131(5):e1584-e1604. doi:10.1542/peds.2012-0974
- ²⁷⁰ Sayal K, Prasad V, Daley D, Ford T, Coghill D. ADHD in children and young people: prevalence, care pathways, and service provision. *The Lancet Psychiatry*. 2018;5(2):175-186. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(17)30167-0
- ²⁷¹ Comer JS, Chow C, Chan PT, Cooper-Vince C, Wilson LAS. Psychosocial Treatment Efficacy for Disruptive Behavior Problems in Very Young Children: A Meta-Analytic Examination. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 2013;52(1):26-36. doi:10.1016/j.jaac.2012.10.001
- ²⁷² Creswell C, Waite P, Cooper PJ. Assessment and management of anxiety disorders in children and adolescents. *Archives of Disease in Childhood*. 2014;99(7):674-678. doi:10.1136/archdischild-2013-303768
- ²⁷³ Fristad MA, MacPherson HA. Evidence-Based Psychosocial Treatments for Child and Adolescent Bipolar Spectrum Disorders. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*. 2014;43(3):339-355. doi:10.1080/15374416.2013.822309
- ²⁷⁴ Hay P, Chinn D, Forbes D, et al. Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists clinical practice guidelines for the treatment of eating disorders. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry*. 2014;48(11):977-1008. doi:10.1177/0004867414555814
- ²⁷⁵ Schäfer JÖ, Naumann E, Holmes EA, Tuschen-Caffier B, Samson AC. Emotion Regulation Strategies in Depressive and Anxiety Symptoms in Youth: A Meta-Analytic Review. *J Youth Adolescence*. 2017;46(2):261-276. doi:10.1007/s10964-016-0585-0
- ²⁷⁶ Current Issues in Mental Health in Canada: Child and Youth Mental Health. https://lop.parl.ca/sites/PublicWebsite/default/en_CA/ResearchPublications/201413E. Accessed July 11, 2019.
- ²⁷⁷ Das JK, Salam RA, Lassi ZS, et al. Interventions for Adolescent Mental Health: An Overview of Systematic Reviews. *Journal of Adolescent Health*. 2016;59(4, Supplement):S49-S60. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2016.06.020
- ²⁷⁸ Elements of Effective Practice for Mentoring™ - MENTOR. <https://www.mentoring.org/program-resources/elements-of-effective-practice-for-mentoring/>. Accessed October 21, 2019.
- ²⁷⁹ LGBTQ Supplement to the Elements of Effective Practice for Mentoring. :81.
- ²⁸⁰ Garringer M, Bourgojn J. STEM Supplement to the Elements of Effective Practice for Mentoring. :90.
- ²⁸¹ Mentorship Best Practices Toolkit. YWCA Metro Vancouver; 2017. https://ywcavan.org/sites/default/files/resources/downloads/Mentorship_Best_Practices_Toolkit_Oct2017_web_0.pdf. Accessed July 19, 2019.
- ²⁸² Literature Review: Youth Mentoring and Delinquency Prevention. Washington, D.C.: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention; 2019. <https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Mentoring.pdf>. Accessed July 8, 2019.
- ²⁸³ *Mentoring Interventions to Affect Juvenile Delinquency and Associated Problems*. The Campbell Collaboration; 2013. doi:10.4073/csr.2013.10
- ²⁸⁴ Tolan PH, Henry DB, Schoeny MS, Lovegrove P, Nichols E. Mentoring programs to affect delinquency and associated outcomes of youth at risk: A comprehensive meta-analytic review. *J Exp Criminol*. 2014;10(2):179-206. doi:10.1007/s11292-013-9181-4
- ²⁸⁵ DeWit DJ, Wells S, Elton-Marshall T, George J. Mentoring Relationships and the Mental Health of Aboriginal Youth in Canada. *J Primary Prevent*. 2017;38(1-2):49-66. doi:10.1007/s10935-016-0441-8
- ²⁸⁶ Strøm HK, Adolfsen F, Fossum S, Kaiser S, Martinussen M. Effectiveness of school-based preventive interventions on adolescent alcohol use: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Substance Abuse Treatment, Prevention, and Policy*. 2014;9(1):48. doi:10.1186/1747-597X-9-48
- ²⁸⁷ Mason M, Ola B, Zaharakis N, Zhang J. Text messaging interventions for adolescent and young adult substance use: a meta-analysis. *Prev Sci*. 2015;16(2):181-188. doi:10.1007/s11121-014-0498-7

- ²⁸⁸ Kristjansson AL, Mann MJ, Sigfusson J, Thorisdottir IE, Allegrante JP, Sigfusdottir ID. Implementing the Icelandic Model for Preventing Adolescent Substance Use. *Health Promotion Practice*. June 2019;152483991984903. doi:10.1177/1524839919849033
- ²⁸⁹ Emmers E, Bekkering GE, Hannes K. Prevention of alcohol and drug misuse in adolescents: An overview of systematic reviews. *Nordic Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*. 2015;32(2):183-198. doi:10.1515/nsad-2015-0019
- ²⁹⁰ Bennett K, Rhodes AE, Duda S, et al. A Youth Suicide Prevention Plan for Canada: A Systematic Review of Reviews. *Can J Psychiatry*. 2015;60(6):245-257. doi:10.1177/070674371506000603
- ²⁹¹ Zalsman G, Hawton K, Wasserman D, et al. Suicide prevention strategies revisited: 10-year systematic review. *The Lancet Psychiatry*. 2016;3(7):646-659. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366(16)30030-X
- ²⁹² Hamilton E, Klimes-Dougan B. Gender differences in suicide prevention responses: implications for adolescents based on an illustrative review of the literature. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2015;12(3):2359-2372. doi:10.3390/ijerph120302359
- ²⁹³ Mishara BL, Daigle M, Bardon C, et al. Comparison of the Effects of Telephone Suicide Prevention Help by Volunteers and Professional Paid Staff: Results from Studies in the USA and Quebec, Canada. *Suicide Life Threat Behav*. 2016;46(5):577-587. doi:10.1111/sltb.12238
- ²⁹⁴ Katz C, Bolton S-L, Katz LY, et al. A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF SCHOOL-BASED SUICIDE PREVENTION PROGRAMS: Review: School-Based Suicide Prevention Review. *Depress Anxiety*. May 2013;n/a-n/a. doi:10.1002/da.22114
- ²⁹⁵ Fowler HS, Lebel M. Promoting Youth Mental Health through the Transition from High School – Literature Review and Environmental Scan. Social Research and Demonstration Corporation; 2013:37. https://campusmentalhealth.ca/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/student_mental_health.pdf.
- ²⁹⁶ MacLeod KB, Brownlie EB. Mental Health and Transitions from Adolescence to Emerging Adulthood: Developmental and Diversity Considerations. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health*. 2014;33(1):77-86. doi:10.7870/cjcmh-2014-007
- ²⁹⁷ Thompson AE, Greeson JKP, Brunsink AM. Natural mentoring among older youth in and aging out of foster care: A systematic review. *Children and Youth Services Review*. 2016;61:40-50. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2015.12.006
- ²⁹⁸ Hale DR, Fitzgerald-Yau N, Viner RM. A Systematic Review of Effective Interventions for Reducing Multiple Health Risk Behaviors in Adolescence. *Am J Public Health*. 2014;104(5):e19-e41. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2014.301874
- ²⁹⁹ Petrosino A, Turpin-Petrosino C, Hollis-Peel ME, Lavenberg JG. "Scared Straight" and other juvenile awareness programs for preventing juvenile delinquency. Cochrane Developmental, Psychosocial and Learning Problems Group, ed. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. April 2013. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD002796.pub2
- ³⁰⁰ Ciocanel O, Power K, Eriksen A, Gillings K. Effectiveness of Positive Youth Development Interventions: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *J Youth Adolescence*. 2017;46(3):483-504. doi:10.1007/s10964-016-0555-6
- ³⁰¹ de Vries SLA, Hoeve M, Assink M, Stams GJJM, Asscher JJ. Practitioner Review: Effective ingredients of prevention programs for youth at risk of persistent juvenile delinquency - recommendations for clinical practice. *J Child Psychol Psychiatr*. 2015;56(2):108-121. doi:10.1111/jcpp.12320
- ³⁰² Farrington DP, Gaffney H, Lösel F, Tfofi MM. Systematic reviews of the effectiveness of developmental prevention programs in reducing delinquency, aggression, and bullying. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*. 2017;33:91-106. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2016.11.003
- ³⁰³ What Works Clearinghouse. <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/EvidenceSnapshot/578>. Accessed October 18, 2019.
- ³⁰⁴ Fleming P, McGilloway S, Herson M, et al. Individualized funding interventions to improve health and social care outcomes for people with a disability: A mixed-methods systematic review. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*. 2019;15(1-2). doi:10.4073/csr.2019.3
- ³⁰⁵ Case-Smith J. Systematic Review of Interventions to Promote Social-Emotional Development in Young Children With or at Risk for Disability. *American Journal of Occupational Therapy*. 2013;67(4):395-404. doi:10.5014/ajot.2013.004713
- ³⁰⁶ Lindsay S, Hartman LR, Fellin M. A systematic review of mentorship programs to facilitate transition to post-secondary education and employment for youth and young adults with disabilities. *Disability and Rehabilitation*. 2016;38(14):1329-1349. doi:10.3109/09638288.2015.1092174
- ³⁰⁷ Friedman ND, Warfield ME, Parish SL. Transition to adulthood for individuals with autism spectrum disorder: current issues and future perspectives. *Neuropsychiatry*. 2013;3(2):181-192. doi:10.2217/npv.13.13
- ³⁰⁸ Otero TL, Schatz RB, Merrill AC, Bellini S. Social Skills Training for Youth with Autism Spectrum Disorders: A Follow-Up. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Clinics*. 2015;24(1):99-115. doi:10.1016/j.chc.2014.09.002
- ³⁰⁹ Interventions for Mental Health Problems in People with Learning Disabilities. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE); 2019. <https://pathways.nice.org.uk/pathways/mental-health-problems-in-people-with-learning-disabilities#path=view%3A/pathways/mental-health-problems-in-people-with-learning-disabilities/interventions-for-mental-health-problems-in-people-with-learning-disabilities.xml&content=view-index>.