



REBOOT PLUS EXPANSION

Final Research Report

Carla Hotel and Danielle Quigley

September 2023

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	3
Recommendations.....	8
Introduction.....	13
Research Design and Methodology.....	15
Data Collection.....	15
Measures.....	15
Results.....	17
Baseline Data.....	17
Professionals' Data.....	20
Student data.....	24
Douglas College.....	26
Bow Valley College.....	37
Fanshawe College.....	42
Humber College.....	47
College of the North Atlantic.....	51
Interview data.....	55
Boards of Trade / Chambers of Commerce.....	57
Conclusion.....	60

Executive Summary

Education is frequently lauded as a means for young people to unlock opportunities, explore diverse possibilities, and unleash their true potential. Through education, one gains knowledge, skills, career prospects, and stability. However, not all doors are readily accessible to everyone, and certain individuals find themselves at a standstill.

Reboot Plus is an innovative program dedicated to enhancing education and fostering career development. The primary goal of this program is to empower youth who have faced obstacles in the conventional transition from school to the workforce, while also transforming employers' perceptions of the untapped potential within this demographic.

Program Goals

Reboot Plus is supported by the Future Skills Centre, Government of Canada, with a primary mission to identify and evaluate projects that produce tangible evidence on how to equip Canadians with the necessary skills to navigate a rapidly evolving labor market.

The Reboot Plus program aims to achieve three key goals:

- 1) Provide comprehensive support, knowledge, skills, and exposure to post-secondary education and the workplace for youth who are not on track to graduate from high school, enabling them to embark on a meaningful career pathway.
- 2) Increase employer awareness regarding the significance of engaging young people in the present labor market and demonstrate their capacity to do so effectively.
- 3) Assess the portability and fidelity of the Reboot Plus model across four unique post-secondary institutions outside of B.C.

Methodology

The methodology employed in this research project was designed to maximize data collection from various participants, including students, employers / professionals, teachers, school districts, Boards of Trade / Chambers of Commerce, and other stakeholders from all college partners. Data was gathered at multiple time points, both before and after the program, utilizing a combination of quantitative and qualitative approaches.

The mixed methods approach included participant and employer surveys, participant demographics, intake and exit interviews, school district and other stakeholder interviews and focus groups, along with various written reflections from students. Three scales at two time points (i.e., the Job Search Clarity (JSC), General Self Efficacy (GSE), and Interpersonal Communication Competence (ICC)) scales were used to measure change in participant perception, knowledge, and skill. The use of mixed methods provides rich contextual data to

better understand the nuances and complexities of program implementation, inputs, outputs, and outcomes.

Participants

As of June 2023, the Reboot Plus program has seen the completion of seven student cohorts across five Canadian colleges (with some sites, namely Douglas College and Fanshawe running multiple groups at the same time. In these cases, those groups have been collapsed into a single cohort for data analyses). A total of 143 students registered for the program across partner sites.

Since the inception of the Reboot Plus program, a database containing information on 883 professionals / employers who showed interest in participating in informational interviews was compiled. A remarkable total of 782 interviews have been conducted with professionals since the program started. Since 2022, 201 professionals have participated in the program, some of whom engaged in multiple interviews.

The program's reach extended from Douglas College to four new colleges in three provinces across Canada interacting with several school districts and 10 Boards of Trade / Chambers of Commerce. Across all cohorts, a diverse representation of gender identities and ethnic backgrounds were represented; specifically, participants reported representing at least eight different gender identities and speaking more than 12 different languages in the home.

A notable finding was that many participants indicated their households relied, to some extent, on governmental assistance. However, the most striking and consistent outcome reported was the overwhelmingly neutral to negative or very negative experiences many participants had reported as a reflection of their education thus far.

Participants

The participant-centered approach and incorporation of universal design for learning in Reboot Plus have proven highly effective in meeting the needs of its participants across all five college settings. Students consistently expressed satisfaction, ranging from satisfied to very satisfied, with the program, emphasizing its value in enhancing communication skills, boosting confidence, fostering hope, and increasing awareness of career pathways within the labor market. The informational interviews played a pivotal role in students' growth, providing insights into diverse work opportunities and work environments. Notably, the unique structure of these interviews, including thorough preparation and a low-pressure format, significantly boosted student engagement and confidence.

The program's connection to the post-secondary environment and course credit was of paramount importance to the participants. The possession of student cards and access to campus resources and spaces, such as the cafeteria, held significant value for their sense of self-worth and belonging. Recognizing the significance of social connection and a sense of belonging for student success, retention, persistence, and overall well-being, Reboot Plus dedicated considerable effort to create both on-campus and online spaces where participants could truly

feel connected. Feedback from all groups highlighted the exceptional role played by teachers and the program in cultivating a sense of social belonging, which was often unfamiliar to these students in a traditional classroom setting.

As a result of their participation in Reboot Plus, students experienced heightened self-awareness, forged meaningful social connections, and developed a positive orientation towards their future endeavors, reflecting the program's profound impact on their overall growth and well-being.

Pre and Post Test Outcomes

Across all measured expected outcomes, there were either stable or incremental improvements in general self-efficacy, interpersonal communication competence, and job search clarity observed within each of the cohorts. Notably, job search clarity was consistently improved across groups while the two other scales were less reliable across the cohorts and partner sites.

On the Job Search Clarity scale, there was more often improvement across all items, including the type of job, type of work or industry, and clarity of job search objectives. In some groups, the data suggests that participants' career preferences were more well-defined than their specific job search objectives, pointing to potential areas for guidance and support within the job search process.

It is still essential to approach these findings with caution due to the smaller number of respondents. The relatively small sample sizes necessitate interpreting any inferences as analytically generalizable rather than statistically significant. In essence, these group results provide a valuable reference point for comparing with existing research in the field.

These encouraging trends from the test outcomes have been cross-referenced and integrated with the results obtained from interviews, reflections, and focus groups. Such a comprehensive approach allows for a deeper understanding of the findings, which will be further elaborated and expanded upon in the results section.

Stakeholders

Data was gathered from various stakeholder groups, which include participants, facilitators, program employers, professional groups, school district administrators, teachers, staff, and Boards of Trade / Chambers of Commerce. The overall satisfaction with Reboot Plus is remarkably high among all individuals directly involved in the program, such as participants, facilitators, school district staff, and employer / professional groups. Furthermore, numerous stakeholders from different groups have reported recommending the program to potential students.

The comprehensive findings reveal that Reboot Plus effectively addresses the needs of its participants. Consistently, participants expressed a heightened sense of hope and readiness to

explore their career options and the labor market after completing the program. Additionally, employers have gained valuable insights into young individuals who may have atypical educational or life experiences, such as facing challenges that have limited their education and / or work opportunities.

Professionals / Employers

The enthusiasm shown by professionals / employers to participate in informational interviews has surpassed expectations. Many professionals willingly volunteered multiple times, expressing a keen interest in additional meetings with participants, and even extending their support through mentorship and work integrated learning opportunities. This research provides compelling evidence that the program model not only effectively engages young individuals in career exploration and the labor market but also broadens employers' perspectives to consider this demographic as potential employees.

The results indicate a remarkable increase in willingness and motivation among employers to support youth in the workplace. They now better understand the significance of assisting young people as they enter the workforce and are eager to participate in similar opportunities in the future. The program's impact on employer attitudes and their readiness to actively support youth's professional journey is evident from these positive findings.

Boards of Trade / Chambers of Commerce

Consistent with the professionals / employers' experiences, Board of Trade / Chamber of Commerce representatives relayed unanimous, enthusiastic endorsements of Reboot Plus. Seven representatives from Boards of Trade / Chambers of Commerce in six cities across metro Vancouver, and three partner cities were interviewed about their experiences with Reboot Plus.

Evident in each interview, the Reboot Plus model was emphatically embraced as a good opportunity. Specifically noting current labour and workforce shortages across the country, the interviewees expressed keen interest in making connections with future members of the workforce and fulfilling strategic objectives regarding sector outreach.

While this rationale was cited as motivation for initial involvement, the overall benefits were observed to far exceed a singular focus. The extraordinary outcome was the positive impact on members from the youth they met and worked with. The responses highlighted the opportunity for professionals to give back with purpose, for more substantial and beneficial community engagement and for key learning and perspective building experiences.

Portability

The Reboot Plus program sought to test the portability of the model by expanding to offer the program in four post-secondary colleges across Canada; namely, Bow Valley College (Calgary,

Alberta), Humber College (Toronto, Ontario), Fanshawe College (London, Ontario), and College of the North Atlantic, (Stephenville, Newfoundland).

Reboot Plus initially tested the integrity of program delivery across sites in the greater Vancouver region. From multiple sites including Burnaby, Maple Ridge, Coquitlam, Pitt Meadows, New Westminster, Surrey, and Richmond, there has been and continues to be an abundance of evidence that the program can be successfully adapted across urban communities in B.C.

The Douglas College 2020-2022 program report (Hotel and Quigley, July 2022) identified the components necessary for program success. The core elements were explained as follows:

- The college and school district partnerships are fully invested;
- Professionals in fields of work are identified from student interests;
- Instruction and support from Reboot Plus facilitators and liaisons are flexible and adaptive; and
- Comfort supports for students (e.g., food and transportation) are provided.

The expansion to the four partner colleges in Alberta, Ontario, and Newfoundland provided a further opportunity to test portability and fidelity of the program model outside of the greater Vancouver regional district.

Consistent with the Douglas College experience, the aforementioned program attributes were repeatedly identified as significant and as essential components for success.

In addition, there were clear and consistent experiences across all the colleges confirming the following key components:

- Flexible and Adaptive Curriculum
- Course Credit or Recognition
- Participant Centered Ethos
- Skilled Facilitators
- Strong Stakeholder Relationships
- Professional Management Structure (i.e., PEERs / DC Training Group)

In the expansion project, there were notable exceptions where school district commitment was not achieved (i.e., Bow Valley and Humber). Both programs struggled for different reasons to establish commitment in large urban school districts (Calgary and Toronto). At Bow Valley, the research component created significant barriers and the program opted to recruit individually from the community advertising through social media and other service providers in the youth sector. Humber / Guelph encountered more of a challenge competing with many well-established programs and was not able to communicate the value-added component to a well-resourced alternate education system. Recruitment was moved to the community as well, with a focus more on youth in programs at Humber and other local programs supporting transitions and employment for youth.

An interesting outcome from Bow Valley was higher participation across multiple barrier youth. There may be an argument for an expanded / more open recruitment mandate with less singular reliance on school districts – as most communities host alternate education programs – various NGOs, colleges, and other sectors. Humber’s experience led planners to conclude Reboot Plus would better serve less urban or less resourced school districts such as Brampton or Mississauga.

In September 2023, the Reboot Plus program including the expansion sites was extended for an additional cohort. Bow Valley and Humber opted to not participate in the extension project funded for an accelerated 12-week period from October 2023 to December 2023. Rationale for both related to the short timeline to implementation. These two partners failed to originally secure partnerships with school districts for the 2022-2023 program. This outcome speaks to portability of the model in that sufficient time is needed to establish relationships with key school leaders and for districts to implement and support programming in their schools.

For model fidelity, program developers, researchers, and school administration set clear parameters to program delivery to ensure similar implementation across sites. This work included participant selection, integrity of curriculum delivery, consent forms, pre- and post-test interviewing and focus groups. It was important to identify who was to be responsible for program coherence at each site.

As the program moves to involve more sites, the need for program champions at the school district or other partner level, content and employment experts, knowledgeable and compassionate facilitators, and buy-in from the college are key to the success of the program, and ultimately, students.

The Reboot Plus program is unique in the youth sector. There are few comparable programs. Connecting youth with others in a college environment with the objective of exploring themselves (i.e., their interests, their strengths) with specific opportunities to explore career pathways is a resoundingly successful model which can be replicated across sites.

Recommendations

As the Reboot Plus program model has been effectively implemented across multiple school Districts in B.C. and across four cities in Canada, it is strongly recommended that the structure and design be retained and supported.

Specifically, vital program components are those that hold and increase student engagement within the cohort, with the teachers and facilitators, with campus faculty and resources, and with employers and Boards of Trade / Chambers of Commerce. The following are considerations for continual improvement.

Future considerations and recommendations (some of which have been adopted and become part of current best practices) are as follows:

Program Model

- Continue the “meet students where they are at” program philosophy. The flexibility and unwavering positive regard for participants were cited repeatedly.
- Maintain the universal design for learning approach for maximum inclusivity design including multi-mode format with online options where appropriate.
- Continue flexible timelines for students to begin informational interviews at any point within the program.
- Promote program adaptability at any stage needed, including individual and group interviews and curriculum flexibility.
- Evaluate and clarify target participant criteria. Variations among partners were apparent. Location and needs of partners play a role in determining participant selection criteria.

Curriculum

- Build in flexibility and adaptability with curriculum organization and implementation to meet unique cohort needs.
- Retain comforts to support participant attendance and retention (e.g., food and transportation).
- Facilitate opportunities for daily program feedback in classes (e.g., spontaneous and planned).
- Identify mental health needs early and provide relevant student support resources in classrooms.
- Develop and integrate technology and wellness components into curriculum (e.g., external support).
- Continue to add more interactive and / or experiential components (e.g., group work, interviews).

School Districts or Other Partnerships

- ®Develop key relationships early. Direct communication and working relationships are needed with decision makers in school districts / partnerships.
- ® Consult and plan to coordinate interactions such as information sessions, support needed, service delivery formats, and calendars.
- ® Distribute promotional materials to clarify program purpose, structure, dates, and content.

- ® Clarify and confirm course credit for Reboot Plus toward student graduation and for transfer to be received (e.g., Career Life Connections, CLC). The credit and understanding of the credit and its components varied across the districts.
- ® Cultivate personal relationships between program facilitators to interact with partners to make connections with students and families, as well as school staff, to describe program components, answer questions, and clear up any confusion.

Research

- Embed informed consent and research protocols (see below) such as surveys in application, intake, and curriculum to ensure fluid and standardized evaluation.
- Investigate opt out consent methodology with college Research Ethics Boards for future research applications.
- Facilitate opportunities for daily program feedback for ongoing research (e.g., spontaneous and planned). More structured and planned collection continues to be required.
- Avoid use of participation incentives for research activities unless equal participation can be established in advance (e.g., consent to participation achieved by each class member).
- Continue to explore research methods to include more experiential opportunities such as narratives, photo voice, and case study.
- Establish consultation practices with past and present participants for support, follow up, and evaluation purposes.
- Review and evaluate methods of collection of self-identification data (i.e., equity seeking groups) to ensure compliance with REB requirements. Participant awareness and opting out options are essential.

NB. It is envisioned that the research project as part of Reboot Plus may not be required to run the program in the future. It was the research component that resulted in some barriers for college and school districts participation. Creating an in-house evaluation module to be implemented by each cite as needed may create more opportunities for continued and new partnerships.

Research Protocols

To enhance the program's effectiveness and impact on re-engaging disengaged Canadian youth, it is recommended that research protocols be embedded into the program. This will enable:

- Continuous program evaluation for ongoing monitoring and improvement.
- Evidence-based decision making to optimize interventions and resources.
- Longitudinal studies to measure sustained benefits and long-term outcomes.

- Program improvement and innovation through data-driven insights.
- Knowledge sharing and collaboration with stakeholders for collective learning.
- Contribution to the field by sharing research findings and best practices.

To ensure a strong foundation for program implementation and to facilitate evidence-based decision making, it is strongly recommended that pre-program data collection be collected prior to the first class. Gathering relevant data prior to program commencement enables a comprehensive understanding of the target population and establishes a baseline for evaluation. There are some key benefits of collecting pre-program data prior to the first class:

- **Needs Assessment:** Pre-program data collection allows for a thorough needs assessment, enabling program organizers to identify the specific challenges, barriers, and needs of the disengaged youth. By gathering data on their educational backgrounds, career aspirations, personal circumstances, and perceived obstacles, the program can be tailored to address their unique requirements effectively.
- **Targeted Intervention:** Data collected prior to the program provides valuable insights into the characteristics and profiles of the participants. This information helps in designing targeted interventions, customized to the needs of the specific group. Understanding their motivations, interests, and barriers allows for the development of strategies that resonate with the participants, maximizing engagement and success.
- **Baseline Measurement:** Pre-program data collection establishes a baseline measurement against which the program's impact can be evaluated. By capturing data on variables such as self-efficacy, communication competence, and hope / confidence levels, program organizers can track and measure the changes and progress made by participants throughout the program.
- **Program Adaptation:** With comprehensive pre-program data, program organizers can identify potential gaps or areas that require adaptation. Understanding the participants' awareness of employment and career options, as well as employer perceptions, allows for tailored curriculum development and targeted employer engagement efforts to address specific needs and align with participant aspirations.
- **Evaluation and Continuous Improvement:** Pre-program data collection establishes a framework for comprehensive evaluation and continuous improvement. By comparing pre-program data with post-program outcomes, program organizers can gauge the effectiveness of interventions, identify areas of success, and highlight potential areas for further enhancement.

By prioritizing pre-program data collection, program organizers can gather vital information, design targeted interventions, establish baselines for evaluation, and set the stage for evidence-based decision making and continuous improvement. This data-driven approach fosters a more effective and impactful re-engagement program, empowering disengaged youth to overcome barriers and succeed in their educational and career pursuits.

By implementing these recommendations, the program can maximize its potential to empower and support disengaged youth, leading to improved educational and career outcomes.

Introduction

In the vast landscape of Canada, a profound challenge persists—youth disengagement from education career planning. It is an issue that demands urgent attention and innovative solutions. The educational and career aspirations of today's youth are critical for shaping their future and contributing to the prosperity of Canadian society. However, a concerning number of young individuals across the country find themselves disengaged from high school and lacking direction in terms of career planning. Recognizing the urgent need to address this issue, our research project has undertaken a comprehensive investigation into a program designed to re-engage Canadian youth who have lost interest in high school and career planning.

The primary aim of this research project was to evaluate the effectiveness of the program in several key areas: increasing participants' general self-efficacy, enhancing their interpersonal communication competence, instilling hope, and confidence about their future, raising awareness of employment and career options, and fostering employer awareness of participants' potential and their capacity to recruit and onboard them. Through rigorous analysis and empirical evidence, we sought to uncover the tangible impact of the program on the lives of disengaged youth and the broader implications for both individuals and the Canadian workforce.

This research is vital given the far-reaching consequences of youth disengagement from high school and career planning. It is evident that without appropriate intervention, disengaged youth may face limited opportunities, reduced earning potential, and increased social and economic challenges. Moreover, the impact extends beyond the individual to affect communities and the nation, as untapped potential and talent are squandered, hindering progress and innovation.

To address these concerns, the program in focus was carefully developed to provide targeted support and resources to disengaged youth, aiming to reignite their passion for learning, empower their decision-making abilities, and equip them with the skills and confidence necessary for a successful transition into the workforce or further education.

Through this research project, we aim to shed light on the impact of the program on the student participants, as well as professionals, school board staff, program facilitators, and Boards of Trade / Chambers of Commerce who were involved in the program. By examining the specific research questions of self-efficacy, interpersonal communication competence, hope / confidence about the future, awareness of employment and career options, and employer engagement, we will be able to identify the program's strengths, areas for improvement, and its overall significance in re-engaging Canadian youth.

The urgency to address youth disengagement from high school and career planning looms large. Our research project strives to contribute profound insights and evidence-driven recommendations that can shape policies, educational initiatives, and employer engagement strategies. By investing in programs that re-engage and support disengaged youth, they are more likely to become active contributors to society, forging a future that is prosperous and

inclusive for all. The time to empower Canadian youth is now—a moment to usher in a new era of potential and possibility.

Research Design and Methodology

Researchers were involved in the Reboot Plus program to evaluate student progress over the 16 weeks. Informed consent from parents (if students were under 19 years) or students themselves (if they were 19 years or older) was obtained at the beginning of the program, and each participant completed an intake survey including demographic data and three normed scales. Following their completion of the program, they completed exit surveys and interviews with the program teachers and research assistants.

Data Collection

Before the program, an intake interview was conducted, demographic information as well as measures of general self-efficacy, interpersonal communication competence and job search clarity were collected. After the program, these measures were collected again along with a measure of program evaluation and an exit interview was completed.

Table 1. Data Collection Tools.

Student pre-test measures	Student post-test measures
Intake questions / demographics	Exit interview
General self-efficacy	General self-efficacy
Job search clarity	Job search clarity
Interpersonal communication competence	Interpersonal communication competence

Measures

A measure of general self-efficacy was collected at pre- and post-test. This questionnaire was designed to assess optimistic self-beliefs to cope with a variety of difficult demands in life. It explicitly refers to personal agency (i.e., belief that one's actions are responsible for successful outcomes) and consists of 10 items rated on a 4-point scale from *not at all true* to *exactly true*. The possible score range for this scale is 10 to 40, with lower scores indicating lower general self-efficacy and higher scores indicating higher general self-efficacy. Example items are: "I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough," "I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events," and "It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals."

Second, a measure of interpersonal communication competence was used. This 10-item measure examines several dimensions of self-competence: self-disclosure, empathy, social relaxation, assertiveness, interaction management, altercentrism, expressiveness, supportiveness, immediacy, and environmental control. Each item is measured on a 5-point scale from *almost never* to *almost always*. The possible score range for this scale is 10 to 50,

with higher scores indicating stronger feelings of competence in in participants' interpersonal communication abilities. Example items on this measure are: "I allow friends to see who I really am" (self-disclosure), "I can put myself in others' shoes" (empathy), "I am comfortable in social situations" (social relaxation), and "My friends truly believe that I care about them" (immediacy).

Third, a measure of job search clarity was used to assess the level of clarity participants had in terms of career objectives and options, and job search tactics. This measure consists of eight items rated on a 5-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Example items on this measure are: "I have a clear idea of the type of job I want," "I have a clear idea of where I want to work," and "I do not have very clear job search objectives" (reverse scored).

Results

In this section, the results of the evaluation of the Reboot Plus program are presented. The evaluation sought to assess the program's impact on students across multiple dimensions, including general self-efficacy, interpersonal communication competence, hope / confidence about the future, awareness of employment and career options, and employer engagement. The evaluation was also intended to examine the program's impact on professionals who took part in the interview / mentorship component of the program as well as Boards of Trade / Chambers of Commerce involved in connecting professionals to the program. Finally, scalability was examined by exploring program outcomes at each partner site.

For students, the evaluation process encompassed a pre-program data collection phase, followed by the implementation of the Reboot Plus program, and concluded with a post-program assessment. By comparing pre- and post-program data, we aimed to identify significant changes and measure the program's effectiveness in empowering disengaged youth and facilitating their successful transition into education or the workforce.

The results presented provide an understanding of the program's impact on the targeted outcomes and shed light on the broader implications for youth re-engagement initiatives in Canada. Throughout this section, we will present quantitative and qualitative data that illuminate the changes experienced by program participants, as well as the perceptions and experiences of stakeholders, including educators, employers, and community partners. These insights serve to inform best practices, provide evidence for decision making, and offer valuable recommendations for program improvement and replication in similar contexts.

Additionally, the results of a survey distributed to professionals in comparable sectors but who were not involved in the program are presented as baseline data. The key outcomes for professionals who did participate in the program are also presented in order to investigate employer engagement. The degree to which the program has facilitated employer awareness of participants' potential and their willingness to recruit, onboard, and support them in their career development is the focus.

By examining the results, valuable lessons can be extracted, and actionable insights drawn, to contribute to the ongoing effort of empowering and re-engaging youth in unlocking their full potential in education and the workforce.

Baseline Data

Baseline data was collected from employers (N = 72) between May 2022 and June 2023. This data was collected from employers across a variety of sectors but who were not involved as Professionals in Reboot Plus. The strategy was to provide an opportunity for stable comparison between employers who participated and those who did not, to discuss the potential impact of the program on employers.

Significant findings from the survey found that of the 72 respondents, there was a relatively close split between employers who regularly hire young people between 17-20 years of age. 45% said that they somewhat agreed or strongly agreed while 36% said they somewhat disagreed or strongly disagreed that they regularly hire youth.

Of this group, employers indicated that they were less likely to hire young people who have not achieved a high school diploma (55% indicated that they do not regularly hire someone who does not have a high school diploma versus 29% who said they regularly did). Further, 31% reported that they would not interview a young person who has performed poorly in school while 41% indicated that they would. There was a resoundingly positive response (82% agreed) to the belief that young people who have atypical school or life experiences may have lots of potential.

Several similar themes came up from this group of professionals, including:

1. A recognition of Challenges with the Traditional Education System

The educational system is very focused on one way of learning, not suited to all.

2. The Importance of Patience and Retention in Youth Employment

In our experience working with youth in general, we've had to exercise greater patience when helping them develop into their roles. Unfortunately, when time is a cost, it's not something we can always afford - especially when retention is a 2-way street.

Young people who have atypical school or life experience often have mental health issues or struggle with social issues.

3. The Value of Attitude

Proven that in many times attitude and willing to be a team player is best than good grades or experience.

Attitude is critical. A youth who has limited work experience can do really well with an attitude to achieve in the real world.

4. The Importance of Hands-On Skills and Recognizing Diverse Paths to Success

Our business looks for aptitude for hands-on skills which do not necessarily relate to academics.

I believe that these types of young people need to know they are great opportunities for successful and meaningful jobs that aren't contingent on high school diplomas. More trade-related opportunities need to be included in career fairs events at schools starting

early on (grade 8,9, or 10?) so they know things like construction type jobs are out there and have the potential to be lucrative careers.

We believe there can be many reasons young people may not do well in school. We value character, honesty, creativity, a desire to learn and hard work.

5. The Importance of Hiring Youth

This is a big dilemma in our society that young adults are not adaptive, flexible and team player, but I strongly disagree, they bring lots of innovative ideas, different ideologies, enthusiasm. We need more inclusive employers.

6. The Need for More Opportunities

I feel all kids deserve a chance. Just because you didn't do well in school means nothing these days. I believe the school system is really letting kids down. I think employers should take the chance to 'train' these kids and give them the chance to learn real world experiences.

I would like to see more job specific training programs offered "close to home", especially for youth with disabilities.

In summary, the feedback from employers in our survey highlights several key themes regarding the challenges and opportunities associated with hiring youth. Firstly, there is a recognition of the limitations of the traditional education system, with an emphasis on its one-size-fits-all approach. Secondly, employers stress the importance of patience and retention when employing young individuals, acknowledging that the developmental process may require more time and effort.

Thirdly, attitude was seen as a crucial factor in youth employment, often outweighing academic qualifications or experience. Fourthly, there is an emphasis on the significance of hands-on skills and the need to recognize diverse pathways to success, including opportunities beyond the achievement of a high school diploma. Moreover, employers express the importance of hiring youth in promoting innovation, different perspectives, and enthusiasm within the workforce.

Finally, there was a call for more opportunities, including job-specific training programs and greater inclusivity, to ensure that all young individuals have a chance to succeed in the real world. These themes collectively underline the complexities and potential benefits of hiring youth and offer valuable insights for policymakers, educators, and employers aiming to support and empower the younger workforce.

Professionals' Data

Professionals who participated in the program were asked to participate in the research as well. The response from professionals participating in informational interviews has far surpassed expectations. Numerous professionals willingly volunteered multiple times, expressing a keen interest in holding additional meetings with participants. Some even went beyond expectation by offering more extensive support, including mentorship and work-integrated learning opportunities. The research findings strongly support the effectiveness of the program model, as it not only successfully engages young people in exploring career options and the labor market but also has broadened employers' perspectives on viewing this demographic as potential employees.

The results clearly indicate a noticeable increase in willingness and motivation among employers to support youth in the workplace. They have come to understand the significance of aiding youth as they enter the workforce and have shown a genuine eagerness to participate in similar opportunities in the future.

Data from post-participation professionals' survey are as follows:

A total of 74 professionals across all participating Colleges completed the survey (N = 16 from Bow Valley College, N = 6 from College of the North Atlantic, N = 39 from Douglas College, N = 10 from Fanshawe College, N = 3 from Humber College). Participants were asked to report how they participated in the program and most indicated they participated in one-on-one interviews with a student (88% at Bow Valley, 100% at College of the North Atlantic, 59% at Douglas College, 50% at Fanshawe College). Participants connected to Humber College were more likely to participate as guest speakers in class (67%).

Professional participants were asked how strongly they agreed / disagreed with the following statements:

1. Since participating in Reboot Plus, I am more willing to introduce youth participants to colleagues.
2. Since participating in Reboot Plus, I am more motivated to support youth to attach to the workplace.
3. Since participating in Reboot Plus, I am more motivated to review my company's policies and practices related to recruiting and onboarding youth.
4. Since participating in Reboot Plus, I am more willing to participate in similar initiatives.
5. Since participating in Reboot Plus, I have an improved understanding of the importance of supporting youth to enter the workforce.

Table 2. Baseline Professionals' Data Questions.

Statement	Bow Valley College	College of the North Atlantic	Douglas College	Fanshawe College	Humber College	Overall
Since participating in Reboot Plus, I am more willing to introduce youth participants to colleagues.	4.00 (.82)	4.83 (.41)	4.17 (.82)	4.33 (.71)	4.00 (0)	4.21 (.78)
Since participating in Reboot Plus, I am more motivated to support youth to attach to the workplace.	4.06 (.93)	6.67 (.82)	4.39 (.65)	4.56 (.73)	4.67 (.58)	4.37 (.75)
Since participating in Reboot Plus, I am more motivated to review my company's policies and practices related to recruiting and onboarding youth.	3.73 (.96)	4.75 (.50)	3.80 (.76)	3.71 (.76)	3.50 (.71)	3.83 (.82)
Since participating in Reboot Plus, I am more willing to participate in similar initiatives.	4.63 (.50)	4.83 (.41)	4.31 (.92)	4.70 (.48)	4.67 (.58)	4.49 (.76)
Since participating in Reboot Plus, I have an improved understanding of the importance of supporting youth to enter the workforce.	4.13 (.96)	5.00 (0)	4.30 (.91)	4.38 (.74)	4.67 (.58)	4.34 (.87)

Note. The response scale for these statements was: 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = somewhat disagree, 3 = neither agree nor disagree, 4 = somewhat agree, and 5 = strongly agree

Table 3. % of Agreement / Disagreement with Each Statement

Statement	Bow Valley College	College of the North Atlantic	Douglas College	Fanshawe College	Humber College	Overall
Since participating in Reboot Plus, I am more willing to introduce youth participants to colleagues.						
Agree / strongly agree	81%	100%	67%	80%	67%	74%
Neutral	13%	0%	23%	10%	0%	16%
Disagree / strongly disagree	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Since participating in Reboot Plus, I am more motivated to support youth to attach to the workplace.						
Agree / strongly agree	75%	83%	85%	80%	100%	82%
Neutral	19%	17%	8%	10%	0%	11%

Disagree / strongly disagree	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Since participating in Reboot Plus, I am more motivated to review my company's policies and practices related to recruiting and onboarding youth.						
Agree / strongly agree	50%	67%	46%	40%	33%	47%
Neutral	38%	0%	31%	30%	33%	30%
Disagree / strongly disagree	6%	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%
Since participating in Reboot Plus, I am more willing to participate in similar initiatives.						
Agree / strongly agree	100%	100%	82%	100%	100%	91%
Neutral	0%	0%	15%	0%	0%	8%
Disagree / strongly disagree	0%	0%	3%	0%	0%	1%
Since participating in Reboot Plus, I have an improved understanding of the importance of supporting youth to enter the workforce.						
Agree / strongly agree	75%	100%	79%	70%	100%	80%
Neutral	19%	0%	13%	10%	0%	12%
Disagree / strongly disagree	6%	0%	3%	0%	0%	3%

Note: in cases where percentages do not add up to 100%, this is due to items left unanswered.

Notable Feedback and Insights from Professionals / Employers

The professionals / employers were asked whether working with the Reboot Plus program changed or impacted their views toward working with youth, and their responses shed light on several themes that collectively underscore the significance of direct guidance and mentorship for young individuals entering the workforce.

A prevailing positive attitude toward working with youth was clear across responses, with many professionals expressing enthusiasm for supporting and nurturing the next generation of professionals. Participants often recognize the immense potential within young people, highlighting their eagerness to learn and their ability to offer fresh perspectives. Furthermore, these interactions frequently align with personal or organizational missions and values, emphasizing the importance of youth empowerment. The importance and value of mentorship was a consistent thread, with individuals acknowledging the crucial role they play in providing insights, knowledge, and real-world experiences to aid youth in making informed career decisions.

While some indicated that their involvement in the program had not significantly changed their views, they remain committed to working with and supporting young people. Many participants expressed gratitude for the opportunity to be part of the program and for the chance to interact with young individuals. They mentioned that the program had made them more aware of the importance of supporting youth. One participant noted this program had “Completely” changed their view toward working with youth and noted that participation in Reboot Plus was, *one of the most important things I have ever done.*

Several participants noted that they wished a program like Reboot Plus had existed for them, when they were a student. For example, *It was inspiring to talk to the student and hear about*

his plans for the future. I feel happy knowing our youth are supported in such important programs. I think it's crucial to take time to talk to youth about their educational and career futures. It's essential to have this guidance at this age. I wish I had had something like this when I was a high school graduate!

Some of the professionals indicated that they felt they could tell the experience was positive for the student. For example, *It was rewarding to shed any bit of wisdom I could and to see that the students genuinely felt a positive impact from it.* Another noted that an important part of the interview experience was, *To see excitement or a "lightbulb" moment in the student's eyes when I said something she hadn't thought of before.*

The following themes emerged from their responses:

1. Positive Attitudes Toward Youth: Many individuals express a positive and enthusiastic attitude toward working with youth. They see it as important and valuable to support and guide young people as they begin their careers. For example, *I work with Youth all the time, so I highly encourage it always.*

2. Recognition of Youth Potential: Several participants mentioned that interacting with youth has reaffirmed their belief in the potential of young people. They often highlight the eagerness to learn and the fresh perspectives that young individuals bring to the table. For example, *My view has always been that youth are the key to the future. We all need to educate, support, challenge, respect and arm our young people with knowledge and experience as our youth will replace us all someday. It is a privilege to be of some (unknown) value to young people by passing on knowledge.*

3. Alignment with Mission or Values: Some individuals noted that their involvement in the program aligns with their personal or organizational mission and values. They express a commitment to supporting youth and helping them succeed. For example, *[Our company] is committed to developing youth, so we are 100% aligned with Reboot [Plus]'s goal.*

4. Importance of Mentorship: Mentorship and guidance for youth were emphasized in many quotes. Participants acknowledge the significance of providing insights, knowledge, and real-world experiences to help youth make informed decisions about their careers. For example, *I believe this program is so valuable for giving youth insight into the realities of careers. I would most definitely mentor a young person to help them follow their career aspirations with an actual understanding of what that might look like day to day.*

Overall, these quotes reflect a positive outlook on working with youth and a recognition of the importance of mentorship and guidance in helping them achieve their career goals. Some participants shared drawbacks in their experience. One key area to consider in future iterations of the program is ensuring Professionals are comfortable with the format of their participation. For example, one participant noted, *The group meeting with the students was emotionally overpowering.* Another noted, *Unfortunately, I was a bit disappointed by my experience. I was told I could expect up to 10 informational interviews, but I only had one. The interview was done virtually, and I think I would have connected more with the individual had it been in person.*

There was a Reboot Plus employee in the conversation, and again, I think I would have made a deeper connection with the youth had it just been her and I. I was looking forward to getting to know a member of a vulnerable population so I could advocate for her, but I didn't get to know her on a personal level. Having said that, I still believe in Reboot Plus' mission and want to continue to support it if a few adjustments are made.

The feedback and insights from professional participants in the Reboot Plus program shed light on several key themes that highlight the significance of mentorship and guidance for young individuals entering the workforce. The overwhelming sentiment expressed by professionals is a positive and enthusiastic attitude towards working with youth, emphasizing the importance of supporting and nurturing the next generation of professionals. These interactions often align with personal or organizational missions and values, emphasizing the importance of youth empowerment. Furthermore, participants recognize the immense potential within young people, highlighting their eagerness to learn and their ability to offer fresh perspectives. The role of mentorship is consistently emphasized, with participants acknowledging their crucial role in providing insights, knowledge, and real-world experiences to aid youth in making informed career decisions.

While some participants indicated that their involvement had not significantly changed their views, they remained committed to working with and supporting young people. Many expressed gratitude for the opportunity to be part of the program and for the chance to interact with young individuals, highlighting the program's impact on increasing awareness of the importance of supporting youth. Some participants expressed that they wished such a program had existed for them when they were students, underlining the program's significance in providing guidance and support to young individuals at a crucial stage in their educational and career journeys. Overall, these quotes reflect a positive outlook on working with youth and a recognition of the importance of mentorship and guidance in helping them achieve their career goals, though some aspects of the program format were noted for potential improvement.

Student data

Participants across the Douglas College and partner site cohorts were remarkably diverse in terms of gender identity, ethnicity, age, and language backgrounds. Participants represented a spectrum of gender identities, including females, males, non-binary individuals, and those who identify as Two-Spirited, Agender, gender fluid, Transgender, Genderqueer, and more. Ethnically, they come from a wide array of backgrounds, with some participants identifying as Indigenous, Jewish, Aboriginal, Irish / Native, Métis, Filipino, Scottish, Indian, Iranian, European, Vietnamese, White, Hispanic, Native, Canadian, Japanese, Pakistani, Latin, Caucasian, Nigerian, Afghan, Irish, Italian, Middle Eastern, Mexican, Caribbean, and more.

Age-wise, the participants span from 16 to 24 years old, with varying educational experiences, having attended between 0 to 5 different elementary schools and 0 to 5 different high schools. Language diversity was also evident, as some participants reported primarily speak languages

other than English at home, including Spanish, Japanese, Urdu, Punjabi, Tigrigna, Somali, Latin, French, Yorùbá, Dari, Oromo, and Amharic.

Alongside this diversity, there are also commonalities among the participants. Most were born in Canada, and English was often the primary language spoken in their homes. The majority did not work outside of the home, but a portion of the group contributed to their household finances through employment. When asked about their overall school experiences, responses varied, with some feeling somewhat negative, some feeling neutral, and others feeling somewhat positive or very positive about their schooling. In summary, this collective group of participants in the program represents a rich diversity of identities, experiences, and backgrounds.

Recruitment of students has varied across cohorts. Each cohort varied slightly in terms of composition. Generally, participants have been described as falling into a “grey area,” which is to say, those who are not served specifically by current school programming and supports. These students were described as falling within an average range of intellectual abilities, and who have faced barriers, adversities, or who have otherwise had atypical pathways through their education and preparation for work.

In this section, data collected from students who participated in the Reboot Plus program is presented. Data collection occurred prior to and upon completion of the in-class portion of the program. Through a comparison of these two data sets, our objective is to gain insights into the program's influence. It is important to note that due to limited sample sizes, inferential statistics cannot be employed, but our analysis aims to provide descriptive insights that contribute to understanding the program's potential effects. This knowledge will aid in program refinement and enhancement. We first present the data collected from participants at the Douglas College site, followed by Bow Valley College, Fanshawe College, Humber College, and College of the North Atlantic.

The key outcomes for student participants are explored:

1. **General Self-Efficacy:** We analyze the extent to which Reboot Plus has enhanced participants' self-belief, self-confidence, and motivation to overcome challenges and pursue their educational and career goals.
2. **Interpersonal Communication Competence:** We assess the impact of the program on participants' ability to effectively communicate, collaborate, and build relationships, thereby equipping them with essential skills for success in academic and professional environments.
3. **Job Search Clarity:** We delve into participants' perspectives on their job prospects, examining the extent to which the program has instilled hope, confidence, and a sense of purpose in their educational and career journeys.

Douglas College

As the original pioneer for model development and implementation, Douglas College has achieved a high degree of success in establishing Reboot Plus in several school districts. Key to success was starting school district relationships at the highest levels to create the continuity and buy-in for support.

Reboot Plus has become a permanent fixture for several districts where there is a recognition and commitment to support these students outside of district resources and services. Key to success in these relationships is a congruency in creativity and flexibility between district and college with a readiness to adapt the model to cohort needs. Each relationship is unique and complete reliance on any one individual such as guidance counsellor or teacher was limiting. Ongoing communication and relationship building has been essential. Some of these elements have included direct transportation to college, flexibility and adaptability of curriculum, delivery timeframe and teaching format, and participant needs and abilities.

An additional observation was the post-covid burnout, job intensification and exhaustion at district level to support something external. There is a continued need to be attentive to and support these transitions.

Going forward, Reboot Plus needs to clearly distinguish its placement in the educational system in terms of the gap it fills and the participants that are otherwise not uniquely supported.

Results

This section presents the data collected by Douglas College from three expansion cohorts over different periods, collected as Cohort 1 (April 2022), Cohort 2 (Fall 2022), and Cohort 3 (February 2023). The data reflects the number of participants, survey completions, and outcomes at Time 1 (intake) and Time 2 (exit) stages. Data was collected in April 2022 at Time 1 for Cohort 1. At this time, there were five fully completed surveys, along with one partial completion and one survey that was started but had no questions answered. Unfortunately, no surveys were fully completed at Time 2 for this group.

The Fall 2022 Cohort 2 saw a combination of online and in-person participation for survey completion. At Time 1, collected in Fall 2022, there were five fully completed surveys conducted online and six surveys completed in person. At Time 2, five surveys were completed in person, while there were no online surveys completed.

For Cohort 3, data was collected in Winter 2023 at Time 1, and there were 13 surveys fully completed in person. At time 2, four surveys were fully completed, and one survey was partially completed at Time 2.

The data from these expansion cohorts showed varied levels of participation and completion rates. For Cohort 1 we experienced significant challenges with survey completion, resulting in no completed surveys at Time 2. Cohort 2 had both online and in-person participation, whereas Cohort 3 was primarily composed of in-person surveys. The findings from these expansion

cohorts provide valuable insights for future studies and highlight the importance of optimizing survey completion rates and considering the impact of different participation methods.

Table 4. Douglas College Cohorts.

	Time 1	Time 2	Entrance interview	Exit interview
Cohort 1 - April 2022	n = 6	n = 0	N = 0	N = 0
Cohort 2 - Fall 2022	n = 11	n = 5	N = 18	N = 8
Cohort 3 - Feb 2023	n = 13	N = 5	N = 8	N = 5

Douglas College Cohort 1

In this cohort, students identified as female (50%), male (17%), nonbinary (17%) or left this question blank (17%). Students identified as Indigenous or First Nation (33%), Hungarian / Australian (17%), or Filipino (17%). Half of these students were 18 years of age, one was 19, and one was 17 years. Most students lived with two or more adults in the home (67%) and all students lived with one other child or young person. Half of the students reported having been born in Canada and 33% reported emigrating from another country (both as young children). English was spoken in the home as a first language in all homes and multiple languages were listed as primary languages by two participants. None of the students reported working outside of the home, contributing to the family finances. Students reported having attended between one and five different elementary schools (mode = 1) and between one and two secondary schools (mode = 2). These students reported feeling neutral toward their overall experience of school (on a scale from 1 to 5 where 1 = *very negative* and 5 = *very positive*) the most common response was 3 (*neutral*) and the average score was 2.8 ($SD = .40$).

Data for Cohort 1 was collected in April 2022. The General Self-Efficacy Scale data is presented first. The scale, ranging from 1 (*Not at all true*) to 4 (*Exactly true*), aims to assess individuals' beliefs in their ability to manage challenging situations and accomplish goals. Out of the 10 items, the pre-test responses were analyzed for six participants, while no data is available for the post-test phase. The average responses (Mean) and the variation in those responses (Standard Deviation) provide insights into participants' self-perceived levels of self-efficacy. For instance, participants seemed moderately confident in their ability to solve difficult problems with effort (Question 1, $M = 3$, $SD = 1.10$), while they expressed relatively lower confidence in their capacity to find solutions when facing opposition (Question 2, $M = 2.17$, $SD = .41$), stick to and accomplish their goals (Question 3, $M = 2.17$, $SD = .41$), and deal with unexpected events (Question 4, $M = 2.17$, $SD = .75$). Similarly, participants reported a certain level of assurance in their ability to solve problems if they invest the necessary effort (Question 6, $M = 2.33$, $SD = .82$). Notably, while the analysis provides descriptive information about participants' self-efficacy beliefs before program participation, the absence of post-test data limits our ability to assess potential changes resulting from the program. The table of results is presented below.

Table 5. General Self-Efficacy, Douglas College Cohort 1.

	Pre-program (N = 6) M (SD)	Post-program (N = 0)
1. I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.	3 (1.10)	-
2. If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want.	2.17 (.41)	-
3. It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.	2.17 (.41)	-
4. I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.	2.17 (.75)	-
5. Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.	2.33 (.82)	-
6. I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.	3.17 (.41)	-
7. I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.	2.83 (1.17)	-
8. When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.	2.50 (.55)	-
9. If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.	2.50 (.55)	-
10. I can usually handle whatever comes my way.	2.83 (.75)	-

Note: The scale for this measure is 1 = Not at all true, 2 = Hardly true, 3 = Moderately true, 4 = Exactly true.

Interpersonal Communication Competence Scale

Cohort 1 participants' interpersonal communication competence data is presented next. The Interpersonal Communication Competence Scale has a range from 1 (*almost never*) to 5 (*almost always*) to gauge various aspects of communication proficiency. The data presents the mean scores and the corresponding standard deviations. Participants reported a tendency to allow their friends to see their true selves (Question 1, $M = 4.40$, $SD = .55$) and believed in their ability to consider others' perspectives (Question 2, $M = 4.20$, $SD = 1.10$). Participants also conveyed a strong belief from their friends that they cared (Question 9, $M = 4.40$, $SD = .55$) and participants felt their emotions were discernible to friends (Question 7, $M = 4.20$, $SD = .84$), and did not see their approach to conversations as relatively one-sided (Question 5, $M = 2.40$, $SD = .55$).

While participants felt moderately comfortable in social situations (Question 3, $M = 3.75$, $SD = .96$), confronting individuals who wronged them was less common (Question 4, $M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.22$). Participants recognized some ability to navigate smooth topic transitions (Question 6, $M = 3.20$, $SD = 1.10$), aimed for descriptive rather than evaluative communication (Question 8, $M = 3.60$, $SD = 0.89$), and expressed a moderate sense of accomplishment in achieving their communication goals (Question 10, $M = 3.40$, $SD = .55$). This data snapshot sheds light on participants' self-perceived interpersonal communication skills and tendencies, providing valuable insights into their beliefs about their communication behaviors and attitudes prior to participation in the program.

Table 6. Interpersonal Communication Competence Scale, Douglas College Cohort 1.

	Pre-program (N = 6) M(SD)	Post-program (N = 0)
1. I allow friends to see who I really am.	4.40 (.55)	-
2. I can put myself in others' shoes.	4.20 (1.10)	-
3. I am comfortable in social situations.	3.75 (.96)	-
4. When I've been wronged, I confront the person who wronged me.	3.00 (1.22)	-
5. My conversations are pretty one-sided.	2.40 (.55)	-
6. My conversations are characterized by smooth shifts from one topic to the next.	3.20 (1.10)	-
7. My friends can tell when I'm happy or sad.	4.20 (.84)	-
8. My communication is usually descriptive, not evaluative.	3.60 (.89)	-
9. My friends truly believe that I care about them.	4.40 (.55)	-
10. I accomplish my communication goals.	3.40 (.55)	-

Note: The scale for this measure is 1 = Almost never, 2 = Seldom, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often, 5 = Almost always

Job Search Clarity

At Time 1, Cohort 1 participants expressed a strong clarity in terms of the type of work they wanted to do (Question 5, $M = 4.40$, $SD = .55$) and some understanding of the type of company they aspired to work for (Question 4, $M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.22$), indicating a solid sense of direction in terms of general work preferences. Participants also demonstrated some clarity about where they wanted to work (Question 2, $M = 3.60$, $SD = 1.14$). Notably, participants were fairly neutral about having a clear idea about the type of job they desired (Question 1, $M = 3.40$, $SD = 0.89$) and job search objectives (Question 3, $M = 3.20$, $SD = 0.84$). The data suggests that participants' career preferences are more well-defined than their specific job search objectives, pointing to potential areas for guidance and support within the job search process.

Table 7. Job Search Clarity, Douglas College Cohort 1

	Pre-program (N = 5) M (SD)	Post-program (N = 0)
I have a clear idea of the type of job I want.	3.40 (.89)	-
I have a clear idea of where I want to work.	3.60 (1.14)	-
I do not have very clear job search objectives.	3.20 (.84)	-
I have a clear idea of the type of company I want to work for.	4.00 (1.22)	-

I have a clear idea of the type of work I want to do.	4.40 (.55)	-
---	------------	---

Note: The scale for this measure is 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Somewhat disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Somewhat agree, 5 = Strongly agree

Douglas College Cohort 2

A total of 11 participants completed the time 1 questionnaires, however only 10 completed the demographic questions. Of the 10 students who completed these items, 50% identified as male, 30% identified as female, 10% identified as Two-Spirited and 10% identified as Agender. Diverse ethnicities were reported, including Jewish, Aboriginal, Irish / Native, Métis, French Canadian, Filipino, Caucasian, Hispanic, Native, and Canadian. Participants were between 18 and 21 years of age ($M = 18.89$). Students reported living with between one and five adults in the home and between zero and three other children or youth in the home. Most students were born in Canada (90%) and spoke primarily English in the home (100%). Two students reported speaking multiple languages in the home. Two students reported currently working outside of the home and 60% reported contributing to the household finances. Students reported having attended between one and five different elementary schools and between one and four different high schools.

General Self-Efficacy

The following section presents data from Cohort 2. First, the General Self-Efficacy Scale provides insights into participants' perceived capabilities and problem-solving attitudes. Participants' responses are presented with the corresponding mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) values, highlighting shifts from pre- to post-program participation. Once again, inferential statistics are not presented due to small sample sizes.

When examining the highest mean scores at pre- and post-test, participants consistently displayed a strong belief in their capacity to solve challenging problems with effort (Question 1, Pre: $M = 3.55$, $SD = .69$; Post: $M = 3.6$, $SD = .55$), indicating a stable problem-solving attitude. Similarly, participants maintained a positive problem-solving outlook when investing effort (Question 6, Pre: $M = 3.45$, $SD = 0.82$; Post: $M = 3.6$, $SD = .55$).

Participants' perceived ability to remain calm during difficulties (Question 7, Pre: $M = 3.27$, $SD = .79$; Post: $M = 3.4$, $SD = 0.89$) remained stable, reflecting a consistent coping ability. Their perceived ability to handle challenges was also relatively stable (Question 10, Pre: $M = 3.09$, $SD = 0.70$; Post: $M = 3.3$, $SD = 0.67$).

In terms of beliefs in resourcefulness when dealing with unforeseen situations (Question 5, Pre: $M = 3.09$, $SD = .70$; Post: $M = 3.2$, $SD = .45$), participants exhibited relatively stable perceptions of their abilities. Similarly, participants' confidence in goal attainment (Question 3, Pre: $M = 2.73$, $SD = 0.47$; Post: $M = 2.7$, $SD = 0.45$) and their capacity to navigate opposition (Question 2, Pre: $M = 2.64$, $SD = .67$; Post: $M = 2.8$, $SD = 0.45$) showed only marginal shifts.

Participants' beliefs in their ability to generate solutions to problems (Question 8, Pre: $M = 3.00$, $SD = .63$; Post: $M = 2.8$, $SD = 0.45$) experienced a slight decrease, with this being one of the larger differences between pre- and post-program responses. Participants' confidence in thinking of solutions when in trouble (Question 9, Pre: $M = 3.55$, $SD = .52$; Post: $M = 3.40$, $SD = 0.55$) was relatively consistent over time.

In terms of perceived efficiency in dealing with unexpected events (Question 4, Pre: $M = 3.09$, $SD = .70$; Post: $M = 2.8$, $SD = .45$), there was slight variability, but the overall difference was not substantial. These findings collectively indicate that participants' responses remained relatively stable across various aspects, with only minor changes observed in select areas.

Table 8. General Self-Efficacy, Douglas College Cohort 2.

	Pre-program (N = 11) M (SD)	Post-program (N = 5) M (SD)
1. I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.	3.55 (.69)	3.6 (.55)
2. If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want.	2.64 (.67)	2.8 (.45)
3. It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.	2.73 (.47)	2.7 (.45)
4. I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.	3.09 (.70)	2.8 (.45)
5. Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.	3.09 (.70)	3.2 (.45)
6. I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.	3.45 (.82)	3.6 (.55)
7. I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.	3.27 (.79)	3.4 (.89)
8. When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.	3.00 (.63)	2.80 (.45)
9. If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.	3.55 (.52)	3.40 (.55)
10. I can usually handle whatever comes my way.	3.09 (.70)	3.3 (.67)

Note: The scale for this measure is 1 = Not at all true, 2 = Hardly true, 3 = Moderately true, 4 = Exactly true.

Interpersonal Communication Competence Scale

Participants' openness in revealing their true selves to friends remained relatively consistent (Question 1, Pre: $M = 3.55$, $SD = 1.13$; Post: $M = 3.60$, $SD = 0.89$) as did their ability to empathize by understanding others' perspectives (Question 2, Pre: $M = 4.09$, $SD = 1.04$; Post: $M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.71$). In terms of their comfort in social situations, participants' feelings remained stable (Question 3, Pre: $M = 3.27$, $SD = 1.10$; Post: $M = 3.20$, $SD = 0.45$), as did their willingness to address wrongdoings with the person responsible (Question 4, Pre: $M = 3.09$, $SD = 1.38$; Post: $M = 3.20$, $SD = 1.30$).

Participants' beliefs that their conversations are one-sided increased (Question 5, Pre: $M = 2.45$, $SD = 0.69$; Post: $M = 3.40$, $SD = 0.89$). Conversely, their beliefs in their ability to transition smoothly between conversation topics remained relatively steady (Question 6, Pre: $M = 3.09$, $SD = 0.94$; Post: $M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.71$).

Their beliefs in the accuracy of friends' perceptions of participants' emotional states increased slightly (Question 7, Pre: $M = 3.09$, $SD = 1.22$; Post: $M = 3.40$, $SD = 0.89$). Meanwhile, participants' beliefs that their communication style was more descriptive than evaluative stayed consistent (Question 8, Pre: $M = 3.40$, $SD = 0.97$; Post: $M = 3.40$, $SD = 0.55$).

Finally, participants' beliefs that their friends believe in their care for them remained stable (Question 9, Pre: $M = 4.55$, $SD = 0.69$; Post: $M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.71$), and their sense of achieving their communication goals decreased (Question 10, Pre: $M = 3.64$, $SD = 0.81$; Post: $M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.00$).

Table 9. Interpersonal Communication Competence, Douglas College Cohort 2.

	Pre-program (N = 11)	Post-program (N = 5)
1. I allow friends to see who I really am.	3.55 (1.13)	3.60 (.89)
2. I can put myself in others' shoes.	4.09 (1.04)	4.00 (.71)
3. I am comfortable in social situations.	3.27 (1.10)	3.20 (.45)
4. When I've been wronged, I confront the person who wronged me.	3.09 (1.38)	3.20 (1.30)
5. My conversations are pretty one-sided.	2.45 (.69)	3.40 (.89)
6. My conversations are characterized by smooth shifts from one topic to the next.	3.09 (.94)	3.00 (.71)
7. My friends can tell when I'm happy or sad.	3.09 (1.22)	3.40 (.89)
8. My communication is usually descriptive, not evaluative.	3.40 (.97)	3.40 (.55)
9. My friends truly believe that I care about them.	4.55 (.69)	4.00 (.71)
10. I accomplish my communication goals.	3.64 (.81)	3.00 (1.00)

Note: The scale for this measure is 1 = Almost never, 2 = Seldom, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often, 5 = Almost always

Job Search Clarity

Comparing the pre-test and post-test means, participants generally reported increased clarity in their job search objectives in several areas after completing the program. Notably, there was an improvement in participants' clarity regarding the type of job they wanted (pre $M = 3.18$, $SD = 1.08$; post $M = 3.60$, $SD = 0.55$). Participants' clarity about the type of work they desired to do (pre $M = 4.09$, $SD = 0.94$; post $M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.71$), where they wanted to work (pre $M = 2.91$, $SD = 1.22$; post $M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.71$), as well as having clear job search objectives remained stable from pre- to post-test (pre $M = 2.91$, $SD = 0.94$; post $M = 2.80$, $SD = 1.30$). Interestingly,

their clarity related to the type of company they wanted to work for decreased (pre $M = 3.45$, $SD = 0.93$; post $M = 2.80$, $SD = 0.84$).

Table 10. Job Search Clarity, Douglas College Cohort 2

	Pre-program (N = 11) M (SD)	Post-program (N = 5)
1. I have a clear idea of the type of job I want.	3.18 (1.08)	3.60 (.55)
2. I have a clear idea of where I want to work.	2.91 (1.22)	3.00 (.71)
3. I do not have very clear job search objectives.	2.91 (.94)	2.80 (1.30)
4. I have a clear idea of the type of company I want to work for.	3.45 (.93)	2.80 (.84)
5. I have a clear idea of the type of work I want to do.	4.09 (.94)	4.00 (.71)

Note: The scale for this measure is 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Somewhat disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Somewhat agree, 5 = Strongly agree

Douglas College Cohort 3

Thirteen students participated in cohort 3 and 10 participants completed the demographic questionnaire. Of those 10 students, 40% identified as female and 60% identified as male. Various ethnic backgrounds were reported, including Scottish, Native, French, First Nations, Indian, Iranian, European, Vietnamese, White, Filipino, Métis, Scottish, German, and Chinese. Students were between 16 and 21 years of age ($M = 17.9$). Students reported living with between zero and four adults in the home and with between zero and three other children or youth in the home. Most participants reported being born in Canada (70%) and speaking English as the first language in their home. Most students reported that they did not work outside of the home (70%) and of those who did, all reported contributing financially to their household. Students reported having attended between one and four elementary schools and between one and five high schools.

Cohort 3 participants' self-efficacy perceptions were assessed using the General Self-Efficacy Scale. Participants' conviction in their ability to tackle demanding problems through determined effort (Question 1, Pre: $M = 3.08$, $SD = 0.49$; Post: $M = 2.80$, $SD = 0.45$) demonstrated a slight decline following the program. Participants experienced a slight increase in their confidence to find ways to overcome opposition after program participation (Question 2, Pre: $M = 2.69$, $SD = 0.63$; Post: $M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.71$).

Concerning participants' sense of achievement in adhering to objectives, responses were relatively consistent before and after the program (Question 3, Pre: $M = 2.62$, $SD = 0.96$; Post:

$M = 2.40, SD = 0.89$). Confidence in dealing effectively with unforeseen events was also relatively stable over time (Question 4, Pre: $M = 2.77, SD = 0.60$; Post: $M = 3.00, SD = 0.00$). Additionally, participants' perceived ability to navigate unforeseen situations was also relatively stable (Question 5, Pre: $M = 2.77, SD = 0.73$; Post: $M = 3.00, SD = 1.00$).

Participants' confidence in their problem-solving ability through effort exhibited a slight rise post-program (Question 6, Pre: $M = 3.23, SD = 0.73$; Post: $M = 3.60, SD = 0.55$). Maintaining composure during challenges, an indicator of coping abilities, remained relatively steady (Question 7, Pre: $M = 2.69, SD = 0.95$; Post: $M = 2.60, SD = 1.14$). Participants' perception of generating solutions was also relatively stable (Question 8, Pre: $M = 2.85, SD = 0.56$; Post: $M = 3.00, SD = 0.71$).

Lastly, participants' confidence in thinking of solutions when facing difficulties was relatively stable (Question 9, Pre: $M = 2.77, SD = 0.73$; Post: $M = 3.00, SD = 0.00$) as was perceived ability to handle challenges (Question 10, Pre: $M = 2.77, SD = 0.60$; Post: $M = 2.60, SD = 0.89$). Notably, the largest changes were observed in the perceived efficacy of solving problems if they invested the necessary effort (Question 6) following the program.

Table 11. General Self-Efficacy, Douglas College Cohort 3.

	Pre-program (N = 13) M (SD)	Post-program (N = 5) M (SD)
1. I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.	3.08 (.49)	2.80 (.45)
2. If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want.	2.69 (.63)	3.00 (.71)
3. It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.	2.62 (.96)	2.40 (.89)
4. I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.	2.77 (.60)	3.00 (0)
5. Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.	2.77 (.73)	3.00 (1.00)
6. I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.	3.23 (.73)	3.60 (.55)
7. I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.	2.69 (.95)	2.60 (1.14)
8. When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.	2.85 (.56)	3.00 (.71)
9. If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.	2.77 (.73)	3.00 (0)
10. I can usually handle whatever comes my way.	2.77 (.60)	2.60 (.89)

Note: The scale for this measure is 1 = Not at all true, 2 = Hardly true, 3 = Moderately true, 4 = Exactly true.

Interpersonal Communication Competence Scale

Participants' willingness to reveal their genuine selves to friends displayed a slight decrease after the program (Question 1, Pre: $M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.82$; Post: $M = 3.60$, $SD = 1.34$). Participants' capacity for empathy and understanding others' perspectives exhibited an increase after the program (Question 2, Pre: $M = 3.92$, $SD = 0.86$; Post: $M = 4.60$, $SD = 0.55$).

Regarding comfort in social situations, participants' comfort levels decreased (Question 3, Pre: $M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.91$; Post: $M = 2.60$, $SD = 0.55$). However, their tendency to directly address wrongdoings with the responsible person remained relatively stable (Question 4, Pre: $M = 2.92$, $SD = 1.44$; Post: $M = 2.40$, $SD = 1.34$).

Participants' inclination towards one-sided conversations showed some variation (Question 5, Pre: $M = 2.77$, $SD = 1.01$; Post: $M = 2.60$, $SD = 0.89$). In contrast, their ability to transition smoothly between topics remained consistent (Question 6, Pre: $M = 3.23$, $SD = 1.09$; Post: $M = 3.40$, $SD = 0.55$).

The accuracy of participants' friends in perceiving their emotional states increased (Question 7, Pre: $M = 3.54$, $SD = 1.39$; Post: $M = 4.20$, $SD = 1.10$). Meanwhile, participants' communication style, tending towards description rather than evaluation, remained relatively steady (Question 8, Pre: $M = 3.46$, $SD = 0.66$; Post: $M = 3.60$, $SD = 0.55$).

Finally, participants' ability to make their friends believe in their care for them showed a slight decrease (Question 9, Pre: $M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.08$; Post: $M = 4.60$, $SD = 0.89$), as did their sense of achieving communication goals (Question 10, Pre: $M = 3.62$, $SD = 0.77$; Post: $M = 3.80$, $SD = 0.45$). Notably, the most significant change was in Question 2, where participants' empathy and understanding of others' perspectives increased after the program.

Table 12. Interpersonal Communication Competence, Douglas College Cohort 3.

	Pre-program (N = 13) M (SD)	Post-program (N = 5) M (SD)
1. I allow friends to see who I really am.	4.00 (.82)	3.60 (1.34)
2. I can put myself in others' shoes.	3.92 (.86)	4.60 (.55)
3. I am comfortable in social situations.	3.00 (.91)	2.60 (.55)
4. When I've been wronged, I confront the person who wronged me.	2.92 (1.44)	2.40 (1.34)
5. My conversations are pretty one-sided.	2.77 (1.01)	2.60 (.89)
6. My conversations are characterized by smooth shifts from one topic to the next.	3.23 (1.09)	3.40 (.55)
7. My friends can tell when I'm happy or sad.	3.54 (1.39)	4.20 (1.10)
8. My communication is usually descriptive, not evaluative.	3.46 (.66)	3.60 (.55)
9. My friends truly believe that I care about them.	4.00 (1.08)	4.60 (.89)
10. I accomplish my communication goals.	3.62 (.77)	3.80 (.45)

Note: The scale for this measure is 1 = Almost never, 2 = Seldom, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often, 5 = Almost always

Job Search Clarity

Comparing the pre-test and post-test scores, participants generally reported increases in their job search clarity in various areas after completing the program. Notably, there was an improvement across all items, including in participants' clarity regarding the type of job they wanted (pre $M = 3.85$, $SD = 0.90$; post $M = 4.20$, $SD = 1.30$), where they wanted to work (pre $M = 3.54$, $SD = 1.05$; post $M = 3.80$, $SD = 0.84$), and having clear job search objectives (pre $M = 2.92$, $SD = 1.04$; post $M = 1.40$, $SD = 0.55$). Their clarity related to the type of company they wanted to work for also increased (pre $M = 3.15$, $SD = 1.14$; post $M = 3.80$, $SD = 1.30$) as did their clarity about the type of work they desired to do (pre $M = 3.92$, $SD = 0.86$; post $M = 4.60$, $SD = 0.55$).

Table 13. Job Search Clarity, Douglas College Cohort 3.

	Pre-program (N = 13)	Post-program (N = 5)
1. I have a clear idea of the type of job I want.	3.85 (.90)	4.20 (1.30)
2. I have a clear idea of where I want to work.	3.54 (1.05)	3.80 (.84)
3. I do not have very clear job search objectives.	2.92 (1.04)	1.40 (.55)
4. I have a clear idea of the type of company I want to work for.	3.15 (1.14)	3.80 (1.30)
5. I have a clear idea of the type of work I want to do.	3.92 (.86)	4.60 (.55)

Note: The scale for this measure is 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Somewhat disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Somewhat agree, 5 = Strongly agree

Program Satisfaction

Upon completion of Reboot Plus, participants were asked to rate their satisfaction with various aspects of the program using a scale from 1 (*Strongly Disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly Agree*).

Participants were generally satisfied with the program, rating it positively in various aspects such as agreeing that the instructor promoted discussion and participation and that the instructor was flexible and able to adjust the materials to meet their needs, as well as that the program's objectives were clearly explained, the program met their goals. Students expressed satisfaction overall with the program.

Table 14. Program Satisfaction, Douglas College Cohort 3.

	(N = 5) M (SD)
1. The program’s objectives were clearly explained	4.80 (.45)
2. I believe the program achieved its objectives	4.40 (.55)
3. The program met the goals that I had when I started	4.80 (.45)
4. The instructor was knowledgeable about the subject matter	4.50 (.58)
5. The instructor presented the concepts and material clearly in a way that helped me understand	4.50 (.58)
6. The instructor promoted discussion and participation	5.00 (0)
7. The instructor was well organized and kept activities on track	4.75 (.5)
8. The instructor was flexible and able to adjust the materials to meet my individual needs	5.00 (0)
9. I found the program useful	4.25 (.50)
10. I intend to apply what I learned during the program to my future work / career pursuits	4.50 (.58)
11. I would recommend the program to other students	4.50 (.58)
12. The program fit well into my schedule	4.67 (.58)

Note: The scale for this measure is 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Somewhat disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Somewhat agree, 5 = Strongly agree

Bow Valley College

Bow Valley College (n=17) was unable to partner with the Calgary School District and therefore recruitment for the program was modified. The school district response was negative based on a risk and protectionist perspective. As a result, their data must be viewed with caution as it is not directly comparable. Their participants were recruited primarily through social media and onsite campus advertising.

Bow Valley was able to build a successful partnership with the Calgary Chamber of Commerce. The college team launched a marketing campaign through social media, radio, and onsite campus. Twenty-four participants signed up (Fifty inquired with interest). Several internal referrals came from Youth in Transition-Bridge program for immigrant students working on language and literacy skills.

As a result, the participants were slightly older than other cohorts and not necessarily in high school. The youngest participant left high school before completing, though many participants were recruited for upgrading. As many participants were not in school, the major success was getting them out of their homes and on campus. For many, practicing taking college transit, coming to the college, connecting with other participants they could relate to. They reported building confidence and feeling belonging as an outcome of the program.

In this cohort, students identified as female (59%), male (29%), gender fluid (6%), and nonbinary (6%). Various ethnic backgrounds were reported such as: Japanese, Pakistani,

Indigenous, Latin, Caucasian, Nigerian, Afghan, Irish, Italian, and several participants reported more than one ethnicity. Participants were between 17 and 24 years of age ($M = 19.73$, $SD = 2.09$). Participants lived with between one and four other adults in the home (mode = 2 other adults), and between zero and four children (mode = 2 children). Almost half of participants (47%) reported having been born outside of Canada and moved to Canada as early as 2008 and as recently as 2022 (29% of participants in this cohort had moved to Canada between 2020 and 2022). Several languages other than English were mainly spoken in the homes of participants, including Spanish, Japanese, Urdu, Punjabi, Tigrigna, Somali, Latin, French, Yorùbá, Dari, Oromo, and Amharic. Most participants did not work outside of the home (77%), and of those who did work, they worked an average of 15 hours per week at their job (range = 8-24 hours). Several participants reported contributing to their household income. Participants reported having attended between zero (i.e., was homeschooled) and three different elementary schools and between zero (i.e., homeschool) and two high different high schools, though one participant noted that they had attended “many” different high schools previously. The most common response to how students felt about their overall experience of school was *neutral* (35%). Some participants reported feeling *somewhat negative* (29%), and some reported feeling *somewhat positive* or *very positive* (18%) about their overall experience of school (18% of participants did not answer this question).

General Self-Efficacy

Participants' conviction in their ability to tackle demanding problems through determined effort remained relatively stable from pre- to post- program participation (Question 1, Pre: $M = 3.13$, $SD = 0.62$; Post: $M = 3.11$, $SD = 0.78$). Participants' confidence in finding ways to overcome opposition remained relatively stable after program participation as well (Question 2, Pre: $M = 2.86$, $SD = 1.17$; Post: $M = 2.67$, $SD = 0.87$).

Concerning participants' sense of achievement in adhering to objectives, perceptions remained relatively stable (Question 3, Pre: $M = 2.73$, $SD = 0.70$; Post: $M = 2.78$, $SD = 1.09$), however their confidence in dealing effectively with unforeseen events increased slightly (Question 4, Pre: $M = 2.87$, $SD = 0.74$; Post: $M = 3.33$, $SD = 0.87$). Their perceived ability to navigate unforeseen situations increased slightly as well (Question 5, Pre: $M = 2.80$, $SD = 0.86$; Post: $M = 3.33$, $SD = .71$).

Participants' confidence in their problem-solving ability through effort remained stable (Question 6, Pre: $M = 3.27$, $SD = .59$; Post: $M = 3.22$, $SD = 0.83$). In contrast, maintaining composure during challenges, an indicator of their perception of coping abilities, increased (Question 7, Pre: $M = 2.73$, $SD = .88$; Post: $M = 3.75$, $SD = 1.49$). Meanwhile, participants' perception of generating solutions remained stable (Question 8, Pre: $M = 3.20$, $SD = 0.78$; Post: $M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.87$).

Lastly, participants' confidence in thinking of solutions when facing difficulties remained stable (Question 9, Pre: $M = 3.13$, $SD = 0.74$; Post: $M = 3.33$, $SD = 0.71$) as did their perceptions of handling challenges (Question 10, Pre: $M = 3.33$, $SD = 0.82$; Post: $M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.71$). Notably,

the largest changes were observed in Question 7, their belief that they can remain calm facing difficulties because they can rely on coping abilities.

Table 15. General Self-Efficacy, Bow Valley College

	Pre-program (N = 16) M (SD)	Post-program (N = 9) M (SD)
1. I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.	3.13 (.62)	3.11 (.78)
2. If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want.	2.86 (1.17)	2.67 (.87)
3. It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.	2.73 (.70)	2.78 (1.09)
4. I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.	2.87 (.74)	3.33 (.87)
5. Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.	2.80 (.86)	3.33 (.71)
6. I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.	3.27 (.59)	3.22 (.83)
7. I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.	2.73 (.88)	3.75 (1.49)
8. When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.	3.20 (.78)	3.00 (.87)
9. If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.	3.13 (.74)	3.33 (.71)
10. I can usually handle whatever comes my way.	3.33 (.82)	3.00 (.71)

Note: The scale for this measure is 1 = Not at all true, 2 = Hardly true, 3 = Moderately true, 4 = Exactly true.

Interpersonal Communication Competence Scale

Participants' openness in revealing their true selves to friends increased (Question 1, Pre $M = 3.27$, $SD = 1.53$; Post $M = 4.63$, $SD = 0.74$) as did their ability to empathize by understanding others' perspectives (Question 2, Pre $M = 3.20$, $SD = 1.52$; Post $M = 3.88$, $SD = 0.84$). Their comfort in social situations also increased (Question 3, Pre $M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.25$; Post $M = 3.50$, $SD = 0.93$). Regarding the willingness to address a person they felt wronged them, participants' scores increased (Question 4, Pre $M = 2.87$, $SD = 0.99$; Post $M = 3.50$, $SD = 1.20$). Beliefs that their conversations are one-sided decreased (Question 5, Pre $M = 3.20$, $SD = 0.68$; Post $M = 2.88$, $SD = 0.84$). Participants' beliefs in their ability to transition smoothly between conversation topics increased slightly (Question 6, Pre $M = 3.13$, $SD = 0.83$; Post $M = 3.50$, $SD = 1.31$). Beliefs that their friends could read their emotional states increased (Question 7, Pre $M = 3.13$, $SD = 0.99$; Post $M = 3.63$, $SD = 1.30$). Participants' beliefs that their communication style was more descriptive than evaluative increased slightly (Question 8, Pre $M = 3.25$, $SD = 0.87$; Post $M = 3.50$, $SD = 1.07$) and beliefs that their friends believe in their care for them remained stable (Pre $M = 4.14$, $SD = 0.86$; Post $M = 4.13$, $SD = 1.13$). Finally, participants' sense of

achieving their communication goals increased (Pre $M = 3.21$, $SD = 0.80$; Post $M = 3.63$, $SD = 0.92$).

Table 16. Interpersonal Communication Competence, Bow Valley College

	Pre-program (N = 15) M (SD)	Post-program (N = 8) M (SD)
1. I allow friends to see who I really am.	3.27 (1.53)	4.63 (.74)
2. I can put myself in others' shoes.	3.20 (1.52)	3.88 (.84)
3. I am comfortable in social situations.	3.00 (1.25)	3.50 (.93)
4. When I've been wronged, I confront the person who wronged me.	2.87 (.99)	3.50 (1.20)
5. My conversations are pretty one-sided.	3.20 (.68)	2.88 (.84)
6. My conversations are characterized by smooth shifts from one topic to the next.	3.13 (.83)	3.50 (1.31)
7. My friends can tell when I'm happy or sad.	3.13 (.99)	3.63 (1.30)
8. My communication is usually descriptive, not evaluative.	3.25 (.87)	3.50 (1.07)
9. My friends truly believe that I care about them.	4.14 (.86)	4.13 (1.13)
10. I accomplish my communication goals.	3.21 (.80)	3.63 (.92)

Note: The scale for this measure is 1 = Almost never, 2 = Seldom, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often, 5 = Almost always

Job Search Clarity

Comparing the pre-test and post-test means, participants increased their job search clarity in several domains over the course of the program. Notably, there was an improvement in participants' clarity regarding the type of job they wanted (pre $M = 3.47$, $SD = 1.30$; post $M = 4.38$, $SD = 0.92$). Participants' clarity about where they wanted to work also showed a slight increase (pre $M = 3.40$, $SD = 1.24$; post $M = 3.88$, $SD = 0.99$). Participants' clarity about the type of work they desired to do also increased following their participation in the program (pre $M = 3.50$, $SD = 1.40$; post $M = 4.13$, $SD = 0.84$).

Conversely, participants' clarity related to having clear job search objectives remained relatively stable from pre- to post-test (pre $M = 2.77$, $SD = 1.30$; post $M = 2.63$, $SD = 1.30$) as did their clarity regarding the type of company they wanted to work for (pre $M = 3.14$, $SD = 1.46$; post $M = 3.38$, $SD = 1.19$).

Table 17. Job Search Clarity, Bow Valley College

	Pre-program (N = 15)	Post-program (N = 8)
I have a clear idea of the type of job I want.	3.47 (1.30)	4.38 (.92)
I have a clear idea of where I want to work.	3.40 (1.24)	3.88 (.99)
I do not have very clear job search objectives.	2.77 (1.30)	2.63 (1.30)
I have a clear idea of the type of company I want to work for.	3.14 (1.46)	3.38 (1.19)
I have a clear idea of the type of work I want to do.	3.50 (1.40)	4.13 (.84)

Note: The scale for this measure is 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Somewhat disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Somewhat agree, 5 = Strongly agree

Program Satisfaction

Overall, participants rated that they were satisfied with the program, placing all statements on this scale within the range of *Agree* to *Strongly Agree*. They strongly agreed that their instructor was knowledgeable about the subject matter and presented concepts and materials clearly in a way that helped their understanding. They also strongly agreed with the statement that the program was useful. Students expressed satisfaction overall with the program.

Table 18. Program Satisfaction, Bow Valley College

	(N = 7) M (SD)
The program's objectives were clearly explained	4.57 (.54)
I believe the program achieved its objectives	4.63 (.74)
The program met the goals that I had when I started	4.25 (.89)
The instructor was knowledgeable about the subject matter	5.00 (0)
The instructor presented the concepts and material clearly in a way that helped me understand	5.00 (0)
The instructor promoted discussion and participation	4.67 (.50)
The instructor was well organized and kept activities on track	4.67 (.50)
The instructor was flexible and able to adjust the materials to meet my individual needs	4.78 (.44)
I found the program useful	5.00 (0)
I intend to apply what I learned during the program to my future school / college studies	4.67 (.50)
I intend to apply what I learned during the program to my future work / career pursuits	4.67 (.50)
I would recommend the program to other students	4.78 (.67)

The program fit well into my schedule	4.67 (.50)
What's your overall rating of the program?	1.63 (1.41)

Note. The scale for all questions except the last is 1 = Strongly disagree, 2. = Somewhat disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Somewhat agree, and 5 = Strongly agree. For the last question (What's your overall rating of the program) the scale is 1 = Really enjoyed it, 2 = Mostly enjoyed it, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Mostly did not enjoy it, 5 = Really did not enjoy it

Fanshawe College

Fanshawe College (n = 26) reported that support from one of the school boards and in particular, the Superintendent was a key determinant of success. There was commitment and buy-in from all levels and the offering of course credit was established immediately.

Significant to success was the commitment to equitable service. The large geographic area included meant that direct transportation was required. The entire class came from an alternative education program with their teacher from over an hour away.

Fanshawe used social media to encourage community, professionals and school board participation which established stronger investment of stakeholders. Lauding stakeholder participation on social media was beneficial.

Success depended on the support and advocacy within the school boards and more time was needed to cultivate these relationships. Course credit was important, and it would have been beneficial to identify which credit and program Reboot Plus represents.

One of the unique aspects of rural community participation was identified as increased awareness and accessibility. For many rural students, this program experience broke down some preconceived notions about who attends post-secondary. Credit is flexible at Fanshawe and can be on a case-by-case basis and career related, which further encouraged participants to explore options.

The transportation of the whole class created more opportunity for connections and the groups became like a family. The bus driver became an unofficial partner, including some participation in events such as bowling and sharing ice cream. The teacher attended each week and saw opportunities to connect other course content to Reboot Plus learnings.

Participants in this cohort identified as female (35%), male (42%), gender neutral (4%), Transgender (4%), Non-Binary (8%), and Genderqueer (8%). Some participants identified as having mixed backgrounds or multiple ethnicities, including Indigenous, Middle Eastern, Nigerian, Mexican, and Caribbean. Sixty-nine percent of participants identified as White. Students were between the ages of 16 and 23 years ($M = 17$, $SD = 1.55$). Participants reported living with between one and four adults in the home and between one and two children in the home (not including themselves). Most participants reported having been born in Canada (8% reported having been born outside of Canada). Most participants reported speaking English as a main language in their homes (4% reported speaking a language other than English). Most participants did not work outside of the home (23% reported that they were employed). Of

those who were employed, they reported working between 15 and 22 hours per week and 23% of participants reported contributing financially to their household. Students reported attending between one and five or more elementary schools (mode = 3) and between one and four high schools (mode = 1). When asked to think about their overall experience of school, participants described it as *somewhat negative* or *very negative* (39%), *neutral* (39%), or *somewhat positive* (23%).

General Self-Efficacy

Participants' confidence in dealing with tough problems through determined effort remained consistent from pre to post program (Question 1, Pre: $M = 3.27, SD = 0.67$; Post: $M = 3.42, SD = 0.58$). Participants' belief in finding ways to overcome challenges when opposed increased slightly between pre- and post-test (Question 2, Pre: $M = 2.65, SD = 0.69$; Post: $M = 3.08, SD = 0.50$).

When it comes to sticking to their goals, participants' feelings remained stable (Question 3, Pre: $M = 2.81, SD = 0.63$; Post: $M = 3.00, SD = 0.72$). However, their confidence in handling unexpected events increased slightly (Question 4, Pre: $M = 2.77, SD = 0.71$; Post: $M = 3.21, SD = 0.72$). A similar trend was seen in their belief that they can handle unexpected situations (Question 5, Pre: $M = 2.85, SD = 0.68$; Post: $M = 3.17, SD = 0.82$).

Participants' assurance in their problem-solving skills through hard work remained consistent throughout the program (Question 6, Pre: $M = 3.31, SD = 0.62$; Post: $M = 3.33, SD = 0.76$). On the other hand, their sense of staying calm during challenges, which shows how well they think they can handle problems, increased slightly (Question 7, Pre: $M = 2.58, SD = 0.95$; Post: $M = 2.92, SD = 0.88$). Meanwhile, participants' perception of their ability to come up with different solutions to problems increased slightly (Question 8, Pre: $M = 2.62, SD = 0.75$; Post: $M = 2.92, SD = 0.72$).

Lastly, participants' belief in thinking up solutions when facing difficulties remained unchanged (Question 9, Pre: $M = 3.04, SD = 0.66$; Post: $M = 3.00, SD = 0.72$), and their sense of handling whatever comes their way increased slightly (Question 10, Pre: $M = 3.00, SD = 0.85$; Post: $M = 3.25, SD = 0.68$).

Table 19. General Self-Efficacy, Fanshawe College

	Pre-program (N = 26) M (SD)	Post-program (N = 24) M (SD)
1. I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.	3.27 (.67)	3.42 (.58)
2. If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want.	2.65 (.69)	3.08 (.50)

3. It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.	2.81 (.63)	3.00 (.72)
4. I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.	2.77 (.71)	3.21 (.72)
5. Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.	2.85 (.68)	3.17 (.82)
6. I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.	3.31 (.62)	3.33 (.76)
7. I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.	2.58 (.95)	2.92 (.88)
8. When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.	2.62 (.75)	2.92 (.72)
9. If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.	3.04 (.66)	3.00 (.72)
10. I can usually handle whatever comes my way.	3.00 (.85)	3.25 (.68)

Note: The scale for this measure is 1 = Not at all true, 2 = Hardly true, 3 = Moderately true, 4 = Exactly true.

Interpersonal Communication Competence Scale

Participants beliefs that they allow friends to see who they really are remained stable (Question 1, Pre $M = 3.96$, $SD = 1.04$; Post $M = 4.00$, $SD = 0.72$), as did their beliefs in their ability to put themselves in others' shoes (Question 2, Pre $M = 3.81$, $SD = 0.94$; Post $M = 3.75$, $SD = 0.90$). Their comfort in social situations remained stable (Question 3, Pre $M = 3.27$, $SD = 1.04$; Post $M = 3.04$, $SD = 0.96$), as did their willingness to confront a person who wronged them (Question 4, Pre $M = 3.42$, $SD = 1.17$; Post $M = 3.46$, $SD = 1.25$). Their beliefs that their conversations are one-sided remained stable (Question 5, Pre $M = 2.77$, $SD = 0.77$; Post $M = 2.75$, $SD = 0.85$), as did their beliefs in their ability to transition smoothly between conversation topics (Question 6, Pre $M = 2.92$, $SD = 1.06$; Post $M = 3.08$, $SD = 1.10$). In terms of their beliefs in their friends' ability to perceive their emotional states, this belief remained stable (Question 7, Pre $M = 3.69$, $SD = 1.12$; Post $M = 3.63$, $SD = 0.71$). Beliefs about their communication style being more descriptive than evaluative increased slightly (Question 8, Pre $M = 3.12$, $SD = 1.21$; Post $M = 3.54$, $SD = 0.59$). Their beliefs that their friends believed in their care for them showed a slight decrease (Pre $M = 4.15$, $SD = 1.01$; Post $M = 3.88$, $SD = 0.85$). Lastly, participants' sense of achieving their communication goals remained stable (Pre $M = 3.31$, $SD = 1.19$; Post $M = 3.50$, $SD = 1.14$).

Table 20. Interpersonal Communication Competence, Fanshawe College

	Pre-program (N = 26) M (SD)	Post-program (N = 24) M (SD)
1. I allow friends to see who I really am.	3.96 (1.04)	4.00 (.72)
2. I can put myself in others' shoes.	3.81 (.94)	3.75 (.90)
3. I am comfortable in social situations.	3.27 (1.04)	3.04 (.96)
4. When I've been wronged, I confront the person who wronged me.	3.42 (1.17)	3.46 (1.25)
5. My conversations are pretty one-sided.	2.77 (.77)	2.75 (.85)
6. My conversations are characterized by smooth shifts from one topic to the next.	2.92 (1.06)	3.08 (1.10)
7. My friends can tell when I'm happy or sad.	3.69 (1.12)	3.63 (.71)
8. My communication is usually descriptive, not evaluative.	3.12 (1.21)	3.54 (.59)
9. My friends truly believe that I care about them.	4.15 (1.01)	3.88 (.85)
10. I accomplish my communication goals.	3.31 (1.19)	3.50 (1.14)

Note: The scale for this measure is 1 = Almost never, 2 = Seldom, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often, 5 = Almost always

Job Search Clarity

Comparing the pre-test and post-test means, participants demonstrated changes in their job search clarity across various dimensions after completing the program. Notably, there was an increase in participants' clarity regarding the type of job they wanted (pre $M = 3.31$, $SD = 1.29$; post $M = 3.96$, $SD = 0.81$). Participants' clarity about where they wanted to work also increased (pre $M = 2.96$, $SD = 1.31$; post $M = 3.75$, $SD = 0.94$). Their clarity about having job search objectives improved as well (pre $M = 3.31$, $SD = 1.19$; post $M = 2.67$, $SD = 0.87$). Their clarity regarding the type of company they wanted to work for also increased (pre $M = 2.88$, $SD = 1.40$; post $M = 3.38$, $SD = 1.06$) as did their clarity about the type of work they desired to do (pre $M = 3.16$, $SD = 1.43$; post $M = 4.04$, $SD = 0.69$).

Table 21. Job Search Clarity, Fanshawe College

	Pre-program (N = 26)	Post-program (N = 24)
1. I have a clear idea of the type of job I want.	3.31 (1.29)	3.96 (.81)
2. I have a clear idea of where I want to work.	2.96 (1.31)	3.75 (.94)
3. I do not have very clear job search objectives.	3.31 (1.19)	2.67 (.87)

4. I have a clear idea of the type of company I want to work for.	2.88 (1.40)	3.38 (1.06)
5. I have a clear idea of the type of work I want to do.	3.16 (1.43)	4.04 (.69)

Note: The scale for this measure is 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Somewhat disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Somewhat agree, 5 = Strongly agree

Program Satisfaction

Overall, participants rated that they were satisfied with the program, indicating their agreement with most statements on this scale. They generally agreed that the program's objectives were met, the instructor was knowledgeable and presented the concepts clearly and in a way that was helpful to their understanding, the instructor promoted participation and was organized and flexible. They agreed that the program was useful, and they agreed that they intended to apply what they learned in future career endeavors. They endorsed a more neutral position on applying what they learned to future school studies. Overall, students expressed satisfaction with the program.

Table 22. Program Satisfaction, Fanshawe College

	(N = 24) M (SD)
The program's objectives were clearly explained	3.96 (.91)
I believe the program achieved its objectives	4.04 (.62)
The program met the goals that I had when I started	3.79 (1.14)
The instructor was knowledgeable about the subject matter	4.46 (.66)
The instructor presented the concepts and material clearly in a way that helped me understand	4.25 (.85)
The instructor promoted discussion and participation	4.63 (.58)
The instructor was well organized and kept activities on track	4.08 (.58)
The instructor was flexible and able to adjust the materials to meet my individual needs	4.13 (.74)
I found the program useful	4.04 (.75)
I intend to apply what I learned during the program to my future school / college studies	3.67 (1.09)
I intend to apply what I learned during the program to my future work / career pursuits	4.08 (.65)
I would recommend the program to other students	4.25 (.61)
The program fit well into my schedule	4.04 (.88)
What's your overall rating of this program?	1.88 (.85)

Note. The scale for all questions except the last is 1 = Strongly disagree, 2. = Somewhat disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Somewhat agree, and 5 = Strongly agree. For the last question

(What's your overall rating of the program) the scale is 1 = Really enjoyed it, 2 = Mostly enjoyed it, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Mostly did not enjoy it, 5 = Really did not enjoy it

Humber College

Humber College (n= 11) had challenges establishing relationships with urban school boards. Consequently, they pursued direct contact and specific program outreach for recruitment. Recruitment also occurred on campus for students looking for transition programs.

Given the location of Humber Guelph in proximity to Toronto, there was an acknowledgement of substantial related and well-funded programming being offered. Hosting at the Humber location was seen to be the biggest issue and there is speculation that hosting in more distant locations such as Brampton or Mississauga for example would have likely provided more opportunity to realize unmet needs in under / less served areas.

Providing educational credit for program completion was found to be key to successful recruitment. Furthermore, there needed to be a clearer distinction of the program model for Reboot Plus students and Youth Transitions in the greater Toronto area. These programs have similar components and need to be clarified for future recruitment strategies.

Given the complexity of navigating large urban school districts, more time to connect and build relationships was considered key to future success and in Humber's case could have used it earlier to be able to recruit for longer.

Participants in this cohort completed their demographic surveys at time 2, therefore only three responses were received for this cohort. Demographic data for this group overall were retrieved from program administrators and indicated that 36% of participants identified as women, 82% identified as racialized peoples, and all participants were between the ages of 15-29 years. From the demographic data collected, participants were between 17 and 24 years.

General Self-Efficacy

The participants' belief in their ability to tackle tough problems through determined effort remained stable from the start to the end of the program (Question 1, Pre: $M = 3.09$, $SD = 0.54$; Post: $M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.00$). Similarly, participants' confidence in finding ways to overcome opposition remained relatively steady after the program (Question 2, Pre: $M = 2.64$, $SD = 1.03$; Post: $M = 2.67$, $SD = 0.58$).

In terms of sticking to their goals, participants' feelings about this stayed quite consistent (Question 3, Pre: $M = 2.91$, $SD = 0.94$; Post: $M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.00$). Their confidence in handling unexpected events remained stable as well (Question 4, Pre: $M = 3.09$, $SD = 0.54$; Post: $M = 3.33$, $SD = 0.58$). A similar trend was seen in their belief in resourcefulness for handling unforeseen situations (Question 5, Pre: $M = 3.18$, $SD = 0.98$; Post: $M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.00$).

Participants' assurance in their problem-solving skills through hard work remained relatively consistent (Question 6, Pre: $M = 3.45$, $SD = 0.52$; Post: $M = 3.33$, $SD = 0.58$). In contrast, their belief in staying calm during challenges showed a slight decrease (Question 7, Pre: $M = 3.45$, $SD = 0.69$; Post: $M = 2.67$, $SD = 1.53$). Meanwhile, participants' perception of generating multiple solutions remained steady (Question 8, Pre: $M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.00$; Post: $M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.00$).

Lastly, participants' confidence in thinking of solutions when in trouble stayed consistent (Question 9, Pre: $M = 2.91$, $SD = 0.94$; Post: $M = 2.67$, $SD = 0.58$). Their belief in their ability to handle challenges decreased slightly over time (Question 10, Pre: $M = 3.09$, $SD = 0.70$; Post: $M = 2.67$, $SD = 0.58$).

Table 23. General Self-Efficacy, Humber College

	Pre-program (N = 11) M (SD)	Post-program (N = 3) M (SD)
1. I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.	3.09 (.54)	3.00 (0)
2. If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want.	2.64 (1.03)	2.67 (.58)
3. It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.	2.91 (.94)	3.00 (1.00)
4. I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.	3.09 (.54)	3.33 (.58)
5. Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.	3.18 (.98)	3.00 (1.00)
6. I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.	3.45 (.52)	3.33 (.58)
7. I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.	3.45 (.69)	2.67 (1.53)
8. When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.	3.00 (1.00)	3.00 (1.00)
9. If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.	2.91 (.94)	2.67 (.58)
10. I can usually handle whatever comes my way.	3.09 (.70)	2.67 (.58)

Note: The scale for this measure is 1 = Not at all true, 2 = Hardly true, 3 = Moderately true, 4 = Exactly true.

Interpersonal Communication Competence Scale

Participants' beliefs that they allow their friends to see who they really are decreased slightly (Question 1, Pre $M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.34$; Post $M = 3.67$, $SD = 0.58$). Similarly, their beliefs in their ability to put themselves in others' shoes decreased (Question 2, Pre $M = 4.09$, $SD = 0.94$; Post $M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.00$). Comfort in social situations also saw a slight decrease (Question 3, Pre $M = 2.91$, $SD = 1.04$; Post $M = 2.67$, $SD = 0.58$). Regarding the willingness to confront the person who wronged them, participants' beliefs decreased (Question 4, Pre $M = 3.55$, $SD = 0.93$; Post $M = 2.67$, $SD = 0.58$). In terms of beliefs that their conversations tended to be one-sided,

participants' beliefs increased slightly (Question 5, Pre $M = 2.09$, $SD = 1.04$; Post $M = 2.33$, $SD = 1.53$). Participants' beliefs about their ability to transition smoothly between conversation topics remained stable (Question 6, Pre $M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.00$; Post $M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.00$). Beliefs about their friends' ability to perceive their emotional states showed an increase (Question 7, Pre $M = 3.09$, $SD = 1.51$; Post $M = 3.67$, $SD = 1.15$). In terms of communication style being more descriptive than evaluative, participants' beliefs decreased slightly (Question 8, Pre $M = 3.27$, $SD = 1.01$; Post $M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.00$). Participants' beliefs that their friends believed in their care for them showed a slight decrease (Question 9, Pre $M = 4.73$, $SD = 0.47$; Post $M = 4.33$, $SD = 1.15$). Lastly, participants' sense of achieving their communication goals remained stable (Question 10, Pre $M = 3.27$, $SD = 1.19$; Post $M = 3.33$, $SD = 0.58$).

Table 24. Interpersonal Communication Competence, Humber College

	Pre-program (N = 11) M (SD)	Post-program (N = 3) M (SD)
1. I allow friends to see who I really am.	4.00 (1.34)	3.67 (.58)
2. I can put myself in others' shoes.	4.09 (.94)	3.00 (0)
3. I am comfortable in social situations.	2.91 (1.04)	2.67 (.58)
4. When I've been wronged, I confront the person who wronged me.	3.55 (.93)	2.67 (.58)
5. My conversations are pretty one-sided.	2.09 (1.04)	2.33 (1.53)
6. My conversations are characterized by smooth shifts from one topic to the next.	3.00 (0)	3.00 (0)
7. My friends can tell when I'm happy or sad.	3.09 (1.51)	3.67 (1.15)
8. My communication is usually descriptive, not evaluative.	3.27 (1.01)	3.00 (0)
9. My friends truly believe that I care about them.	4.73 (.47)	4.33 (1.15)
10. I accomplish my communication goals.	3.27 (1.19)	3.33 (.58)

Note: The scale for this measure is 1 = Almost never, 2 = Seldom, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often, 5 = Almost always

Job Search Clarity

Participants exhibited changes in their job search clarity across various dimensions after completing the program. Participants' clarity regarding the type of job they wanted (pre $M = 3.09$, $SD = 1.51$; post $M = 3.67$, $SD = 0.58$) increased, as did their clarity about where they wanted to work (pre $M = 3.09$, $SD = 1.51$; post $M = 3.67$, $SD = 1.53$). Their perceptions that they had clear job search objectives increased as well (pre $M = 2.82$, $SD = 1.25$; post $M = 2.33$, $SD = 1.15$). Their clarity regarding the type of company they wanted to work for increased (pre $M = 2.82$, $SD = 1.33$; post $M = 3.67$, $SD = 2.31$) as did their clarity about the type of work they desired to do (pre $M = 3.27$, $SD = 1.49$; post $M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.00$).

Table 25. Job Search Clarity, Humber College

	Pre-program (N = 11)	Post-program (N = 3)
1. I have a clear idea of the type of job I want.	3.09 (1.51)	3.67 (.58)
2. I have a clear idea of where I want to work.	3.09 (1.51)	3.67 (1.53)
3. I do not have very clear job search objectives.	2.82 (1.25)	2.33 (1.15)
4. I have a clear idea of the type of company I want to work for.	2.82 (1.33)	3.67 (2.31)
5. I have a clear idea of the type of work I want to do.	3.27 (1.49)	4.00 (1.00)

Note: The scale for this measure is 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Somewhat disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Somewhat agree, 5 = Strongly agree

Program Satisfaction

Overall, participants rated that they were satisfied with the program, placing most statements on this scale within the range of *Agree* to *Strongly Agree*. They particularly agreed that their instructor was knowledgeable about the subject matter, presented concepts and materials clearly in a way that helped their understanding, and that their instructor promoted participation. Students expressed satisfaction overall with the program.

Table 26. Program Satisfaction, Humber College

	(N = 3) M (SD)
The program's objectives were clearly explained	4.67 (.58)
I believe the program achieved its objectives	4.33 (1.15)
The program met the goals that I had when I started	4.33 (1.15)
The instructor was knowledgeable about the subject matter	5.00 (0)
The instructor presented the concepts and material clearly in a way that helped me understand	5.00 (0)
The instructor promoted discussion and participation	5.00 (0)
The instructor was well organized and kept activities on track	4.33 (1.15)
The instructor was flexible and able to adjust the materials to meet my individual needs	4.33 (1.15)
I found the program useful	4.67 (.58)
I intend to apply what I learned during the program to my future school / college studies	4.67 (.58)
I intend to apply what I learned during the program to my future work / career pursuits	4.67 (.58)

I would recommend the program to other students	4.33 (1.15)
The program fit well into my schedule	3.33 (1.53)
What's your overall rating of this program?	1.67 (1.15)

Note. The scale for all questions except the last is 1 = Strongly disagree, 2. = Somewhat disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Somewhat agree, and 5 = Strongly agree. For the last question (What's your overall rating of the program) the scale is 1 = Really enjoyed it, 2 = Mostly enjoyed it, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Mostly did not enjoy it, 5 = Really did not enjoy it

College of the North Atlantic

CNA (n=5) reported that the structure of the materials, curriculum, and the opportunities to meet other partners with lots of ongoing support from DC / PEERs Inc. were key to their success.

Internal college support was also important, including facilities and support staff who gave presentations and conducted tours to build a sense of possibility.

There were some key developments in the program which are of note. Specifically, the use of comforts such as food for CNA became *Supper Club* where the group engaged in team building with a break to share a meal. The facilitator also often engaged in social activities during breaks with the participants such as playing pool where friendships were built among the group.

Community partnerships were also key, including providing computers and additional funding for students. Supports from partners on mental health and income issues were noted important.

Adult education credits (for CNA was two AB credits, or a certificate of achievement, or a certificate of participation if not all components completed. First aid training was added and well received.

In a small rural community recruitment was best achieved on a case-by-case basis. Social media had no impact. Community-based referrals and individual meetings with the Chamber were most helpful. Privacy requirements required more time and awareness.

Issues were raised around competition between other community employment programs. Key to success of Reboot Plus is to clearly distinguish its mandate.

College of North Atlantic predicted that an opportunity to deliver the program as second time would definitely result in more students. The college and community are fully on board for a second cohort. There may be an opportunity to do Reboot Plus as part of our upcoming workforce development pilot project. Four of the participants will complete their ABE together in the fall. They acknowledged that these students would not have considered doing their ABE without Reboot Plus.

In this cohort, demographic surveys were collected at time 2, thus three responses were collected. Of these 3 participants, two identified as male and one identified as female. All

identified as White, were born in Canada, and spoke English as a first language in their homes. They reported living with between zero and two adults and between zero and one children in their homes. One participant reported that they were employed and worked between 12-16 hours per week. One participant reported contributing financially to their household. All participants reported having attended one elementary school and one high school. One student reported feeling *neutral* about their school experience so far and two reported feeling *somewhat positive* or *very positive* about their school experience.

General Self-Efficacy

Participants' confidence in dealing with challenging problems through determined effort remained relatively stable from pre- to post-program (Question 1, Pre: $M = 2.80$, $SD = 1.10$; Post: $M = 2.67$, $SD = 0.58$). Participants' belief in finding ways to overcome opposition displayed an increase at post-test (Question 2, Pre: $M = 2.40$, $SD = 0.89$; Post: $M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.00$).

Regarding staying committed to goals, participants' feelings increased slightly (Question 3, Pre: $M = 2.20$, $SD = 0.45$; Post: $M = 2.67$, $SD = 0.58$). Their confidence in handling unexpected events increased as well (Question 4, Pre: $M = 2.40$, $SD = 1.34$; Post: $M = 3.33$, $SD = 0.58$). A similar pattern was observed in their belief in resourcefulness for handling unforeseen situations (Question 5, Pre: $M = 2.40$, $SD = 1.34$; Post: $M = 3.33$, $SD = 0.58$).

Participants' assurance in their problem-solving skills through determined effort increased slightly (Question 6, Pre: $M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.71$; Post: $M = 3.33$, $SD = 0.58$). Conversely, their belief in staying calm during challenges increased (Question 7, Pre: $M = 1.60$, $SD = 0.89$; Post: $M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.00$). Meanwhile, participants' perceptions of generating multiple solutions to a problem remained consistent (Question 8, Pre: $M = 2.20$, $SD = 1.30$; Post: $M = 2.67$, $SD = 0.58$).

Finally, participants' confidence in thinking of solutions when in trouble increased slightly (Question 9, Pre: $M = 2.60$, $SD = 1.14$; Post: $M = 3.00$, $SD = 0.00$), whereas their belief in handling whatever comes their way decreased slightly (Question 10, Pre: $M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.00$; Post: $M = 2.67$, $SD = 0.58$). Notably, the most significant change was in Question 7, where participants exhibited an increased belief in their ability to remain calm while facing difficulties due to their coping abilities. They also demonstrated substantial increases over time on Questions 4 and 5, their confidence in dealing with unexpected events and their beliefs in knowing how to handle unforeseen situations.

Table 27. General Self-Efficacy, College of the North Atlantic

	Pre-program (N = 5) M (SD)	Post-program (N = 3) M (SD)
1. I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough.	2.80 (1.10)	2.67 (.58)

2. If someone opposes me, I can find the means and ways to get what I want.	2.40 (.89)	3.00 (1.00)
3. It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish my goals.	2.20 (.45)	2.67 (.58)
4. I am confident that I could deal efficiently with unexpected events.	2.40 (1.34)	3.33 (.58)
5. Thanks to my resourcefulness, I know how to handle unforeseen situations.	2.40 (1.34)	3.33 (.58)
6. I can solve most problems if I invest the necessary effort.	3.00 (.71)	3.33 (.58)
7. I can remain calm when facing difficulties because I can rely on my coping abilities.	1.60 (.89)	3.00 (0)
8. When I am confronted with a problem, I can usually find several solutions.	2.20 (1.30)	2.67 (.58)
9. If I am in trouble, I can usually think of a solution.	2.60 (1.14)	3.00 (0)
10. I can usually handle whatever comes my way.	3.00 (1.00)	2.67 (.58)

Note: The scale for this measure is 1 = Not at all true, 2 = Hardly true, 3 = Moderately true, 4 = Exactly true.

Interpersonal Communication Competence Scale

Participants' beliefs that they allow friends to see who they really are decreased slightly from pre- to post-test (Question 1, Pre $M = 3.80$, $SD = 1.64$; Post $M = 3.33$, $SD = 2.08$). Their beliefs in their ability to put themselves in others' shoes increased slightly (Question 2, Pre $M = 3.80$, $SD = 0.84$; Post $M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.00$). Their comfort in social situations decreased (Question 3, Pre $M = 3.20$, $SD = 1.79$; Post $M = 2.67$, $SD = 1.53$). Regarding the willingness to confront a person who wronged them, participants' beliefs remained relatively stable (Question 4, Pre $M = 3.40$, $SD = 1.52$; Post $M = 3.33$, $SD = 1.53$). Participants beliefs that their conversations tended to be one-sided decreased (Question 5, Pre $M = 2.80$, $SD = 0.84$; Post $M = 2.33$, $SD = 0.58$) whereas their beliefs about their ability to transition smoothly between conversation topics remained stable (Question 6, Pre $M = 2.80$, $SD = 1.79$; Post $M = 2.67$, $SD = 0.58$). Participants' beliefs that friends could perceive their emotional states remained stable (Question 7, Pre $M = 3.20$, $SD = 1.79$; Post $M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.00$). Participants' beliefs that their communication style was more descriptive than evaluative increased slightly (Question 8, Pre $M = 3.20$, $SD = 1.10$; Post $M = 3.67$, $SD = 1.15$), as did their beliefs that their friends believed in their care for them (Question 9, Pre $M = 3.80$, $SD = 1.79$; Post $M = 4.00$, $SD = 1.00$). Finally, participants' sense of achieving their communication goals increased (Question 10, Pre $M = 2.60$, $SD = 1.14$; Post $M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.00$).

Table 28. Interpersonal Communication Competence, College of the North Atlantic

	Pre-program (N =) M (SD)	Post-program (N = 3) M (SD)
1. I allow friends to see who I really am.	3.80 (1.64)	3.33 (2.08)
2. I can put myself in others' shoes.	3.80 (.84)	4.00 (1.00)

3. I am comfortable in social situations.	3.20 (1.79)	2.67 (1.53)
4. When I've been wronged, I confront the person who wronged me.	3.40 (1.52)	3.33 (1.53)
5. My conversations are pretty one-sided.	2.80 (.84)	2.33 (.58)
6. My conversations are characterized by smooth shifts from one topic to the next.	2.80 (1.79)	2.67 (.58)
7. My friends can tell when I'm happy or sad.	3.20 (1.79)	3.00 (1.00)
8. My communication is usually descriptive, not evaluative.	3.20 (1.10)	3.67 (1.15)
9. My friends truly believe that I care about them.	3.80 (1.79)	4.00 (1.00)
10. I accomplish my communication goals.	2.60 (1.14)	3.00 (1.00)

Note: The scale for this measure is 1 = Almost never, 2 = Seldom, 3 = Sometimes, 4 = Often, 5 = Almost always

Job Search Clarity

From the beginning to end of their participation in the program, participants demonstrated changes in their job search clarity across several items. Their clarity regarding the type of job they wanted (pre $M = 3.60$, $SD = 1.14$; post $M = 3.67$, $SD = 2.31$) remained relatively stable over time. Participants' clarity about where they wanted to work increased (pre $M = 2.40$, $SD = 1.14$; post $M = 3.33$, $SD = 2.08$) as did their perception that they had clear job search objectives (pre $M = 2.40$, $SD = 1.14$; post $M = 1.33$, $SD = 0.58$). Their clarity regarding the type of company they wanted to work for increased (pre $M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.00$; post $M = 3.67$, $SD = 2.31$) as did their clarity about the type of work they desired to do showed changes following the intervention (pre $M = 3.00$, $SD = 1.41$; post $M = 3.67$, $SD = 2.31$).

Table 29. Job Search Clarity, College of the North Atlantic

	Pre-program (N = 5)	Post-program (N = 3)
1. I have a clear idea of the type of job I want.	3.60 (1.14)	3.67 (2.31)
2. I have a clear idea of where I want to work.	2.40 (1.14)	3.33 (2.08)
3. I do not have very clear job search objectives.	2.40 (1.14)	1.33 (.58)
4. I have a clear idea of the type of company I want to work for.	3.00 (1.00)	3.67 (2.31)
5. I have a clear idea of the type of work I want to do.	3.00 (1.41)	3.67 (2.31)

Note: The scale for this measure is 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Somewhat disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Somewhat agree, 5 = Strongly agree

Program Satisfaction

Overall, participants rated that they were satisfied with the program, placing all statements on this scale within the range of *Agree* to *Strongly Agree*. They indicated strong agreement with the statements that their instructor was knowledgeable about the subject matter, presented concepts and materials clearly in a way that helped their understanding, and that their instructor promoted participation. They also indicated strong agreement that their instructor was flexible and met their needs, that the program was useful, and that they would recommend the program to other students. Students expressed satisfaction overall with the program.

Table 30. Program Satisfaction, College of the North Atlantic

	(N = 3) M (SD)
The program's objectives were clearly explained	4.33 (1.15)
I believe the program achieved its objectives	4.67 (.58)
The program met the goals that I had when I started	4.67 (.58)
The instructor was knowledgeable about the subject matter	5.00 (0)
The instructor presented the concepts and material clearly in a way that helped me understand	5.00 (0)
The instructor promoted discussion and participation	5.00 (0)
The instructor was well organized and kept activities on track	5.00 (0)
The instructor was flexible and able to adjust the materials to meet my individual needs	5.00 (0)
I found the program useful	5.00 (0)
I intend to apply what I learned during the program to my future school / college studies	4.67 (.58)
I intend to apply what I learned during the program to my future work / career pursuits	4.67 (.58)
I would recommend the program to other students	5.00 (0)
The program fit well into my schedule	4.33 (1.15)
What's your overall rating of this program?	1.33 (.58)

Note. The scale for all questions except the last is 1 = Strongly disagree, 2. = Somewhat disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Somewhat agree, and 5 = Strongly agree. For the last question (What's your overall rating of the program) the scale is 1 = Really enjoyed it, 2 = Mostly enjoyed it, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Mostly did not enjoy it, 5 = Really did not enjoy it

Interview data

Students completed the Reboot Plus program and participated in exit interviews to discuss their experiences and feedback about the program as well as how they felt it had an impact on them. This qualitative data provides a richer opportunity to learn about the outcomes of the program.

The interviews were transcribed and analyzed for thematic similarities. Outcome across all five programs were notably consistent.

Many students discussed the impact Reboot Plus had on their career decision making citing improved knowledge and confidence in their ability to access information about pathways to various careers. Students remarked that they learned valuable knowledge about how to find the career and education information they needed.

From meeting with professionals and hearing their education and career stories, some students discussed their new knowledge that, “Education and careers don’t go in a straight line; they go in different paths. If you end up coming to something that doesn’t work out, just go another way.” Another student noted that they came to realize that not everyone’s career path is chosen early and maintained, and that it is important to have goals but also important to explore different options.

Several students discussed the growth they had felt throughout their experience in the program. Some students felt the push toward independence and for some students the social opportunity to become a member of a new group in this program helped them see themselves in a different light. Patterns from exit interviews with students consistently identified consistent impacts. Notably, when asked about the most important skills learned, responses were:

- Identifying their strengths
- Learning about their work personalities
- Improving communication skills
- Improving resume skills
- Exploring career options
- Improving problem solving abilities
- Learning how to ask questions
- Building self confidence
- Learning time management and planning

Many comments from interviews followed certain themes including improved self-confidence, communication skills and career awareness:

I feel a little bit more confident now. Sometimes I smile now. I feel more comfortable, and I learned from them.

The first most important thing is my interviewing skills. I’ve always had really bad communication skills. I’m not really good at describing things or explaining myself. The second most important skill I would say is searching through jobs or searching through industries to see what jobs match my skill set. The third would be learning to go out on my own to research different jobs and see what comes up. It’s always something I wondered about and wouldn’t have learnt in conventional school.

Definitely. I’m more resilient than I thought I was. I was able to get here on time and put in the work. This taught me to get the work done.

I learned many skills. Reboot Plus taught me many skills and about my personality. It's really helpful.

Reboot Plus gave me the idea of going above and beyond in getting educational qualifications, rather than just doing the minimum. I want to follow in the footsteps of the person I met.

I originally planned on becoming an ESL teacher in Japan, but I did an interview and I realized that my skill set, and job personality wouldn't match the job at all. So, I looked into other job opportunities and instantly fell in love with what I found (in cybersecurity)

It was really good to learn about what kind of education was necessary for the jobs and how the work environment doing actual job differed from what we see from the outside of the industry. Hearing what it's like to be in that job and environment was very helpful.

When asked about if their career plans have changed:

Yes, it did. It gave me the idea of going above and beyond in getting educational qualifications, rather than just doing the minimum. I want to follow in the footsteps of the person I met.

Yes, they have changed. Before Reboot Plus, I had no idea how to get to where I wanted to be, or about post-secondary education. Now I feel more informed.

Yeah, it definitely helped. I came into the program thinking about dentistry, but after talking to professionals, I became more interested in forensics.

When asked about changes in how they view themselves, most students reported:

- Feeling more adjusted
- Feeling more certain about their futures
- Feeling more confident with speaking out in groups
- Learning about their own work environment preferences
- Finding it easier to explore their options on their own
- Becoming more focussed
- Becoming more assertive

[Boards of Trade / Chambers of Commerce](#)

Interviews with seven representatives hailing from Boards of Trade / Chambers of Commerce in six different cities within the Metro Vancouver region, along with three partner cities are conducted.

Throughout each interview, there was an unmistakable enthusiasm for the Reboot Plus initiative. Notably, the interviewees acknowledged the current labor and workforce shortages prevailing across the nation, underlining their strong desire to establish connections with the upcoming generation of workers and fulfill their strategic goals related to outreach.

While this motivation initially drove their participation, it became evident that the benefits extended far beyond this initial focus. The outcome was the profoundly positive impact that they encountered from working with youth in the program. The responses underscored the opportunity for professionals to engage meaningfully, contribute purposefully to their communities, and gain valuable learning experiences while broadening their perspectives.

Most feedback for Reboot Plus going forward centered around the occasional challenge of finding the right industry contact for the students. It was envisioned that relationships, networks, and supports would grow as the program became more established.

Notable comments brought forward by Boards of Trade and Chamber of Commerce representatives are divided into three themes, which exemplify the impact of Reboot Plus are as follows:

Valuable Strategic Fit

We are a city building business organization and these connections, this opportunity to provide mentorship and advice is a part of city building. It's integral to the future of our communities.

We've been able to show that we're making a difference as an organization to our city and (Reboot Plus) created a foundation of our whole youth service portfolio. One of the key ingredients in the overall recipe in supporting our youth, which is very important to (us)

After learning a bit about it we could pretty quickly see there was a bit of a natural alignment there and that we could help support and serve up maybe a more fulsome, role in the program.

We want to be a part of that ecosystem in in developing those that are at risk because every single person matters and that's really what this program is all about and is supporting - those people / those individuals that are in need - to ensure that every single person matters in this economy.

It's such an important part of delivering service to our youth in our community, in building foundational blocks for our future workforce, our future entrepreneurs.

It was a bit of a no-brainer from our point of view to want to be involved in seeing where it went and seeing how we can get our organization and our members involved.

Unique Member Benefits

I must say that most of them have just said this outright - that they had one of the most positive experiences learning about youth as well, what their interests are and how they want to be approached in a way that the employer would know most about.

It was also cool to see how a lot of the students after all those sessions seemed very encouraged about the future, about their options.

I was nervous to speak to the students because I didn't know what to expect and they were quite reserved and shy. I worked hard to get them to open up. Instead of telling them how

awesome I was and my impressive journey to CEO, I told them how nervous I was and that I personally struggle with anxiety. They couldn't believe it. I asked them if they felt dumb sometimes and they all said yes. I assured them that none of them should feel like that, and this program would help them see how gifted they all were.

Well, certainly it's been a learning opportunity, an eye opener. Not realizing you know that there were people at risk of not graduating, when we're facing so many economic shifts, we needed to really have a role. I never realized this. We needed to have a role to ensure that we provided those connections, those career supports, that career advice and so that's why we became involved, and I became involved.

This program stirred many emotions for our membership and even our staff, the excitement rippled out into the community.

Well Designed and Managed Model

I think that's what made this work well; there was a very good flow of information. The project team would identify content, material, logos and images and things that we can use and then we're able to run with that.

I think Reboot Plus seems to have really understood clearly what the program could do, should do, ought to do, and then how it's going to do that. It's making sure that it's bringing in the right people on the team. Working with the students on the education side and then having partners like us in the chamber world to make sure that we're doing that business part.

They can't finish high school because they (the students) have other issues but they're good with certain skills. This program is phenomenal.

Giving them some positive feedback and encouragement to do something that they're good at and give them employability in the workforce is a good thing.

We need to get easier access to youth, to the individuals who work with the youth. Stakeholders too, we need to get to them too. This model works.

I'm not exactly sure what the future of the program is, but we were a little disappointed to hear it wasn't moving forward because we thought there was a lot of potential to grow.

The time commitment was small enough that I think we could have gotten a lot more traction. It was an opportunity that had more potential.

Conclusion

The disengagement of young individuals from school and career development can be best described as a gradual process of withdrawal spanning several years. Those who fail to complete high school and struggle with transitioning into work often face unfavorable outcomes, which can have substantial costs for society. While research predominantly focuses on predicting such disengagement, effective prevention and intervention strategies receive less attention.

Nevertheless, there is a consensus within research on the best practices for supporting and fostering school and career engagement, especially for youth facing multiple barriers. These practices include:

- Offering flexible opportunities that allow students to experience success in educational settings.
- Providing coursework that is relevant to students' lives and future aspirations.
- Offering personalized and specific assistance.
- Cultivating a positive interpersonal climate.
- Ensuring access to resources that address individual challenges.

The Reboot Plus program aligns both conceptually and practically with these elements. This program has achieved remarkable success among its participants and across its post-secondary partners and business partners and has made a significant impact on professional communities. While there is no universally applicable intervention that works for everyone, the evidence is promising regarding the positive long-term outcomes for students, employers, and society resulting from Reboot Plus.

Acknowledgements

The research team consists of co-investigators Carla Hotel and Danielle Quigley, researchers affiliated with the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at Douglas College, as well as a team of student research assistants from Douglas College who have worked on this project since 2020: Kalyn Field, Tasha Nazar, and Stephanie Armstrong. The co-investigators thank the student research assistants, students, professionals, school board staff, and program facilitators and the management team for their engagement in this project.