



Additional copies of this report are available from:

National Defence Headquarters
Chief Review Services Branch
101 Colonel By Drive
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0K2

Phone: 613-995-7841

FAX: 613-992-0528

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	I
PART	
PART 1 - INTRODUCTION	1
BACKGROUND	1
AIM	1
SCOPE	1
METHODOLOGY	2
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	2
PART 2 - PROGRAM DESCRIPTION	3
INTRODUCTION.....	3
PROGRAM PROFILE.....	3
<u>Mandate</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>Rationale</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>Program Objectives</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>Principles.....</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>Program Delivery</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>Military Family Resource Centres.....</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>Community Coordinator Organizations</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>United Nations Mission Information Line.....</u>	<u>8</u>
<u>Director Military Family Support.....</u>	<u>9</u>
<u>MFSP Resources</u>	<u>9</u>
OTHER SUPPORT SERVICES OFFERED BY DND AND THE CF	11
<u>Rear Parties</u>	<u>11</u>
<u>Canadian Forces Social Work Services</u>	<u>12</u>
<u>Security and Military Police Services</u>	<u>12</u>
<u>Medical Inspection Rooms (MIR) / Base Hospitals</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>Chaplains.....</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>Financial Counselling Program.....</u>	<u>14</u>
<u>Recreation</u>	<u>15</u>
DESCRIPTION OF THE BROADER PROGRAM ENVIRONMENT	15
<u>The Concept Of Community Development.....</u>	<u>15</u>

<u>Canadian Civilian Community Resource Centres</u>	16
<u>Typical Canadian Civilian Community Services</u>	19
<u>U.S. Military Family Support Programs</u>	22
<u>U.S. Navy</u>	23
<u>U.S. Air Force</u>	24
<u>U.S. Army</u>	25
PART 3 - FINDINGS, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE MILITARY FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAM	29
RATIONALE FOR THE PROGRAM	30
ACHIEVEMENT OF THE OBJECTIVES	37
MANAGEMENT OF THE PROGRAM	40
<u>Identity</u>	40
<u>Partnering and Partnerships</u>	41
<u>Funding</u>	45
DMFS RESPONSIBILITIES	49
MFRC CORPORATION RESPONSIBILITIES	53
PROGRAM DELIVERY	56
OTHER	57
PART 4 FINDINGS, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE COMMUNITY COORDINATOR ORGANIZATIONS OUTSIDE OF CANADA.....	59
BACKGROUND	59
RATIONALE	63
MANAGEMENT OF THE PROGRAM	67
AWARENESS AND OWNERSHIP	72
THE BROADER CANADIAN COMMUNITY	73
DMFS RESPONSIBILITIES	76
CONFLICT RESOLUTION	77
NETWORKING SYSTEMS	78
PART 5 - SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	80
ANNEX A EVALUATION DIRECTIVE	92
ANNEX B LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED.....	95
ANNEX C MILITARY FAMILIES: ARE THEY UNIQUE?	105
ANNEX D U.S. ARMY - FORT DRUM VISIT REPORT	112
ANNEX E INTERVIEW / DISCUSSION GUIDES.....	118

ANNEX F	THE BRITISH.....	124
ANNEX G	DATA COLLECTION SURVEY INSTRUMENT	126
ANNEX H	COMPARATIVE DATA FROM MFRC SURVEY	132
BIBLIOGRAPHY	196

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION

1. The Military Family Support Program (MFSP) in the Department of National Defence was formally established in June 1992 following Defence Management Committee (DMC) approval in March 1991. The MFSP coordinates and provides a range of services to military families at more than 41 locations across Canada, the United States, Great Britain and Europe.

2. With the MFSP coming to the end of its initial five-year funding, concerns were expressed in DND regarding the continuing need for the program; whether the stated objectives of the MFSP were being achieved; whether DND should continue to provide direct funding to the program; and if so, were there significant improvements which should be made to the manner in which the program is managed and delivered. In order to answer these questions, ADM (Personnel) requested a formal Program Evaluation study which was undertaken by the Chief Review Services Branch at National Defence Headquarters.

MAJOR FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

3. The program evaluation confirmed that there is a valid requirement for the Military Family Support Program and that it should continue to be funded by DND for at least an additional five years, at which time it should be re-examined. While the initial funding allocation was \$17 million per year, to date, the MFSP has not expended more than \$12 million in any given year. It is possible, however, that once the Program Evaluation recommendations have been implemented, the MFSP may need more than the \$12 million in order to effectively accomplish its mandate and objectives.

4. There appears to be an even greater need for the MFSP outside of Canada. This has been created by the impact of foreign language and culture on the families, combined with the fact that CF members posted overseas are now increasingly being deployed on 6-month operational tours thereby leaving their families alone in a foreign country.

5. The Directorate of Military Family Support (DMFS) has been very successful, during their brief five years of existence, in creating a network of 41 Military Family Resource Centres where a valid need exists. These MFRCs, in turn, are providing valuable, tangible support and assistance to military spouses and families in what are very difficult and trying times for the Canadian Forces.

6. There are some significant problems inherent in the current design and management of the MFSP, however. In reality, there are 41 different versions of the MFSP operating across the CF, and while tailoring to local needs and circumstances is appropriate, the general lack of: results-oriented objectives; specific policy direction; standards for levels of services to be provided; and, ongoing monitoring has created numerous difficulties across the Program. This fragmentation of the MFSP has been the result of two major factors. First is related to the concept that military spouses on the each base/wing would decide what services would be provided locally. Second, the efforts to delegate responsibility and funding directly to the Base/Wing Commanders has exacerbated the problem. The MFSP has not developed a CF-wide focus and perspective, and has resulted in the MFSP being less effective than it should be in assisting military families. Several of the recommendations in the evaluation report address means whereby these deficiencies could be corrected, such as, the preparation of Business Plans by each MFRC in conjunction with their Base/Wing Commander and DMFS.

7. The original design for the MFSP was that initially ADM(Per) would have the necessary funds to establish and develop the MFRCs as appropriate. It was anticipated that by the end of the initial five year mandate, the funds would then be delegated and devolved to the Base/Wing Commanders. Preliminary steps were taken in this regard in fiscal years 1995-96 and 1996-97, however, serious problems began to arise. Some Base/Wing Commanders, and other military staff, who were not convinced of the need for the MFRCs, realized that they could reduce or hold back the funds for the MFRC on their Base/Wing, or use the funds for other purposes - and several of them did so. Others decided that having the funds as part of their Base/Wing budget gave them the authority to dictate to the MFRC, and the military spouses, what services would be provided, regardless of what ADM(Per)/DMFS staff stated was required or appropriate.

8. As detailed in the evaluation report, the consensus among the interviewees, including a large majority of the Base/Wing Commanders, was that the MFSP provided a very valuable service, and that its survival in a given location should not be left to the “whim of certain senior military officers”. As a result, we recommend that the \$12 million funding for the MFSP be re-centralized under ADM(Per). ADM(Fin CS) has supported this recommendation and is examining the feasibility of funding the MFSP under Grants and Contributions.

9. Given that the original philosophy for the MFSP was one of empowering the military spouses, it was disturbing to discover that, in general, the military spouses have not taken “ownership” of the Program. Many military spouses interviewed were either not aware of the existence of the MFSP; did not know what services were provided; or did not realize that they could have an active involvement in the management of the MFSP and the Centres.

10. There are many reasons for this lack of ownership, but in large measure it relates to the lack of any national perspective of the MFSP, and the absence of any tangible means for military spouses to lead and influence the Program. While each MFRC has military spouses on the local Board of Directors or Advisory Board, their focus is on their own Centre. There is no means for military spouses to determine what is required and appropriate across the MFSP, and in turn, what the minimum level of services should be at all 41 MFRCs. One of the recommendations in the report is that a National Advisory Board to ADM(Per) be created which would be co-chaired by a military spouse and a senior military officer, such as COS (ADM(Per)). Such a Board could provide better linkages and “marketing” the 40,000 CF military spouses by communicating directly with them, and by serving as a focal point for their inputs and initiatives, such as the recent Invisible Ribbon campaign.

11. The effectiveness of the MFSP is also dependant on the assistance, cooperation and support of not only the General Officers, but also the complete CF chain of command, something which has not existed to date. In part, there is “marketing” required with the military members at all ranks, in addition to the spouses.

12. The Program Evaluation report contains 46 specific recommendations which, if implemented, should greatly enhance the level and quality of services which the Military Family Resource Centres provide, and will also significantly improve management of both the individual Centres and the Military Family Support Program.

PART 1 - INTRODUCTION

BACKGROUND

1-1. The Military Family Support Program (MFSP) in the Department of National Defence was formally established in June 1992 following Defence Management Committee (DMC) approval which was given in March 1991. The MFSP coordinates and provides a range of services to military families at 41 locations across Canada, in the United States, Europe and Great Britain.

AIM

1-2. With the MFSP coming to the end of its initial five-year funding envelope, concerns were expressed in DND regarding the continuing need for the program; whether the stated objectives of the MFSP were being achieved; whether DND should continue to provide direct funding to the program; and if so, were there significant improvements which should be made in the manner in which the program is managed and delivered. In order to answer these questions, a formal Program Evaluation study was initiated on 15 December 1995 by the Chief Review Services Branch at National Defence Headquarters.

SCOPE

1-3. The focus for the evaluation was initially on the Military Family Resource Centres (MFRCs) that operate in Canada. At the completion of the evaluation of the 36 MFRCs in Canada in June 1996, it was determined that there were significant differences between the Centres in Canada and those outside of Canada. As a result, the program evaluation was extended and interviews were conducted at the six Community Coordinator Organizations (CCOs) in Britain, Europe and Rome, NY in October and November 1996. The results of this special examination of the CCOs is included as Part 4 of the report. The United Nations Mission Line (1-800) also operates under the umbrella of the MFSP, but it was not evaluated per se.

1-4. Concurrently with this Program Evaluation study, the NDHQ Directorate of Social Economic Analysis was conducting a special study for Land Forces Command titled “Military Family Support During and Following Peacekeeping Operations” where they focussed on the actual delivery of a range of family support services available to Regular and Reserve Force members at CFBs Gagetown, Valcartier, Petawawa, and Edmonton. As a result, this evaluation did not attempt to assess the level or quality of services being provided to families by the MFRCs, and visits were coordinated to avoid placing an excessive workload on some Bases.

METHODOLOGY

1-5. The majority of the background information for this program evaluation was obtained from a review of existing documentation concerning the MFSP, publications on the subject from Canadian social service agencies, the military family support programs in the United States, Britain, and Australia, and through a personal visit to the Army Community Services Branch of the U.S. Army at Fort Drum, New York.

1-6. Individual interviews were also conducted with a selection of 110 military and civilian persons directly involved with the MFSP at NDHQ, at 13 Canadian Forces Bases across the country and at the six CCOs. Furthermore, a survey instrument with more than 30 questions was faxed to all 41 MFRC locations to gather comparative data, and a 100% return rate was obtained.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

1-7. The evaluators wish to extend their thanks to all those persons who willingly provided valuable data and input for the study, a particular thank you to the Base Commanders, Chair of the Boards, and Executive Directors/Community Coordinators at the MFRCs visited (as listed in Annex B) for their assistance and warm hospitality. We also wish to acknowledge the important contributions made by the Garrison Commander, Deputy Garrison Commander, Chief Army Community Services, and their staffs, at Fort Drum, New York. Finally, it would not have been possible to complete this evaluation without the complete and total cooperation of all the staff at the Directorate of Military Family Support, and in particular, LCol (ret'd) J. Jamieson, Mrs L. Climie, Maj L. Tyrrell and Mme D. Demers.

PART 2 - PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

INTRODUCTION

2-1. In order to properly evaluate a program, it is important that a complete and accurate description of the program be provided which details, among other items, the purpose, objectives, resources, and results which can be attributed the program. The following information is intended to provide such an overview of the MFSP.

PROGRAM PROFILE

Mandate

2-2. The Military Family Support Program (MFSP) was initiated in April 1987 in response to the ADM(Per) Military Personnel Policy Board's (MPPB) approval, in 1985, of the need to establish a systematic approach for the co-ordination and planning of military family support in the CF. In response to vast social changes - including changing roles of men and women, and family structures, and the increasing recognition that the military lifestyle can be very stressful, this system of family support was created. The MFSP promotes health and social well-being; provides needed information and referral; assists in the prevention of individual, family and community breakdown; buffers lifestyle stresses; enhances coping skills; and aids individuals or families in distress (NDHQ Policy Directive P2/93, 1993:3). Through its structure and procedures the MFSP provides a mechanism for family input into military family support decision making.

Rationale

2-3. Military families have unique challenges to deal with because of the nature of military life. For example, the impact of military-induced separation causes stress in families. Many spouses report high stress levels and depression while the member is deployed, and children exhibit difficulties in the home and school environments. Fighting, defiance, anger, anxiety, and sadness are all common among military children with absent fathers (Kelley, 1994:164). Evidence has shown that combat experience decreases marital quality and stability because it creates stress and antisocial behaviour (Gimbel, Booth, 1994:691). Essentially, studies examining the effects of military-induced separation on

deploying members and their families demonstrate that cognitive and behavioral changes accompany prolonged periods of separation (Kelly, Herzog-Simmer, Harris, 1994:126). Reintegration of the absent military member back into the family is also the cause of considerable stress. Deploying members report difficulties in communicating, and describe feelings of being 'out of sync' with the rest of the family (Kelly, Herzog-Simmer, Harris, 1994:126).

2-4. The military practice of posting families to different locations across Canada and occasionally abroad every 4 - 5 years may also be a source of difficulty for these families. Children may have problems forming friendships, and become socially distant because they know that they will not be in one place for very long. Werkman has found that "increased geographic mobility was correlated with feelings of unease, isolation, and poor self-image" (1992:985).

2-5. Martin has suggested that military families are at a greater risk for family violence due to the military's responsibility for projecting force, and recent evidence suggests that military wives are more likely to be abused than civilian wives (Cronin, 1995:117). In addition, since reporting family violence can directly jeopardize the family's financial security, battered military wives generally keep this information to themselves.

2-6. Increasing divorce rates in Canadian society as a whole have also caused the number of single parent families to increase. This causes particular child care concerns for those single service members who may be deployed. Financial concerns have also heightened worries for military families. Rents for PMQs and the cost of living have been steadily rising but military salaries have not, and CANEX does not provide the advantages it once did; this leaves a greater number of military families with significant financial difficulties. Most civilian families can offset financial difficulties by having both spouses in the work force. Unfortunately military life makes it extremely difficult for both family members to work. The Commander of the Special Service Force stated that "frequent moves, isolated base locations with few employment prospects, little opportunity to gain seniority, all conspire against spouses finding suitable and well-compensated employment" (SSF HQ 5000-1 (Comd) 6 Mar 95). In addition, many spouses feel it is their responsibility to stay at home with their children because they believe that it is difficult enough for children to have to deal

with one parent (i.e., the deployed military member) being away so often. Interestingly, the two main concerns reported to the MFRCs in needs assessments are spousal employment and child care issues.

2-7. Each of these issues creates stress in military families, which is of considerable concern to DND since stress affects job performance. Truscott has noted that "...in recent years, there has been an increasing recognition of the role that the family may play in the recruitment, retention and operational effectiveness of military members" (ORAE Project Report No. PR 467, October 1988:5). In addition, there is growing evidence to confirm the general belief that providing family support does in fact improve military readiness, retention and productivity, and successfully offset these family stressors (Pehrson, 1993:441).

Program Objectives

2-8. The objectives of the Military Family Support Program are:

- a) to institute family support within the CF community as part of the CF way of life;
- b) to ensure a coordinated and consistent CF-wide approach based on core professional staff within Multi-Service Family Resource Centre (MSFRC) organizations at all bases and stations where military families are posted, Community Coordinator Organizations (CCOs) at foreign locations where military families are posted, and a Director Military Family Support (DMFS) at NDHQ;
- c) to ensure an effective approach through a volunteer, democratic, working Board of Directors with civilian spouses as a majority of members and the appropriately qualified professionals;
- d) to ensure participation of civilian spouses of military members in the planning, management and evaluation of the MFRCs and CCOs; and
- e) to ensure adequate funding for core personnel, furniture and equipment to support the infrastructure.
(MFSP, Background Structure, Principles and Funding, DMFS, 1990:2)

Principles

2-9. To ensure a common approach across the CF in the development of the MFSP, the following principles have been developed:

- a) PARTNERSHIP between the CF and civilian spouses and families of service members (i.e., the BCOMD and the Board of Directors);
 - b) PARTICIPATION of civilian spouses of military members, as well as military members in the planning, developing, management and evaluation of the MSFRCs and CCOs, the programs and services;
 - c) PROFESSIONALISM in all aspects of the program and among the staff at the Centres;
 - d) ACCESSIBILITY and AVAILABILITY to military families of the resources which have been identified;
 - e) FLEXIBILITY AND DYNAMISM to reflect differences in demographics, the particular uniqueness of each community, and social changes, in peace or war;
 - f) CONFIDENTIALITY, within legal bounds, for users of counseling and crisis programs; and
 - g) EVALUATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY to all members of the CF community for the effectiveness of the MSFRC and CCOs, its programs and services. This process primarily takes place via an annual general meeting.
- (MFSP, Background, Structure, Principles and Funding, DMFS, 1990:6).

Program Delivery

2-10. Military Family Resource Centres. The primary mechanism used to implement the MFSP is the Military Family Resource Centre (MFRC). As of 31 December 1996, there were 41 MFRCs and CCOs, but this number is constantly in flux because of budget cuts, base closures and additional needs in new locations. These Resource Centres are community based, non-profit organizations that are accessible to all military families living in the geographic area of a base/wing/station/detachment, whether they live on-site or in the surrounding community. They have been established to provide information, support and referral, and are designed to meet the needs of military families and to give them opportunities to enhance their quality of life. Programs are offered in accordance with identified community needs and additional programs and services may also be offered through other funding generated locally.

2-11. Military Family Resource Centres are based on a flexible five-part model; each Centre is encouraged to develop programs which are appropriate and desirable for their community.

The five components of MFRCs are:

- a) information referral;
- b) children's services;
- c) education;
- d) crisis intervention; and
- e) volunteer management

(MFSP, Background, Structure, Principles, and Funding, DMFS, 1990:4).

2-12. Military families can access services as a family unit, as individuals, or in groups. The MFRC's most important goal is to promote the active participation of military families in planning, developing, managing and evaluating the Centre. Consequently the Board of Directors, which is a volunteer body, must have military spouses as 51% of its members. In Canada, responsibility for the individual MFRC rests with its Board of Directors, who work in partnership with the local Base/Wing Commander to meet the needs of military families.

The Board of Directors hires the Executive Director who is responsible for managing the MFRC as well as hiring and supervising all other staff. The size of the Board of Directors varies from place to place but it is usually composed of 5 - 12 members. Staff at the MFRCs generally have Bachelors or Master's Degrees in Social Work, Business Administration, Communication, Community Health, Psychology, Social Sciences, Recreation, or Education, or a Diploma in Early Childhood Education, or bookkeeping and secretarial techniques.

2-13. The Canadian Forces Administrative Order (CFAO) 56-40 (6 Apr 95) notes that although MFRCs in Canada are managed by incorporated Boards of Directors and the CF maintains an arms length relationship with respect to their staffs and personnel issues, it must be recognized that local Commanders have ultimate responsibility for activities conducted on their base. Thus, it is imperative that Boards work in partnership with local Commanders to ensure mutually agreeable goals are achieved.

2-14. There are currently 224 full-time equivalent employees working at the MFRCs, with the average number of employees at each Centre being 5.6. The Canadian Forces are paying for most, but not all, of these positions. Thus, typically Centres have 5 or 6 staff, but there is a wide range in the number of staff employed at each Centre. For example, small Centres such as Aldergrove, Debert, Wainwright, and Yellowknife only employ about 2 staff members, whereas larger Centres such as Borden, Halifax, Valcartier, and Winnipeg have 8 - 10 personnel.

2-15. Volunteers are an integral part of the MFRCs, and they engage in a wide variety of functions. Typical activities performed by volunteers include telephone service offering information and referral, translation and proof-reading of MFRC communications, typing, gathering information material directed to families, coordination of family events or meetings, assisting in the announcement or publicity of educational workshops, sponsoring new families on base, distribution of needs assessment questionnaires to families living on and off base, organizing of weekly gatherings for parents of young children, and outreach to families at risk in the neighbourhood.

2-16. Community Coordinator Organizations (CCOs) are set up in six foreign locations, where military families exist in sufficient numbers. They are "managed" by Advisory Boards consisting of a majority of spouses of military members. The Board recommends to the Senior Canadian Officer, who should be hired as the Community Coordinator, and the organization is designed to address the concerns of the CF community. CCOs are not able to be incorporated in Europe, therefore, the Commanding Officer "runs" the Centre at foreign locations with advice from the Advisory Board.

2-17. United Nations Mission Information Line (UNMIL) was established on 2 August 1992 to provide timely and accurate information to families of peacekeepers who were on a mission with the U.N. This 1-800 number now serves all CF members, and their families, who are on missions anywhere outside Canada and provides unclassified situation reports on major operations as issued by the units in-theatre, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week on an automated system. Those who have additional questions or a crisis situation, and would like to talk confidentially, may contact the operator of the line by pressing "0" at any time during the recorded message.

2-18. The UNMIL is operated by the Director Military Family Support and staff salaries of approximately \$100,000 are included in the DMFS budget. The NDHQ / ADM(DIS) 76 Communications Group absorbs an amount of approximately \$20,000 annually out of their budget for the telephone service. On the basis of 80,000 calls per year, the staff costs are roughly \$1.26 per call with an additional \$0.25 in phone charges.

2-19. Director Military Family Support (DMFS) at NDHQ provides professional and technical advice in the development, and ongoing work, of MFRCs and CCOs, including assistance to boards of directors and advisory boards and to bases/wings/stations in the development of boards. DMFS is the NDHQ authority on CF family issues and policies and on the release of public funds in concert with boards of directors who then hire contract personnel. DMFS ensures funding criteria are met and that professional standards of quality are established and maintained within the MFSP. The Directorate is also responsible for analyzing, developing, interpreting and promulgating departmental policy and standards of practice on issues relating to the military family and community.

2-20. DMFS is allocated \$300,000 per year for salary expenditures and their O&M budget is an additional \$326,000 per year. There are 4 officer-level positions: 1 Director social worker, 1 Major social worker, 1 civilian social worker (SW-SCW-4), and 1 Administrative Officer (AS-5). At the present time, the Major position in DMFS is in the process of being civilianized with the position to be filled by an NPF employee in the future.

MFSP Resources

2-21. DND is responsible for providing the financial (ADM(Per)), and physical resources (B/WComd), necessary to operate the MFRCs and CCOs effectively. Authorized annual funding was \$17 million although 1995/96 expenditures were approximately \$12 million. It is important to note that the MFSP funds only cover salaries, benefits, professional development, and limited O&M (i.e., \$2,000 per staff member). Although most MFRCs are dependent on DND for a major portion of their funding, they are not part of the DND organizational structure, but are independent non-profit organizations. Most Centres in Canada also apply for federal and provincial grants, engage in public fundraising activities, and charge user fees for some activities. The CCOs are totally dependant on DND funding and do not have access to other sources of funds.

2-22. DMFS Policy Guideline #11 (1 May 95), *Funding of Multi-Service Resource Centres and Community Coordinator Organizations by the Canadian Forces*, outlines DND support responsibilities to the MFRCs. This document states that while DND has committed itself to being the primary funding source for the MFRCs and the CCOs, DND will not necessarily fund all facilities, staff and activities that the board feels are needed. DND, through the B/WComd or equivalent, has committed itself and is authorized to use public funds and/or public facilities to provide the following:

- a) The physical facility required to house the MSFRC or CCO staff and programs;
- b) The furniture and equipment required by the MSFRC or CCO to conduct its work in the five core areas of service approved for public support which are: Information and Referral, Children's Services, Quality of Life Enrichment, Crisis Intervention and Volunteer Development;
- c) The maintenance costs associated with the facility, furnishings and equipment mentioned above;
- d) The public is responsible for the provision and maintenance of equipment and furniture for MSFRC. This is normally actioned through the Base/Station Supply Section;
- e) Basic operating costs (O&M) associated with the five core areas of service mentioned above. This amount would normally be no less than \$5,000 for a CCO or small MSFRC and no less than \$2,000 for each full-time staff member at a larger MSFRC. For staff who work less than full time, the percentage of the time they work based on a 37.5 hour week should be used to determine the operating cost allowance; and
- f) Salaries and benefits for required staff in the approved for public funding positions. These are the Executive Director (ED) at each MSFRC and the Community Coordinator (CC) at each CCO as well as required levels of administrative support staff at each. Reports from the Director Budgets (DB) are downloaded in collaboration with DMFS. In the case of each MSFRC, public funds are also authorized for coordinators in each of the five core areas of service. At large MSFRCs more than one coordinator in each core area may be required.

(DMFS Policy Guideline #11, *Funding of Multi-Service Family Resource Centres and Community Coordinator Organizations by the Canadian Forces*, DMFS, 1995:3-5).

2-23. Also stressed in DMFS Guideline #11 is that:

... Public funds are not available nor should they be used to hire or fund MSFRC positions which fall outside the limits of those outlined above. In addition, public funds are not authorized and should not be used for the actual programs and services offered by each MSFRC or CCO. Funding for programs and services, as well as staff positions other than the core positions mentioned earlier, must come from sources such as user fees, donations, fundraising, grants from the municipality or province, Non-Public Funds (NPF) allocations...etc (Ibid, 1995:5).

2-24. The primary expenditures that the MFRCs/CCOs incur come from two areas: a) salaries, including benefit packages, and b) operations and maintenance (O&M), which includes insurance coverage for the Board of Directors and the MFRCs, professional fees for lawyers, chartered accountants, advertising, communication/publicity, office supplies, documentation for families, and rentals.

OTHER SUPPORT SERVICES OFFERED BY DND AND THE CF

Rear Parties

2-25. The primary role of the Rear Party is to maintain limited support to the deployed troops. Additionally, the Rear Party assists the spouses of deployed troops in the following manner:

- a) it provides advice and help in the case of an emergency;
 - b) it acts as a liaison with other Base sections in regard to problems of pay and home maintenance and repairs;
 - c) it can assist in maintaining contact with deployed members and can pass on important messages and requests;
 - d) it can provide emergency mail service in the event of a mail strike;
 - e) it may satisfy other family needs; judged on a case-by-case basis by the Officer-In-Charge (OIC) of the Rear Party.
- (Land Force Command Support Plan, Family Support Handbook, 1994:2-2).

Canadian Forces Social Work Services

2-26. A limited number of military Social Workers are available, through the Canadian Forces Medical Service (CFMS), to deal with the morale, efficiency, and mental health of CF members. Since family issues may affect the psychological well-being of a service member, family members are also entitled to this support. Military Social Work Officers (SWO) have qualifications that are recognized by the Canadian Association of Social Workers.

2-27. SWOs are qualified to assess, diagnose, and treat a variety of psycho-social problems including: a) compassionate problems; b) marital problems; c) family problems; d) problems relating to the stress of military life; e) and, problems requiring the use of civilian social welfare resources. SWOs are also often involved in organizing or assisting with preventive programs of a mental health nature such as: drug and alcohol education, second career assistance network seminars, family life education, marriage enrichment, life skills education, family violence and suicide prevention (CFAO 56-15, *Canadian Forces Social Work Services*, Ch 26/90, 2). The SWO is bound by the ethics of the profession to respect the confidential nature of information given by the client. However they, like CF medical and dental officers, are also part of the military chain of command which may create problems with regard to what information about their clients can/should be released to senior officers.

2-28. In recent years, with the downsizing of the Canadian Forces, a majority of the military social worker positions have been eliminated across Canada and there are no longer any military social workers posted to Britain or Europe. Should the need arise, local social workers services must be obtained from the civilian community.

Security and Military Police Services

2-29. Security and police services, including criminal and service investigations and security inspections for DND, are provided by military police personnel integral to commands, areas, formations, bases, stations and units. In accordance with current military and civil law, the military police may call upon other persons to assist them in the performance of their duties (CFAO 22-4, *Security and Military Police Services*, Ch 4/93, 3).

- 2-30. Military police investigate and report on all criminal and service offenses committed by persons subject to the Code of Service Discipline and on all other criminal and security violations or offenses that occur on or in respect of Defence establishments, works, materiel, CF operation or any other lawful undertakings (CFAO 22-4, *Security and Military Police Services*, Ch 4/93, 5).
- 2-31. In the course of their duties, military police with the appropriate security clearance are authorized access to all CF and DND-controlled areas. Except for medical or social work records, or records that are subject to solicitor/client privilege, all files, records, correspondence and other information relevant to matters under investigation shall be made available to the military police upon request (CFAO 22-4, *Security and Military Police Services*, Ch 4/93, 5).

Medical Inspection Rooms (MIR) / Base Hospitals

2-32. The principal function of the MIR or the Hospital on a base/wing is to provide medical treatment and services to members of the Canadian Forces. Only in isolated Canadian locations, in Europe, or extreme emergencies do they provide medical treatment for the spouses and family of CF members.

Chaplains

2-33. The Chaplain General is responsible for advising the Chief of the Defence Staff on the spiritual well-being of CF members and their families, and coordinating all religious activity in the CF. In addition, the Chaplain General hires, promotes, appoints and releases chaplains, acts as a liaison between ecclesiastical authorities, church organizations and the CF, disseminates information relating to the chaplain services, and visit commanders to discuss religious matters (CFAO 33-11:1).

2-34. Base/Wing Chaplains are also responsible for promoting the spiritual well-being of CF members and their families, advising Commanders on these issues, and to:

- a) provide pastoral care to members and dependants;
- b) collect and disseminate information and statistics relative to chaplain services on the base, as may be required;

- c) coordinate annual leave of chaplains on the base and provide chaplaincy coverage, as required, in consultation with command chaplains; and
- d) supervise, as required, the work of Reserve Force chaplains (CFAO 33-11:2-3).

Financial Counselling Program

2-35. The purpose of the Financial Counselling Program is to help members of the CF, and their families, to make the best possible use of their income, and to avoid the pitfalls of unwise spending and credit buying. The objectives of the program are:

- a) to operate in part as a Better Business Bureau, informing members and their families of questionable sales and credit schemes;
- b) to educate supervisory personnel in methods of helping those who come to them with financial problems; and
- c) to make information about personal financial management available to personnel through lectures, seminars and written material. (CFAO 56-31, *Financial Counselling Program*, 3/88.1).

2-36. On each base/wing or unit a financial counsellor is appointed on a full or part-time basis, depending on the requirement. This person is also the base or unit representative in benevolent and welfare fund matters. Financial counsellors carry out their duties and responsibilities in supporting commanding officers and all arrangements for counselling assistance or referrals are carried out with the CO or with the CO's informed consent. The responsibilities of the financial counsellor include:

- a) arranging financial counselling, both remedial and preventive, for members and their families;
- b) providing advice on budgeting, and general assistance to personnel facing financial difficulties;
- c) assisting COs, legal officers, social work officers, and chaplains in finding solutions to financial problems;
- d) seeking the cooperation of merchants, financial institutions, credit unions, etc. in the area;
- e) referring to regional social work officers those cases where financial difficulties are causing, or have resulted from, underlying personal problems;
- f) preparing applications for assistance from the benevolent and welfare funds; and

- g) maintaining adequate records covering the nature and disposition of cases referred for counselling.
(CFAO 56-31, *Financial Counselling Program*, Ch 3/88, 2-3).

Recreation

2-37. QR&O 4.61 requires an officer in command of a base or unit to ensure that suitable recreation programs are organized for military personnel and, where practicable, for their dependants and for civilians residing in quarters on the base or unit... The well-being of dependants is a major factor in the morale of members of the CF.

(CFAO 50-2, *Recreation*, Ch/Mod.25/77, 2).

DESCRIPTION OF THE BROADER PROGRAM ENVIRONMENT

The Concept Of Community Development

2-38. Community development is a concept upon which the MFRCs are based; thus, it is important to clarify exactly what is involved in this process. The following three definitions provide a complete picture of the concept of community development:

- a) Community development is a strategy involving partnership with community members to solve problems and build strength, self-sufficiency and well-being (Hoen, 1990:1).
- b) Community development is a process through which all members of the community gain an increase in the control over their lives, as well as the life of their community, by achieving equal access to participate in the collective decisions about their needs, and in the development and implementation of strategies which utilize their collective power to meet those needs (City of Toronto Department of Public Health, 1991:2).
- c) Community development is people taking charge of their own futures. It is people identifying commonly-felt problems and needs, and taking steps to resolve the problems and meet the needs. It is people struggling to make their community a better place to live out their lives than it ever was before (Four Worlds Development Project, 1984:7).

2-39. The community development approach is based on the following principles:

- a) a belief in the absolute worth of the individual;
- b) a belief that individuals are able to learn and are able to change;
- c) a belief that an individual can identify problems in his/her life, find solutions and act to achieve them;
- d) a belief that individuals can work effectively together to achieve change in some of the conditions affecting their lives that may be beyond their individual control;
- e) a belief that an individual, by positively changing any part of his/her life may benefit from the change and thus improve his/her overall health;
- f) a belief that community participation and group process are in themselves health enhancing;
- g) a belief that individuals are genuinely interested in participating in their own health (adapted from Peel Health Department, 1989:3).

2-40. Ken Hoffman has described four ways in which one can discover if they are actually "doing" community development:

- a) if the group has a shared sense of purpose;
- b) if the group has a better sense of its own strengths and capabilities;
- c) if the group has developed the management and interpersonal skills they need to work effectively together;
- d) if the community the group is serving assumes ownership of the process and calls the shots (adapted from a speech given by Ken Hoffman, Sandy Hill Community Health Centre, 8 June 95).

Canadian Civilian Community Resource Centres

2-41. Bennett has stated that "Canada's [civilian] family resource Centres are chameleon-like, as uniquely shaped as the communities they serve" (Bennett, 1989:92). However, they do share the common sentiment of placing the highest value on children and on the people who care for them. The variety of these Centres is important because they reflect the local needs of their communities. Most build community ownership into their structure with boards of directors comprised largely of users. Often participants provide input into program planning, and frequently Centres rely heavily on volunteers. Ideally they are "community-based, community-run, community-initiated, and community-accessible" (Bennett, 1989:92).

Family Resource Centres strive to be open and inviting to all, however, this can be difficult in urban areas. Despite the limits imposed by tight budget, enhanced accessibility and outreach are important goals at all Centres (Bennett, 1989:92).

2-42. Family Resource Centres are unique in their commitment to serving families as a whole -- children, parents, and care givers. The role of the users themselves is vital to the success of the Centres. Program participants are not clients, but are active contributors who act as role models, fundraisers, workshop or group leaders. One theme that is stressed by Centres across Canada is that "... families need them to make contact with other families" (Bennett, 1989:93). The idea is that spouses gain a great deal of strength from meeting other mothers and learning from each other. Not only do they learn valuable skills from each other, but they are able to boost their self-esteem by being able to pass on their own tips about parenting.

2-43. Primary prevention is at the core of Family Resource Centre efforts. The Centres are casual, non-authoritarian in nature, and are not promoted as being for families with problems, but for all families. The Centres also allow people to choose their own level of involvement and use non-invasive interventions such as modelling (i.e., the use of hypothetical examples and scenarios) by staff, which is attractive to people who may be suspicious of more formal help.

2-44. Family Resource Centres also share the common challenge of financial security. Very few Centres can say with absolute confidence that their long-term needs will be financially supported. Generally, funding issues are out of a Centre's direct control, "...since the why and wherefores of funding have to do with a complex political agenda -- federally, regionally and municipally" (Pitman, 1989:96). Locating funding sources is difficult and time consuming, and many sources have encountered a lack of consistency in funding. "Since the federal government has no specific policy of support, the situation varies dramatically between provinces. Even when a government has expressed support, a change in political parties or policy can mean a drastic cut in funding" (Pitman, 1989:96).

2-45. In Ottawa, for example, there are essentially three different types of community/resource Centres based on the services they provide. Some of the Centres are autonomous while others are managed by the Regional Municipality of Ottawa-Carleton. Funding is from several sources (FSPP, *Study Report on Family Support*, May 1989:24).

2-46. Although the Centres are somewhat different, all have the following similarities:

- a) a major goal is community involvement in their initiation, management and evaluation;
 - b) all reflect the unique needs of the neighbourhoods, based on local needs assessment;
 - c) all have a board of directors drawn from various segments of the community;
 - d) all provide a multi-disciplinary approach to service. Some staff are from other agencies placed to provide specific services;
 - e) all have coordinators with a university degree in the social sciences. Many have graduate degrees in the social sciences;
 - f) all promote health and the prevention of difficulties;
 - g) all have a complement of volunteers; and
 - h) all are incorporated and non-profit organizations.
- (FSPP, *Study Report on Family Support*, May 1989:24)

2-47. The Ottawa community service resource centres may offer more services than may be necessary on some bases and stations (such as seniors and some health services), and they generally serve a larger population. However, this model of community support Centres with particular staff, services and funding provides valuable information on which to reflect when developing military community resources (FSPP, *Study Report on Family Support*, May 1989:25).

2-48. The Canadian Association of Toy Libraries and Parent Resource Centres has given a collective voice to these Centres. The Association is primarily a vehicle for networking and information-sharing among those who are concerned with the well-being of children and families. The Association has also produced a manual, *Caring About Families: The "How To" Manual for Developing Canadian Family Resource Programs*, which has been used by DMFS to help in setting up their Military Family Resource Centres. The manual outlines how to set up a planning committee, which will in turn set up a governing body that will be responsible for guiding and directing the policies of the group and making decisions. The

next crucial step involves assessing the community's needs by doing a needs assessment. It also covers issues about meeting the needs of families, addressing the issues of accessibility, staff training, and how to attract different groups of people to the Resource Centres.

2-49. The different types of family support programs are discussed in Chapter 3 of the manual, and it provides a step by step explanation of how to implement each of them. Additionally, the manual provides examples of currently existing programs (i.e., St. Mary's Family Learning Centre). The three basic models are:

- a) a family resource Centre, which is an organization which offers a variety of resources and support to families in the community;
- b) an independent family resource program, such as a toy library, playgroup, or support group, which is not necessarily connected with a non-profit organization, such as a family resource Centre or other sponsoring group; and
- c) a hub model, which is an organization that includes a combination of family support service. It usually includes a day care Centre, a registered family home day care program, a resource library and a family drop-in Centre.
(Canadian Association of Toy Libraries, 1990:29)

2-50. The remainder of the manual discusses methods of evaluation, explains how to develop an organizational structure, administrative procedures, covers financial resources, addresses how to find an appropriate location, public relations/publicity, staff/personnel issues, and volunteer development. Essentially, this document provides a step by step account, as well as examples, of how to set up and run a family resource program. DMFS sent a copy of each of these manuals to every base/wing in Canada to facilitate the implementation of their Military Family Resource Centre.

Typical Canadian Civilian Community Services

2-51. Information Most Canadian communities have agencies that provide information. These organizations facilitate the work of volunteers and professionals by supplying essential information, and encouraging cooperation and collaboration among information providers. Major services are: information and referral; publications; database access and data sharing through a public terminal and leasing arrangements; community consultation and public education.

2-52. Counselling General counseling can be found in every community in Canada. Most offer individual, couple and family counseling; mediation counseling for separating and divorcing couples; counseling for men and women in abusive situations; and counseling specifically for children and youth. This counseling may also be provided on a hospital outpatient basis.

2-53. Crisis Intervention Crisis intervention can take the form of crisis lines (i.e., telephone support) or face-to-face crisis counseling. Crisis lines are generally available 24 hours, are strictly confidential, and are often staffed by trained volunteers who are supported by professional staff. Face-to-face crisis counseling is often provided by the police department which usually has a victim services unit.

2-54. Parent/Care giver Resources These resources include information on adoption, childbirth classes, prenatal care and nutrition, and provide drop-in Centres for care givers of pre-school children.

2-55. Financial Aid Government assistance in this area takes the forms of Family Benefits, which involves financial assistance for parents raising children alone, the disabled, the blind, permanently unemployable persons, parents of foster children and some elderly. Family Assistance provides general welfare assistance to unemployable people and low-wage earners, including money for food, clothing, personal needs, household supplies, utilities, and fuel and shelter. Unemployment Insurance, Veterans Services, and Workers' Compensation also fall within this category of services.

2-56. Emergency Assistance This is available in most Canadian communities. Generally this takes the form of soup kitchens and shelters.

2-57. Financial Counselling can be found at credit counselling agencies and income tax clinics.

2-58. Employment/Vocational Services The Employment Standards Branch, job training programs, and vocational training programs are available, in most urban Centres, to assist people in finding employment or training for a career.

2-59. Legal, Consumer Services, Human Rights, Dispute Resolution Under this category of services is Legal Aid, the Better Business Bureau, Ombudsman services, the Canadian Human Rights Commission, and Dispute Resolution Centres.

2-60. Support and Rehabilitation Other forms of community support can be found at the Salvation Army, which not only provides assistance for homeless people but also offers Correctional and Justice Services. This involves supporting those involved in the judicial process by offering counsel and guidance in courts, chaplaincy and social programs in the institutions, and general counseling. The Elizabeth Fry Society provides some of these same services but they are designed specifically for women who come in conflict with the law. The John Howard Society has also been set up to deal with men and women who need crisis intervention and advocacy in the legal arena.

2-61. Housing Housing services for the elderly, and physically or psychiatrically handicapped can be found in almost every Canadian city. In addition, there is generally affordable housing available for people with low and moderate incomes and emergency housing that can provide a secure temporary shelter. Shelters, such as Interval House, are also available to provide a temporary residence for abused women and their children.

2-62. Health Services Each community has a public health department, and generally one can find the Victorian Order of Nurses who provide skilled nursing care, teaching, counseling and referral to clients in their own homes, on a visit basis. Dental clinics, health centres and clinics, and hospitals all provide a wide range of health care and mental health services.

2-63. Services for the Physically Handicapped The Canadian Paraplegic Association provides information, referral and counselling services to spinal cord injured persons and their families in the following areas: adjustment to disability, sexuality, housing, equipment, transportation, financial assistance, education, vocational planning, employment, support services, and sports and leisure. The Easter Seal Society assists in all phases of a rehabilitation program for children and young adults with physical disabilities, (usually to age 19) and fosters research into disabling disorders, preventive measures and new treatment techniques.

2-64. Birth Planning/Pregnancy Counselling Both Birthright and Planned Parenthood provide information, guidance and referral in the areas of contraception, birth planning, pregnancy options and education in sexuality.

2-65. Addiction/Alcohol & Drug Services Al-Anon and Ala-teen are self-help programs of mutual support for families and friends of alcoholics. Alcoholics Anonymous is a self-help and mutual-support group for problem drinkers who want to stop drinking. Narcotics Anonymous is a non-profit fellowship of men and women for whom drugs have become a major problem. Recovering addicts meet regularly to provide each other with mutual support. The Addiction Research Foundation of Toronto, also provides a 1-800 number which provides Ontario residents with free confidential information on alcohol and other drugs.

U.S. Military Family Support Programs

2-66. The American military has adopted family programs from a paternalistic, treatment model. The Department of Defense (DOD) provides services to military families, rather than allowing the families to decide which services are best for them and then play a large role in implementing these programs. Herein lies the primary difference between the Canadian and American approaches to family assistance. DND has adopted a community development model that is based on the belief that families will benefit by actively participating in the management and activities of MFRCs. A sense of personal power, autonomy, and a heightened self-esteem are products of this approach, which encourages family members to decide which programs they require and then volunteer to help implement these programs.

2-67. Thus, one can see that the U.S. DOD approach to family programs is quite different from the DND model, for it is basically a treatment model which offers support and not a community development model that stresses involvement. The attention to language is important because different terms indicate each approach. Americans use the term “support” to illustrate their approach, whereas Canadians speak of “resources” and “community development”.

2-68. Family support programs and Centres developed much earlier in the U.S. than in Canada, and by 1981, Family Service Centres (FSCs) were being established in each element of the U.S. military (ORAE Project Report No. PR 467, 1988:10). Essentially,

... The assumptions behind the development of the FSCs were that family and community factors play a key role in job and career commitment and that improvements in programs and services for families would result in increased family support for the military and increased job morale, performance and commitment of members.

(ORAE Project Report No. PR 467, 1988:10)

2-69. Consequently, a world-wide network of Family Centers staffed by trained specialists characterizes the current formal military family support system in the US, and these Family Centers provide an array of planned services to support military families during each stage of family life and career cycle. Support is not only provided to active duty members and their families, but to retired military personnel and their families as well.

2-70. Each Service (i.e., Army, Navy, Air Force, Marines) provides assistance to its own members. This has created a number of difficulties since there seems to be very little communication across Service lines. In fact, families have often been sent miles from their homes to receive assistance from their own Service and component when help was near at hand through another Service.

2-71. U.S. Navy U.S. Navy Family Service Centers (FSCs) assist personnel, their families and single service members, with a variety of support services. These include an Ombudsman program, Relocation Assistance, Overseas Duty Support program, Overseas Transfer Information Service, Spouse Employment Assistance Program, Sponsor Program, Chaplains, alcohol and drug abuse treatment, the Exceptional Family Member program, and the Family Advocacy program (DOD, "All Hands", Oct. 1, 1992).

2-72. The mission of each U.S. Navy Family Service Center is to support all commands in achieving operational readiness, superior performance, member retention, and a reasonable quality of life for navy personnel and their families. The objectives of a U.S. Navy Family Service Center are to:

- a) support commanding officers' ongoing efforts to ensure mission readiness;
 - b) facilitate adaptation by active duty members and their families to the unique aspects of Navy life;
 - c) promote practical life and work skills;
 - d) foster personal productivity and family strength;
 - e) ensure command awareness of the important relationship between the well-being of Navy members and their families and the Navy's mission;
 - f) enhance close operational coordination between Navy and civilian service providers and resources.
- (Navy Family Support Program, *Family Service Centre Desk Guide, Volume 1, Management and Operational Overview*, 1988:1.2).

2-73. U.S. Navy Family Service Centers implement five core programs through three basic functions. The three functions are information and referral, education and training and counselling. The five core programs, which embody certain core elements, are:

- a) Skills for Living - stress management, financial education, personal enrichment, family enrichment;
- b) Relocation Assistance - pre-departure support, overseas screening, area orientation, mid-tour support, home port changes, support for the sponsor program;
- c) Deployment Support - pre-deployment support, during deployment support, reunion/post-deployment support, support to commands;
- d) Spouse Employment Assistance (SEAP); and
- e) Special Needs - family advocacy, exceptional family member, single parent families, dual career military families, foreign-born spouses.

A final component of the U.S. Navy Family Service Center operations consists of linkages with external service providers (Navy Family Support Program, *Family Service Centre Desk Guide, Volume 1, Management and Operational Overview*, 1988:1.3).

2-74. U.S. Air Force U.S. Air Force Family Support Centers provide services in four areas:

- a) Information, and referral, counselling and follow-up. The Air Force FRC's core function is linking individuals and families with the right resource to meet their specific needs;
- b) Coordination and consultation with other base and civilian agencies to strengthen base policies and programs;
- c) Assistance for base leadership in their efforts to meet family needs;
- d) Family life education and skills programs.

(Air Force, *Family Support Center*, 2).

2-75. The following programs are offered by the U.S. Air Force Family Resource Centers:

- a) The Family Services Program (FSP) is a volunteer program which offers extra assistance to relocating families;
- b) The Transition Assistance Management Program (TAMP) helps those who are separating or retiring from the Air Force by providing transition counselling, career planning, development of job search skills, and access to employment opportunities and information;
- c) The Volunteer Resource Program (VRP) encourages volunteers in the Air Force community.;
- d) The Relocation Assistance Program (RAP) prepares Air Force members, and their families, for relocation to a new base, and offers insight on how to adjust to life at the new base once they get there;
- e) The Air Force Aid Society (AFAS) is a non-profit organization that helps the Air Force take care of its members in emergencies through interest-free loans or grants for basic needs;
- f) The Career Focus Program (CFP) assists the spouses of Air Force members in learning the skills and techniques required for a successful job search;
- g) The Personal Financial Management Program (PFMP) offers information, education, and personal financial counselling.

(Air Force, *Family Support Center*, 5-12).

2-76. U.S. Army Today, there are approximately 65 programs which support soldiers and their families. However, the size of the installation determines the quantity of community support services. Programs which are required at all installations include: alcohol and drug prevention and treatment; legal assistance; sponsorship and Chaplain programs. Depending on the installation size and availability of resources, other community support programs include financial assistance, housing referral services, continuing education and child development services (Devine, Bullman, & Gaston, 1992:7). Further details on the U.S. Army model are included in Annex D of this report.

2-77. U.S. Army Support programs fall under two general categories:

a) Prevention and Wellness Programs

These programs were developed for those individuals and families that are not in serious difficulty, but whose members wish somehow to make their personal relationships more mutually satisfying. This includes Marital Enrichment, Parent Education Programs, Financial Counselling, Child Development Services, Relocation Assistance Programs, and Recreation and Leisure Programs (Orthner, 1990:12).

b) Therapy and Treatment Programs

Therapy and Treatment Programs are designed to directly intervene in the immediate problems of community members. In the military, traditional mental health services, drug and alcohol rehabilitation programs, and social work programs are now complemented by other services such as counselling services, family advocacy and abuse programs. Included under the category of Therapy and Treatment Programs are Crisis Hot-lines, Shelters, Marital and Family Therapies, Alcohol and Drug Treatment Programs, Adult Individual Therapy, Adult Group Therapy, Children's Treatment Programs, and Homebound Services (Orthner, 1990:14).

Australian Military Family Support Services

2-78. The 1986 Hamilton Report propelled changes in the support for Australian Defence Force (ADF) personnel and families. Since that time, Defence organizational structures have changed considerably, as have ADF families and societal values. Currently, four organizations, provide personnel and family support services at a total annual cost of \$14.3 million (\$ Aust.) (Australian Department of Defence, 1994:19):

- a) The Navy Personal Services Organization (PSO)
(The Navy has the most mature organization)
- b) The Army Community Services (ACS)
- c) The RAAF Social Work and Information Services (SWIS)
- d) The Australian Defence Families Information Liaison Staff (ADFILS)

These support systems are fundamentally different in concept and method of delivery due to the individual development of procedures historically, and the inherent differences in the Service organization (Australian Department of Defence, 1994: viii).

2-79. The existing personnel support organizations comprise the PSO with 82 staff, the ACS with 70 staff, SWIS with 31 staff and the ADFILS with 58 staff. Whereas the PSO, ACS and ADFILS are staffed by uniformed personnel, professional and non-professional civilians and clerical support staff, the SWIS is staffed solely with professional and non-professional civilians and clerical support staff (Australian Department of Defence, 1994:7).

2-80. ADFILS, which was established in 1987 as a result of the Hamilton Report, develops policy and provides community development support, education, information and assistance, and information on general personnel matters to Service families. While the single Services provide support to individual Service members and families, ADFILS supplements and complements that role in support of Service family communities (Australian Department of Defence, 1994:13).

2-81. The PSO provides service members and their families with housing, removals, entitlements and social work services. The PSO is unique in that it brings together the administration and delivery of the majority of personal services under one authority in one location. The ACS and SWIS do not provide housing, removals and entitlements as part of their service. ADFILS is responsive to the single Services and provides support to local commanders and families through the provision of community development support, education information and assistance, and through Family Support Funding Program (FIND) information on general personnel matters. Although the support provided by the Service personal service organizations is focussed on serving personnel, it is well recognized that the families are equally important if the operational effectiveness of serving personnel is to be maintained (Australian Department of Defence, 1990:7).

2-82. Unfortunately the delivery of services is inconsistent across the Australian Defence Forces, and there is a disproportionate allocation of resources between and within the four organizations. The present single Service structures and ADFILS do not guarantee the same range of services to all Defence families and the Service structures in particular are overloaded and seem to concentrate on crisis care. The organizations tend to operate as four structurally isolated entities, are not mutually supportive at the regional level, and there is little or no flexibility in meeting peak demands.

PART 3 - FINDINGS, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE MILITARY FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION

3-1. The first responsibility of an NDHQ Program Evaluation study is to identify whether or not a given program is required, and to determine if it should continue to be funded by the Department of National Defence. Secondly, if a program is required, the evaluators must determine if the program is achieving its stated objectives, and thirdly, is there a better way to manage or deliver the program. In addition to addressing these three fundamental concepts, it is frequently possible to examine other major concerns which management and program staff may have regarding the program.

3-2. During the pre-evaluation phase of this program evaluation, a number of major concerns and potential problems were identified by a sample of Executive Directors, Chairs of Boards, Base/Wing Commanders and DMFS Staff which impact on the Military Family Support Program. In brief, they were:

- a) the funding mechanisms for MFRCs;
- b) the unknown level of acceptance of the need for MFRCs;
- c) inconsistent access on bases to information re postings and deployments;
- d) the inconsistency of services provided by the MFRCs;
- e) the limited extent of central direction and the lack of a National model, especially as it pertained to the MARCOM application;
- f) the inconsistent level of training of Board members;
- g) the need for longer term and more complete business planning; and
- h) the relationship between the MFRCs and their Bases/Wings.

3-3. This Evaluation Study was designed to focus on the three fundamental questions, and these additional stakeholders' issues, and to develop recommendations which would assist senior and program managers in their dealings with the Military Family Support Program. Most of the conclusions and recommendations included in Part 3 also apply to the CCOs, however, given their unique nature, the CCOs will be addressed in more detail in Part 4.

RATIONALE FOR THE PROGRAM

3-4. The United States Army discovered some years ago that they “...recruited soldiers, but that they retained families...” In other words, when the decision was being made as to whether or not a soldier would re-enlist for an additional term, the family, particularly the spouse, was a major influence in the soldier’s decision-making process. In places where the U.S. Army tangibly demonstrated that they truly cared about the needs of the spouses and families, re-enlistments were high, with the direct result that the costs associated with recruiting and training new soldiers were significantly reduced.

3-5. Many studies have been conducted that show a direct correlation between the ability to deploy military personnel and the quality of life available for the military families. Where families are being adequately “supported”, military members are less frequently distracted or concerned about problems that may arise when they are away from their homes. In addition, studies have found that the number of military members who needed to be replaced on a deployment and returned home was significantly reduced where family needs were being adequately addressed. For the purposes of this report, the term “deployment” is used to mean any situation where the military members are required to be away from their families for a significant period of time. This would include not only operational deployments, but also long training courses, etc.

3-6. The demographics of Canadian and American families have changed significantly over the past 20 years. In 1971, only 2 out of every 10 families had two income earners, by 1991 it had risen to more than 7 out of every 10 families (Vanier Institute), and both parents were generally working out of financial necessity, not merely for the pleasure of doing so. Similarly, the number of single parent families has increased significantly.

3-7. Military families tend to conform in large measure to these same changes in demographics, but military families take on additional problems and concerns related to the frequent moves imposed on them, the separation from family-related members, and other factors as described in Annex C - Military Families: Are They Unique? In the past, say 25 years ago, the majority of the members of the Canadian Forces were younger, not married, and if married were probably living on only the military member’s salary. Today, more than

71% of the members of the CF are married (DPIS data base) with the result that spouses and families are a major factor in the overall DND/CF equation and must be seriously considered.

No longer can the time honoured approach be that of “... if the forces wanted you to have a wife and family, they would have issued you one....”

3-8. On the basis of the 45 interviews conducted across Canada and in all three Commands, the overwhelming consensus was that the Military Family Resource Centres were a very beneficial and valuable asset to the Department of National Defence and the Canadian Forces, and that they should definitely continue to be funded. While those people directly involved with providing the services at the MFRCs, i.e., the Executive Directors and the Chairs of the Boards, could be seen to be somewhat biased in their views, virtually every one of the Base/Wing Commanders was 100% supportive of the need for the MFRCs. In fact, when asked what they would do if NDHQ cut off the funding for the MFRCs, several stated that they would find alternate means of providing the services to “their” families, even if it meant taking the funds from some other activity.

3-9. Military spouses who were interviewed were frequently asked what difference the existence of the MFRCs had made to them, and what had they done before the Centres were formally created several years ago. Consistently, their responses were that they had “survived” but that it was often in less than ideal circumstances. Their view was that, today, given the current demographics of the large majority being married and with two income earners, as described above, it would be nearly impossible to “survive”, especially in the locations where most of the CF Bases are situated, without having access to a MFRC.

3-10. During the period 1975 to 1990, the majority of long term operational deployments for the Canadian Forces centred on the 6-month rotations to Cyprus with Land Forces Command providing on average some 576 soldiers each time. The Navy has long been accustomed to sending ships to sea for 6-month tours, but the Air Force seldom was directly involved in many long term deployments. Post 1990 has seen a drastic increase in the number and frequency of deployments, starting with the Gulf War and continuing with Bosnia, Croatia, Somalia, Rwanda, Haiti, and a long list of ongoing contributions to world peace. Virtually every member of the CF is now subject to being deployed for long term periods at least every two - three years, and more frequently in certain cases. The impact on

spouses and families of such an increased level of activity has been significant. For many, their ability to cope is being stretched to the limit, and access to “support” mechanisms is definitely required.

3-11. The other significant and recent change which has begun to impact on the families of CF members is related to the downsizing and cost-cutting efforts of the Department. Where once there were sufficiently large rear parties, several military chaplains, social workers and financial counsellors on each Base, these supports for families are slowly being reduced or eliminated in the interests of cost-efficiency. As described in Part 2, the range of other on-base support services was once very extensive, but is no longer the case.

3-12 Also as described in Part 2, the civilian communities around the CF bases have traditionally had a large array of social and community development services which were also available to military families if required. Today, however, with provincial and municipal governments drastically cutting their budgets, these services are being reduced or eliminated, with the result that in many places there are waiting lists of 8-14 months before people can get appointments. For many military families, they will be posted before their name comes to the top of the civilian waiting list. Some MFRCs have been able to shorten the waiting time for the military families, however, by pre-screening the situation and then making a professional referral directly to the civilian service on behalf of a military spouse or family.

3-13. As a good corporate citizen, and the largest single employer in the country, it is important for DND to not only appear to be providing a minimum level of support to the families, but in practice must provide those services which will at least lessen the negative impacts created by DND as an employer on its military members and their families.

It is recommended that:

--- funding for the Military Family Support Program be continued at its current level of \$12 million for a further 5 year period, and that additional funding be allocated in the future where the need can be justified.

3-14. One of the basic principles used in the formulation of the MFSP was that military spouses would have a major role in determining the nature and level of services to be provided by the MFRCs, and that these decisions were not to be made by the military staff. This has

facilitated the tailoring of services to satisfy local needs, and to take into account those services which are available from the civilian community. Difficulties have arisen across the country, and outside Canada, however, which have resulted in a lack of a consistent level of services being offered at each Base/Wing/location as will be expanded upon later.

It is recommended that:

--- the current model whereby the MFRCs are operated at arms-length from DND, with majority control held by military spouses, who can tailor services to fulfil local needs, should be continued, however, it needs to be applied in a manner so that defined minimum services are available consistently and universally both within and outside Canada.

3-15. Across the MFRCs, there is confusion and disagreement regarding why the Military Family Support Program exists and is funded by DND. At one extreme, advocates for the program claim that DND has a moral obligation to enhance the quality of life for the families of military members and that funding should be given to the MFRCs with no restrictions, and no stated objectives regarding what the MFRCs should be accomplishing. Furthermore, the MFRCs should not be required to provide DND, or their Base/Wing Commander, with any information about their activities and programs.

3-16. At the opposite end of the spectrum are those who believe that the MFRCs exist solely to "...keep the spouses and families happy, so that the military member can be deployed...." Under this scenario, responding to crises would be paramount, and that any funds spent on prevention-oriented programs is a poor use of DND's limited resources.

3-17. Based on information collected for this evaluation study, it is apparent that not only do both of these philosophies exist across Canada, but that there are a multitude of variations of them between the two extremes. This has had a significant impact on CF members and their families as they move from base to base, particularly if the new base belongs to a different Command, because each of the Commands has incorporated its own management philosophy into the manner in which their MFRCs are operated, as will be elaborated upon later in this report.

3-18. Unfortunately, the MFSP cannot be called a “program” if the fundamental principles related to its purpose are not recognized and accepted universally. While it would be nice for DND to spend funds solely to enhance the quality of life for its members and their families, it can equally be said that it is “nice” to have hospitals everywhere, but economic reality of the 1990s is that we, as taxpayers, can no longer afford to have things that are merely “nice” to have. Some very pragmatic decisions are being made as witnessed by the number of hospitals and other public services which are currently being eliminated from coast to coast.

3-19. As DND downsizes, and sees more than \$3 billion dollars eliminated from its annual budget, only those costs which relate directly to the mission and mandate of DND and the CF will survive present and future cuts. One of the key strategic objectives of DND/CF is to be able to deploy “... multi-purpose combat capable forces”. As discussed earlier, a significant factor in the success of any military deployment is directly related to the state of well-being of the families. In other words, the two objectives are complementary, not mutually exclusive. If the MFRCs accept the concept that they are enhancing the quality of life for families, so that the CF can more easily deploy its members, then it will be a win-win situation. Otherwise, support from Base/Wing Commanders, who are now struggling to fund all the important activities on their base/wing, may wane as they fail to see a direct benefit from DND’s investment in the MFSP to their operational responsibilities.

It is recommended that:

--- the confusion regarding the priority between the two major perceptions as to why the MFRCs exist needs to be addressed and resolved. That is, do the MFRCs primarily exist to facilitate the deployment of military members on operations and exercises, or is their primary function to contribute to the improvement of the quality of life for military members and their families, in view of the unique requirements and challenges to which they are subjected?

3-20. Partially as a result of the unclear purpose of the MFRCs as described above, it was apparent from information gathered during the evaluation study that full and tangible support for the work of the MFRCs is not being given throughout the military chain of command. In part this stems from the fact that the MFSP had its origins in the political environment and it was perceived by some military personnel as being imposed, and furthermore unnecessary, because "... their own families had survived without such frills". As a result, obstacles and unnecessary problems are being placed in the path of the MFRCs, often without the supportive Base/Wing Commander being aware of it. This will be elaborated on later.

3-21. The U.S. Army discovered that the same situation was arising in their environment some 12 years ago, and they found that it was not acceptable. Among other actions which they took to remedy the problem was that they directly linked their family support programs with the chain of command, and made the degree to which every Commanding Officer supported families, part of their annual performance appraisal system. In discussing the concept with some young, unmarried U.S. Army Lieutenants and Captains, they pointed out that it certainly worked for them because they felt that they had appropriate direction from their senior officers that helping families was an acceptable use of their time and resources.

Furthermore, they felt confident in directing their subordinate NCOs to also be helpful and cooperative as it concerned their Family Support Groups.

3-22. Across the CF Commands, the degree of support and cooperation differs significantly. It appears that Air Command is very supportive of the MFSP and that it has gone to great lengths to ensure that the MFRCs on their Wings are properly accommodated, equipped and funded. Land Forces Command seems to have passively, and to a degree, reluctantly accepted the MFRCs. They still seem to feel that the MFSP was imposed on them and that their Rear Parties and Regiments were doing a perfectly adequate job of "supporting" families by shovelling driveways, fixing cars, etc. Unfortunately, these are not the main types of "support" that military families are looking for today.

3-23. At the time of the program evaluation study within Canada (February 1996) Maritime Command had not accepted the national model of the MFSP. They correctly claim that they have been supporting families since the Canadian navy first went to sea some 87 years ago. But their concept of a MFRC has been to name a serving Lieutenant Commander as the Director, to post-in other serving military members and to hire federal public servants and NPF employees to staff the Centres. Not only are military spouses greeted at the door of the MFRC by a serving naval officer or petty officer, the degree of professional, social and community development knowledge which these people have cannot be ensured, and as the "Director" is posted-in/out every year, as has happened for the past 8 years in Halifax, many concerns are raised about any continuity with the Centre locally.

3-24. Until recently both Halifax and Esquimalt operated their respective Centres under this model. However, several months ago, the Judge Advocate General advised MARPAC that it could be seen to be "intra-vires" for them to have a serving naval officer as the Director of a provincially incorporated, charitable organization on the base, at the same time that the Crown was paying his/her salary, and those of the other staff. MARPAC is in the process of converting to the national MFSP model; however, MARLANT, since it never provincially incorporated its Centre, does not feel the same pressure or urgency to change to the national model. MARCOM's major concern appears to be one of a loss of control over its families and the support or assistance that is provided to them. However, as one Base/Wing Commander pointed out to us, "...families are not part of the chain of command, even though it would be very convenient for us if they were ... but they aren't and we have to respect that."

It is recommended that:

--- the complete Canadian Forces Chain of Command, from the CDS through to the Master Corporals, demonstrate tangible and effective support for the MFRCs, and that they accept the MFSP as a valuable contribution towards achieving the mission and objectives of the CF.

--- all of the Military Family Resource Centres be operated under a common, national model as prescribed by DMFS on behalf of ADM(Per).

ACHIEVEMENT OF THE OBJECTIVES

3-25. The five stated objectives for the MFSP as described in Part 2 are focussed on setting up the MFSP across the country and overseas. They do not per se indicate what the MFSP is intended to accomplish. They are input oriented rather than results-oriented. As such, it is very difficult to determine if the MFSP is achieving the objectives for which the program was created. Data obtained from the survey (Annexes G & H) which was completed by all 41 MFRCs and CCOs shows that there is virtually nothing in common across the Centres. They all had different levels of funding from DND, different numbers of staff, different programs and levels of service delivery, and different foci for their activities, etc. In other words, there appear to be 41 different versions of the “program” being delivered across the country and in Europe. Consequently, it is not possible for the evaluators to confirm that the MFSP is in fact achieving its stated objectives.

It is recommended that:

--- the objectives of the MFSP be refined to be results-oriented and to more adequately reflect that which is reasonably achievable given the limited funding levels available in DND.

--- specific performance indicators and an internal quality control process must be implemented to ensure that in the longer term, the stated objectives are in fact being realized.

3-26. One of the fundamental principles of the MFSP, as discussed earlier, is that military spouses will play a key role in the design and tailoring of the services being provided. This occurs in most places at the local level through their participation on the Boards of Directors or the Advisory Boards. In practice, NDHQ/DMFS has turned over the majority of management and program decisions to these Boards and has given them a large degree of latitude and freedom. The result has been the 41 versions of the MFSP as detailed above.

3-27. There is no mechanism, however, which brings together input and advice at the national level. The need exists to specify what the minimum services are that should be available from every MFRC. For example, is it acceptable that some MFRCs close at 1600

(4:00 PM) and if spouses have a crisis after hours, they have to fend for themselves? Or should a minimum standard be like that of several of the MFRCs where a staff member is available 24 hours / 7 days per week through a pager or cell phone? Similarly, should there be no child-related services available on one base (even though a need exists) while on another base, the majority of their efforts are devoted to child care issues?

3-28. At the present time, in the absence of a national-level advisory board, there are only very limited means for the military to directly provide input, and to influence the overall direction of the MFSP. Similarly, there is no focal point to provide input on changes that are happening nationally with the demographics and needs of Canadian families as a whole. Such input may only occur at the local level and will tend to be inconsistently applied across the country.

3-29. In the absence of a National Advisory Board, the only pan-CF focal point will be the Directorate of Military Family Support in the NDHQ/ADM(Per) organization. While the DMFS staff are very dedicated and sincere people, they cannot necessarily bring the required national perspective on all issues, and particularly not that of a variety of military spouses. There is an urgent need to create a National Advisory Board which facilitates, and, in fact, encourages input from, and discussion by, military spouses directly so that they will ultimately take “ownership” of the MFSP.

3-30. The National Advisory Board should be co-chaired by a military spouse and a senior military officer. Initially, the logical military officer could be the Chief of Staff to ADM(Personnel) given his current involvement in Quality-of-Life issues for military members. There should also be three or four current or former military spouses and a similar number of military members, possibly the Deputy Chief of Staff - Personnel (DCOS Pers) in the Commands. It would also be advantageous for the National Advisory Board to include persons from the civilian community who have professional expertise in a field related to the MFSP, for example, Dr. Robert Glossop of the Vanier Institute of the Family.

It is recommended that:

--- a National Advisory Board be established at the NDHQ level, reporting to the ADM(Personnel) consisting of a selection of stakeholders, but especially military spouses, to undertake the required revision and refinement of the objectives of the MFSP so that they reflect the broader views of the military and civilian communities and to provide ongoing direction and advice to the ADM(Personnel) and his staff.

3-31. At the present time, DMFS policy and guidelines indicate that any MFRC or a CCO will be established where ever there is a significant number of military families. No specific number is stated and it is difficult to determine the rationale for some of the existing MFRCs.

For example, in Dartmouth, Nova Scotia, there are two MFRCs, each with an Executive Director, a full staff, budget, facilities, etc., and they are being maintained because one is operated by MARCOM and the other by AIRCOM. The fact that MARCOM and AIRCOM claim to have significantly different needs for their families defies logic, especially since the majority of the AIRCOM people deploy on the MARCOM ships as the air detachment members. In reality, the two Centres exist because of the major difference in philosophy between AIRCOM and MARCOM as discussed previously.

3-32. Other MFRCs are being opened at the same time that the CF is downsizing from some 85,000 to 60,000 members, and DND is closing and consolidating bases across the country.

For example, CFB Moncton is in the process of establishing a new MFRC and a new one recently opened in Rome, New York to serve Canadian military families in that area. Plans are also underway to create a new MFRC in Naples, Italy.

3-33. Given the significantly reduced funding which DND now has, and will for the next several years, every dollar must be well spent, and the return on each dollar must be maximized. As shown in Annex H, the direct cost to DND of providing MFSP services, based on the number of Regular Force military families who could access the services, ranges from a low of \$71 to a high of \$3850. DND may no longer be able to pay as much as \$3000 per family, to provide support to a only a small number of families, when other more cost-effective approaches could be used.

It is recommended that:

--- the size and location of each of the MFRCs and CCOs must be rationalized, and those that are of marginal contribution to achievement of the revised objectives must be closed or merged where appropriate and more cost-effective.

MANAGEMENT OF THE PROGRAM

Identity:

3-34. The term “support” is often viewed in a negative or pejorative context. It can solidify preconceived concepts in peoples’ minds, and detract from what should be a progressive, forward-looking, preventative approach. Military members and their spouses and families should see the MFRCs as a source for information, referral, guidance, and resources so that they are not “dependent” and do not need to be “propped-up”. They are persons in their own right and have to take individual responsibility for their lives and the decisions they make.

It is recommended that:

--- the titles “Military Family Support Program” and “Director Military Family Support” be changed to replace the word “support” with a more appropriate term.

3-35. Across Canada, a large variety of terms are used to identify the MFRCs. Some are call “Multi-Service Family Support Centres”, others just “Family Support Centre”, while others have names that bear no relationship to DND, the CF, or the local military community. There are a variety of explanations for this. In some cases the “Multi-Service” term was adopted because it was part of the professional vocabulary of social workers; other names deliberately avoided the use of the term “Military” because it might show them as being too closely affiliated with DND/CF; while others selected a name which was very neutral so that they could get grants from their province or civilian community without the perception that the funds were being used to support military families.

3-36. The impact of this proliferation of names has meant confusion for CF members and their families, and for the civilian community who in certain cases thought they were dealing with their municipal Family Resource Centre, when in fact it was the DND one. Furthermore, it is one more aspect in the fragmentation of the MFSP with the result that there is no common identity across the country.

3-37. The physical identification of the MFRCs varies from no signage outside the building(s), to very professional, bilingual signs that appear to conform to Federal and DND policies. It does not seem to be appropriate that unilingual, home-made and non-informative signage should continue to exist on Canadian Forces Bases/Wings.

It is recommended that:

--- the title “Military Family Resource Centre” be used consistently, and in bilingual format, across Canada in order to reflect the integrated nature of the MFSP; to eliminate the confusion which exists when military families are posted from base to base; and to provide for a recognizable identity which conforms to Federal Government and DND policies.

Partnering and Partnerships

3-38. All of the existing MFRCs are either located directly on DND property, or in buildings leased by the Government of Canada and this does not appear to be creating major problems at present. However, there are some concerns that with the creation of the CF Housing Authority (CFHA), the MFRCs will be required to pay rent to the CFHA for the PMQs which they occupy for office and program facilities. If this approach is taken, it would appear to be an additional and unnecessary complication in the funding and operation of the MFRCs. CFAO 56-40 currently specifies that the Base/Wing Commanders are responsible for providing appropriate accommodation for their MFRC, and the nature and extent of these facilities should be left as the prerogative of the Base/Wing Commanders given their local circumstances and conditions. If they decide to accommodate the MFRC in PMQs, then the base/wing will need to compensate CFHA accordingly.

3-39. Furthermore, CFAO 56-40 also states that the Base/Wing Commander will provide the MFRC with required equipment and supplies. However, across the country there are vast differences in interpretation as to how much, and what type of equipment is required by a MFRC. Some are fully equipped with computers, current software, a fax machine, and office supplies, while others are deemed to be lucky to even have a DND telephone, let alone have any DND pens and paper. A more formal and detailed “agreement” is required between the Base/Wing Commanders and their MFRC which specifies the nature and level of services which the Base/Wing will provide to the MFRC. Any shortfalls of required items will need to be factored into the budget for the MFRC and the necessary funds obtained from DND or elsewhere.

It is recommended that:

--- DND should continue to own/lease all the MFRC facilities and equipment at each Base/Wing/Unit and a formal agreement be prepared which specifies the agreed to level of services, utilities, supplies and security which will be provided by the Base/Wing/Unit.

3-40. The concept of “Alternate Service Delivery” (ASD) has recently become of particular interest at both the federal and provincial levels of government, and in DND. The MFSP, when it was created about five years ago was probably a forerunner of the ASD concept in that instead of creating a series of MFRCs, and staffing them all with either public servants, NPF employees, or serving military members, the designers of the program decided to encourage the formation of a series of local, incorporated Boards of Directors across Canada which would operate at arms-length from DND, even though DND was providing the direct funding and support. The Boards of Directors are required to hire, train and manage the staff at the MFRCs. Staff are generally not employees of DND nor the Government of Canada.

3-41. This approach appears to have worked very effectively because it has provided the military spouses with a mechanism whereby they can have direct involvement and control over the services which their MFRC provides. It has also eliminated many of the labour relations and liability problems which are inherent in this type of social services function. In fact, what the MFSP has done appears to be very much in line with DND’s approach to

the Militia Training and Support Centre (MTSC) at Meaford, Ontario which is basically a “Government Owned Contractor-Operated” (GOCO) facility with the majority of on-base services provided by an independent contractor.

3-42. While the MFRCs appear to resemble a “GOCO”, there is no formal “contract” or agreement between DND and each Board of Directors which specifies the details of what each will provide, what expectations there are, what services and level of services will be provided, what information will be exchanged, and how much DND funding will be provided and when.

It is recommended that:

--- DMFS should, in conjunction with each Base/Wing Commander, negotiate and approve a formal contract/ agreement with an appropriate provincially or federally incorporated not-for profit corporation to operate each MFRC on behalf of DND.

3-43. The relative success of each MFRC appears to be directly dependent on the degree of support provided by the Base/Wing Commander. Where a true partnership exists between the Commander, the Chair of the Board of Directors, and the Executive Director, problems are made to disappear. It is inconceivable that a MFRC could expect to survive and prosper without the direct support of the Base/Wing Commander, but it was amazing to discover through the course of the evaluation that there are Executive Directors and Chairs of Boards who never meet with their Base/Wing Commander during a given year. Annex H provides details on the number of respective meetings which were held during fiscal year 1995-96.

3-44. There were a variety of explanations for this lack of discussion including some where people wanted to ensure that their “arms-length” relationship was never jeopardized by being seen to having associated with a senior military officer. In other cases, a decision had been made at some point that the Base/Wing Commander was not entitled to receive any information about the activities of the MFRC because that would “...jeopardize the confidential nature of the Executive Director’s relationship with their clients.” Therefore, there was really no point meeting with the Base/Wing Commander at all. On the other side,

some Base/Wing Commanders can be intimidating, partially as a result of their senior officer status, but also due to their personality, and there are people at the MFRC who did not feel comfortable initiating contacts with “God” on their base.

It is recommended that:

--- efforts be devoted to ensuring that there is in fact a productive, mutually supportive, and professional partnership between each Base/Wing Commander, the Chair of the Board of Directors, and the Executive Director of the MFRC.

3-45. If, as was discussed earlier, the primary purpose of the MFRCs is to assist the CF to deploy and retain members, by ensuring that an appropriate system exists to assist spouses and families enhance their quality of life, it would appear to be imperative that DND/CF willingly provide the names of members and their families as they are posted in, or as the member is deployed on an operation, exercise, or long training course. We found that there were vast differences in the degree of assistance and cooperation across all the Bases/Wings. Some provide the information weekly in electronic format to their MFRC. Others will give the MFRC absolutely no information. In some instances, the reason given for the non-cooperation was that it was against the Privacy Act, however, the MFSP did obtain a ruling from the Privacy Commissioner that this did not contravene the Act. In some locations, Base/Wing Commanders expressed surprise as to how an MFRC could effectively operate without this information. Ironically, it was on some of these same bases/wings that lower level military staff were deliberately preventing the release of this information to the MFRC. An inadequate flow of direct communications between the Executive Director and the Base/Wing Commander led to the situation being perpetuated unnecessarily. Annex H shows the degree to which this information is available across the MFSP.

It is recommended that:

--- as part of the formal contract/agreement, DND/CF must agree to provide to their MFRC the names of all military members and their spouses, with their local mailing address within 5 days of the member or family arriving on the Base/Wing.

--- DND/CF provide to the MFRCs the names of military members deployed on operations, major exercises or long training courses as soon as the information is made public, and certainly within 5 days of their departure.

Funding:

3-46. Funding of the MFRCs is probably the major concern of all persons directly involved in the MFSP. Five years ago, an amount of some \$17 million in direct funding was allocated for the Program. In recent years, the MFSP has utilized approximately \$12 million, with an additional unknown amount being paid for infrastructure, utilities, equipment, supplies, etc., from other DND budgets. The plan was that for the first five years, DMFS would identify the level of funding which each MFRC needed, and the funds were earmarked as such and downloaded to the local Base/Wing Comptroller to arrange payment. By the end of the five year period, the concept was that the total allocation for the MFSP would be transferred to the Commands, and in turn, each Base/Wing Commander would have funds in their base/wing budget to support their MFRC as the need existed, and to the extent possible given other possible conflicting priorities. This was directly in line with the concept of devolution and delegation of funds and responsibilities to the lowest appropriate level.

3-47. For the first few years, this method of direct funding by DMFS worked reasonably well. However, during the last two fiscal years problems have started to arise. While the specific level of funds was earmarked for the MFRC, some Base/Wing Commanders decided that they would prevent the transfer of some of those funds to their MFRC. There were a variety of reasons for this, some more legitimate than others, but the impact was very significant on the operation of the MFRC. The DND funds provided through DMFS can only be used to pay the salaries and benefits of staff, and operating expenses, such as insurance, etc., at the MFRC. Money to fund programs and activities must be found from other sources. When a Base/Wing Commander decides to withhold \$50-75,000 from the MFRC, he or she is in effect saying: eliminate one or two staff immediately. This is hardly an effective manner in which to run a business.

3-48. In the majority of cases where funds were withheld from the MFRC, and it was not always the Base/Wing Commander who decided to do so, the most common reason given was that the person did not agree with what the MFRC was doing, or that they could not find out what the MFRC was doing. In the cases of non-agreement, there was generally a lack of acceptance of the philosophy or professional practices of the social services community by the military member who had control of the funds. In both situations, inadequate communications compounded the problem.

3-49. Adding to the problem of funding the MFRCs through the Commands has been the bureaucracy, form filling, justification, audits, numerous levels of players, unacceptable delays and the fact that most MFRC do not receive their funds until well after the start of the new fiscal year, with the result that other arrangements have had to be made to pay the staff salaries on pay day.

3-50. Everyone who was interviewed for this evaluation was asked their opinion as to which would be the best of three possible options for future funding of the MFRCs. The options were:

Option A: The \$12 million in direct funding is devolved by NDHQ to MARCOM, LFC, AIRCOM, CFRETS and ADM(DIS) and each would be given the responsibility to fund and manage the MFRCs on their bases/wings as they see fit. DMFS would only serve in an advisory capacity to the Commands, if it even continued to exist;

Option B: The \$12 million would be divided up as DMFS has done in the past and it would formally be transferred to the baseline budget for each base/wing that currently had a MFRC. DMFS's role would be the same as in Option A.

Option C: DMFS, on behalf of ADM(Per) would hold the \$12 million centrally and through the use of contracts/agreements negotiated by DMFS, on behalf of the Base/Wing Commanders, would fund the MFRCs directly. If there was another major reduction to DND's budget, then DMFS would have to apportion a comparable reduction across the MFRCs in a rational manner.

3-51. None of the persons interviewed preferred Option A because it was felt that the money would become “lost” in the \$5-6 billion that NDHQ was devolving to the Commands. Furthermore, concerns were expressed that within the Commands, CFRETS and ADM(DIS) there was probably not the required skill set necessary to direct and manage a social service oriented program like the MFSP, or at the very least it would mean creating four mini-DMFSs to oversee their activities.

3-52. About half of the Base/Wing Commanders initially selected Option B, where the funds would be devolved directly to them, as the best option because it would give them the means to ensure that they had an excellent MFRC for their families. However, when they learned that some of their colleagues were not necessarily totally supportive of the MFRCs, and had blocked their funds in the past, the majority of these Base/Wing Commanders concluded that for the good of the complete CF, the funds should be centralized as listed in Option C.

3.53 The other half of the Base/Wing Commanders immediately supported Option C, which was not what the evaluators had anticipated or predicted. Their reasons for selecting Option C were along the lines that:

... as Base/Wing Commander I am responsible for not only the serving military members, but also their families. I do not want to do anything that might jeopardize the support networks which need to be available to them. Furthermore, if you include it as part of the baseline budget for this base/wing, the next time we take a 15% cut, the MFRCs will also be cut, and I do not think that is appropriate because they have no budgetary flexibility, unlike my other sections.

Others stated that:

... while I fully agree with the concept of devolution and delegation, an amount of \$250,000 held at NDHQ to fund my MFRC is not a major problem and is not going to do much to change my stature and status as the Base/Wing Commander.

Finally, a few admitted that:

... as a fighter pilot/gunner/infantry officer/sailor, they really had no previous training and education which prepared them to oversee a social service/community development agency, especially not in comparison to the skill set that is contained in DMFS.

3-54. The vast majority of the Chairs of the Boards of Directors selected Option C as did all of the Executive Directors. Option C is also the preferred choice of the ADM(Per)/DMFS staff.

3-55. Each of the options listed above, however, have definite pros and cons. The major problem with Option C, the preferred one, is that it weakens the partnership linkages between the Base/Wing Commander and the Chair of the Board and Executive Director. When the MFRC got its funds through the Base/Wing, it was easy for the military staff to get the attention of the MFRC staff as required. With direct funding from DMFS, there may be the potential for those MFRCs who attempt to distance themselves from their base/wing to do so even more. If Option C was to be implemented, it is imperative that the partnership and communications be significantly improved where required.

3-56. As Program Evaluators, we are expected to recommend the best solution to senior management, in spite of what popular opinion and surveys may show. In analysing the options listed above, and based on research conducted, we discovered that this would be a key recommendation which would significantly impact on the future of the MFSP. We attempted to identify which option would be the most cost-efficient; would ensure the survival of the MFSP as a CF wide program; and was not excessively bureaucratic. While NDHQ initially advocated that delegation and devolution was the way of the future, recent senior level decisions indicate that the choice between decentralization vs centralization must be made on a realistic basis, not just a philosophical theory. For example, the decision was made that starting 1 April 1996 all of the \$85 million direct funding for the Army, Navy and Air Cadets would be centralized under the Chief Reserves and Cadets at NDHQ. Our research also shows that the U.S. Army directly funds, from the Department of Defense in Washington DC, those family support programs which they deem to be most important and vital, and do not give their Garrison Commanders discretion in this area.

It is recommended that:

--- DND funding for all the MFRCs be managed centrally by DMFS on behalf of ADM(Per) and distributed as earmarked funds through Command and Group Principal comptrollers directly to the contractor, i.e. the Not-for Profit Corporation.

--- funding for the MFRCs be extended beyond the current year to year basis, possibly with initial funding for a three year period, with an option for two additional years.

3-57. The current methodology of determining the funding level for each MFRC on the basis of the number of staff was probably appropriate when the Centres were first being established; however, by this stage it does not permit a rational assessment of the funding actually needed by each MFRC to provide the required level of services. Furthermore, there does not appear to be any direct correlation between the funding level for a given MFRC and the number of families being served, or which could be served in a given area.

It is recommended that:

--- MFRCs should be funded on the basis of a combination of the level and nature of services to be provided, and the number of military families being served, as opposed to the current method of providing funds for a specific number of staff positions.

DMFS RESPONSIBILITIES

3-58. DMFS staff must be commended for their dedication and efforts in establishing some 41 MFRCs and CCOs in less than five years. While the MFSP was conceived in the political environment, DMFS staff have brought it through a somewhat rough and difficult childhood. The MFSP is now entering its “teen years”, and the challenges for DMFS, and all the MFRCs and CCOs, will be significantly greater and different. Now is the time when certain standards, limitations, and restrictions must be put into place for the collective benefit of the Program, DND and the CF.

3-59. If DMFS is the direct funder of the MFRCs, as a result of Option C being implemented, then they must serve as the “Program Manager” for the MFSP. They must become actively involved in all aspects of the management of the program; some aspects of the delivery of services at the base/wing levels; take direction from the ADM(PER) National Advisory Board; but not go so far as to jeopardize the arms-length relationship and contractual arrangements with the Boards of Directors.

It is recommended that:

--- DMFS be tasked with a significantly more active role as the focal point for the management and control of the MFSP, and as the DND/CF arbitrator and authority for all matters concerning the Program.

--- in order to adequately manage the MFSP, DMFS staff must collectively have expertise in, or direct access to:

- a) the military spouse’s perspectives**
- b) military operations, practices, and lifestyle**
- c) community development**
- d) social services development and delivery**
- e) evaluation of social program delivery**
- f) contract negotiation and management**
- g) financial management**
- h) small business management practices.**

--- DMFS staff should conduct an annual visit to each MFRC/CCO to ensure that the terms of the contract/agreement are being adhered to by both DND and the Board of Directors, and to identify any corrective action required. Such visits must be documented in writing with copies being provided to the Base/Wing Commander, Chair of the Board of Directors, and the Executive Director in a timely manner.

3-60. A portion of the funds provided to each MFRC is used to cover overhead expenses such as insurance, audits, financial/payroll management, etc. At the present time each MFRC negotiates locally to obtain these services. There have been limited attempts to obtain national coverage, but they have not been successful. A more concerted effort is required to determine if significant savings could be accrued by contracting with a national insurance company, an accounting firm, and a banking institution to provide these, and possibly other services to all 41 MFRCs and CCOs. Any funds saved in this manner could then be utilized by the MFRCs/CCOs for direct program delivery.

3-61. The focus for the Board of Directors should be on determining the specific needs of their local military community, rather than devoting their limited time and resources to many of the broader program administration issues, such as attempting to obtain and negotiate liability insurance, etc., each year. These elements tend to distract from what should be their primary focus of service/program delivery. Compounding the situation is the frequent turnover of Board members as they or their spouses are posted to another base/wing. A more efficient and effective means needs to be established to address these issues.

It is recommended that:

--- DMFS should negotiate national standing offers for common services utilized by the MFRCs and CCOs, i.e., payroll and financial services, employee benefit packages, liability and professional indemnity insurance, audit services, purchase of supplies, etc., and, where these are more cost effective, MFRCs should be encouraged to utilize them.

3-62. During the course of the evaluation study, we were able to meet many of the Executive Directors and their staffs, and all of the DMFS staff. These people come from a large variety of professional backgrounds including social work, community development, child development, business administration, not-for-profit organization management, and retired military. It was evident that not only were they hard-working and very dedicated to providing high quality services to all military families, but that they collectively have a tremendous amount of knowledge and experience which needs to be shared and exchanged with their colleagues, and with the serving military personnel.

3-63. The MFSP holds an annual conference where each MFRC sends representatives, generally the Executive Director and the Chair of the Board, and the DMFS staff attend. The only military members who are invited to attend tend to be those who are double-hatted, that is, a Chair or Board member who is also a serving military member. In some places, regional conferences are also held where similar representatives from a geographic area attend to discuss common issues and problems.

3-64. At the May 1996 Annual MFSP Conference, one of the main features on the program was the sharing of “Success Stories” by several of the MFRCs. This is a good start towards reducing the fragmentation and lack of consistency across the MFSP. Where something of either a program delivery or management nature has been found to work well and been effective in one location, it should be shared with the others, in case it would be applicable there as well. It appears at this time that there is a vast amount of “re-inventing the wheel” occurring within the MFRCs.

3-65. It is also unfortunate that the “Success Stories” are not being actively shared with a broader selection of military members, including Base/Wing Commanders. Along the same lines, this sharing of expertise and experience needs to go both ways. Base/Wing Commanders tend to be very knowledgeable and articulate, and could provide very valuable insight to people working in the MFRCs, if they were given the opportunity. The fact that annual conferences (and possibly regional conferences) include only two of the three main players in the partnership, and exclude any Base/Wing Commanders as representatives or guest speakers does not appear to be acceptable.

It is recommended that:

--- a mechanism be established whereby the vast knowledge and expertise possessed by the MFRC Executive Directors, their staffs, Board members, DMFS staff, and Base/Wing Commanders can be easily and productively be exchanged and shared in order to collectively gain from the lessons learned by others.

MFRC CORPORATION RESPONSIBILITIES

3-66. As discussed earlier, DND should “contract” for the operation of the MFRCs. There are several aspects which should be considered in identifying the conditions for these “contracts”. Firstly, at the present time it would not be advisable to contract with other than a “not-for-profit” provincially or federally incorporated organization as most of them currently are. The major advantage of this is that the Corporation must adhere to certain provincial/federal laws and standards; can operate to a large degree at arms-length from DND; and can have access to other sources of funds such as those raised through charitable events or from grants. In fact, in several cases as shown in Annex H certain MFRCs receive less than 50% of their total funding from DND and have been able to obtain significant levels of funds from other sources. In other words, the DND contribution to the MFRC is being positively leveraged in some cases to double the nature and level of services available to military families on a given base/wing.

3-67. At the present time the Boards of Directors are composed entirely of military spouses and serving military members. This is a very insular approach and one which gives the perception that no one except people from one of these two categories has any expertise to provide when it comes to the needs of military families. Certainly there are spouses of retired military members who would disagree that they had nothing to contribute. As some of them told us, they “survived” the pre-MFRC days and it was not “nice”. They too, would have lessons to share with the current spouses. Where many Base/Wing Commanders go to great lengths to ensure that their base/wing is part of the broader civilian community by participating in local service clubs, Boards of Trade, inviting civic leaders to the base for discussions, etc., the MFRCs consciously exclude any membership on their Board from the local, non-military community. There may in fact be “locals” who could provide valuable insight and linkages for the MFRC, if they were to be included within the 49% non-spousal component.

3-68. Across the country there are vast differences in the amount of information which the MFRCs provide to DMFS and to their Base/Wing Commander. In some cases there may be too much effort and resources consumed in data collection and analysis, while in others, the total lack of any data or information is not acceptable. The specific needs of each of the three

members of the partnership must be identified, rationalized, and agreed upon with attention being given to the impact on service delivery if excessive staff time is required to generate and produce the information. There must also be a large degree of commonality of information across the MFRCs and CCOs so that DMFS can report to ADM(Per) on the national program basis.

It is recommended that:

--- DND “contract” with only Not-for Profit Corporations in Canada which are provincially or federally incorporated which have, as a minimum, 51% of the Board of Directors as military spouses, with the balance made up of members of both the local military and civilian communities.

--- the MFRCs and CCOs provide regular information reports to both their Base/Wing Commander and DMFS on the activities of their MFRC/CCO.

--- at a minimum, three scheduled meetings be held between the Base/Wing Commander, the Chair of the Board, and the Executive Director each fiscal year to discuss the level and nature of services being provided to families, to assess the level of satisfaction with the services provided, and to facilitate any required changes.

3-69. Given the frequent turnover of Board members as they or their spouses get posted, training of board members has become a major concern. The legal, liability, personnel and financial management responsibilities can be significant. In reality, the Board of Directors is running a small business, sometimes with as few as 2 employees, generally with as many as 8- 10, and in one Centre, as many as 50 staff members. Being a Board member requires specific knowledge and skills which people may have acquired through their work on other boards of directors, or through their professional training. If they have not previously acquired this expertise, then it is incumbent on the MFRC Corporation to ensure that appropriate training is provided immediately to new and existing board members.

3-70. There are many sources of training available for board members. In some locations the province, or organizations such as the United Way, provide such training on a reasonable or no cost basis. There are also private sector companies who for a price will provide such training and development. Within the MFRCs, there are several Executive Directors who have developed their own expertise in the training of board members (often out of desperation); in fact, one of the Executive Directors did her Master's thesis in the area of Board Development and when asked by other MFRCs, is very willing to provide training to those Boards. From DND's perspective, it is not acceptable that public funds are being turned over to a Board of Directors who do not necessarily have the required knowledge to properly manage the funds and the local program effectively.

It is recommended that:

--- as part of the formal "contract", DMFS must be assured that adequate training and development is provided to all Board members of the Not-for Profit Corporations which DND contracts with to operate the MFRCs.

3-71. The combination of a lack of ongoing communications with the Base/Wing Commanders and DMFS, the absence of ongoing information reports, and the limited number of meetings of the "partners", all contribute to a large degree of uncertainty and concern on the part of many of the stakeholders of the MFSP, but particularly for the Base/Wing Commanders. Many expressed the concern that they really did not know what their MFRC/CCO was doing, or was planning to do, and that they might suddenly find their name on the front page of the Globe and Mail. Some of the most apparently innocent events can become front page news, and the MFRC/CCO staff may not completely appreciate the significance of some of their activities.

3-72. When the Base/Wing Commanders had a direct link in the funding chain for the MFRCs and CCOs, they felt some reassurance that they could keep on top of the situation. If they step out of the funding chain (i.e., Option C), they will only do so on the condition that the MFRCs/CCOs undertake to prepare Business Plans which they and their staff are part of during the discussion and negotiation phases. They would like the opportunity to input their perceptions as to the local needs and requirements, and to find out first-hand how the MFRC/CCO is planning to achieve its objectives and how it plans to utilize its funds.

It is recommended that:

--- a three year Business Plan be prepared and updated annually by each MFRC and CCO, in consultation with their Base/Wing Commander and DMFS, which adequately reflects the agreed to funding levels, describes the current and future levels and nature of service which will be provided locally, and the facilities and equipment requirements which the MFRC/CCO would require from the Base/Wing Commander.

PROGRAM DELIVERY

3-73. As mentioned previously, the MFSP is very fragmented and operates in approximately 41 different versions. The level of common services was difficult to determine as part of the evaluation study. Interviews with several military members and their spouses indicated that this vast variation was not acceptable from their perspective as they moved across the country and overseas. They have very little stability in their lives because of their frequent moves, and were surprised to find that even something as universal as family resource centres bore no resemblance to each other and, therefore, did not help to lower their stress levels when moving, as they thought they should. For many, they thought that the warm comfort level provided by a familiar and predictable McDonald's or Tim Horton's in the new city was what the MFRCs should be providing for them as they arrive in a new and strange location.

It is recommended that:

--- military families moving across the country, and outside Canada, be assured that they will receive at least a common minimum level service from each MFRC and CCO that they visit, and that where a given MFRC/CCO does not provide a given service in-house, the MFRC/CCO will have taken steps to ensure that the family can access the service in the local community.

--- DMFS must, in consultation with the Base/Wing Commanders and the Boards of Directors, determine what the minimum level and nature of services are that are required for their respective MFRC/CCO, and what additional services, tailored to local needs, DND is prepared to pay for where the need exists.

OTHER

3-74. As we conducted interviews across Canada and overseas, it became apparent that among the Executive Directors and their staffs that there was a wide gap in the level of knowledge and understanding concerning the mission and purpose of the Department of National Defence and the Canadian Forces. In addition, those who were neither military spouses themselves, nor retired military, seemed to have very limited knowledge about the unique DND/CF culture and practices. In some cases, military spouses felt that they had a hard time discussing their problems with a MFRC/CCO staff member who could not comprehend the environment in which the military and their families lived.

3-75. There were only very limited indications that any orientation or familiarization sessions, visits or activities were being provided to the Executive Directors and their staffs by their bases/wings. When the Base/Wing Commanders were questioned about this gap, they were very supportive of the idea of providing such opportunities. Some offered to take the MFRC/CCO staff out into the field when exercises were on; provide tours of the base facilities and installations; or even take them up in a helicopter. In fact most base/wings have orientation sessions, but as some Commanders said, it had never occurred to them to include the MFRC/CCO staff ... but they certainly would in the future. They also recommended that the Chair of the Board, or the Executive Director, take the initiative to ensure that appropriate military-related training is provided.

It is recommended that:

--- where staff at a given MFRC/CCO have not had any significant previous exposure to military life, or the roles and functions of DND and the CF, the Base/Wing Commander and the Executive Director should undertake to provide

an appropriate amount of orientation training to ensure that staff can adequately relate to the situations experienced by military members and their families.

3-76. With the major changes and downsizing which the Department of National Defence and the Canadian Forces are currently experiencing, there is a continuing need to ensure that all of our programs are achieving the purposes for which they were developed, and that they are doing so in the most productive and cost-effective manner. This Program Evaluation has identified many aspects of the Military Family Support Program which need to be changed or adjusted. The degree to which these changes have been implemented, and their associated impacts should be re-examined at a later date. There is also the possibility that the current level of funding allocated to the MFSP may not be sufficient for it to achieve its mandate and objectives, and additional or different sources of funds may need to be identified.

It is recommended that:

--- a follow-up Program Evaluation study be conducted at the end of four years (fiscal year 2000/2001) to determine if all the necessary improvements to the MFSP have been undertaken, and to determine the requirements for and extent of continued funding by DND.

PART 4 - FINDINGS, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS REGARDING THE COMMUNITY COORDINATOR ORGANIZATIONS OUTSIDE OF

BACKGROUND

4-1. The Military Family Resource Centres (MFRC) outside Canada began in 1991 as Community Coordinator Organizations (CCO) modelled after a similar program run by the then Department of External Affairs. Conceptually, the CCOs were not to offer the full MFRC program but were to focus on Information & Referral and Welcoming Programs, and employed only part-time staff. Today, the Canadian Forces are dispersed throughout Europe and the United States in small concentrations, and there are MFRCs at: Geilenkirchen and Ramstein, Germany; SHAPE and Brussels, Belgium; Daws Hill, England; and Rome, New York in the United States. A new MFRC is also being considered for CF families in Naples, Italy.

Geilenkirchen, Germany and Brunssum, The Netherlands

4-2. The Canadian contingent consists of a total of 187 Regular Force members: 117 members with the NATO Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS) unit; 57 with the Canadian Forces Support Unit in Europe (CFSU(E)); and 17 with Allied Forces Central Europe (AFCENT). The total Canadian Population in this geographic area is approximately 600 people divided between a NATO base at Geilenkirchen, Germany and one approximately 5 km away in Brunssum, The Netherlands. A significant percentage of these military members are required to deploy four to six months a year. The community also includes 12 Canadian school teachers working at the International School in Brunssum.

4-3. The MFRC has been operating since 1992. It is supported by an Advisory Board of six spouses, four military members and three ex-officios: the Military Representative, the Padre and the Director. There are three full-time staff positions: a Coordinator, an Administrative Assistant/Receptionist and an Information & Referral/Volunteer Coordinator. There is also a part-time Crisis Intervention Counsellor on contract. Funding for staff salaries and training is provided by DMFS, and furnished facilities are provided by CFSU(E). The

MFRC offers a variety of programs including Volunteer Coordination, Moms & Tots, a travel information library, educational workshops, Canadian community, a monthly newsletter, a baby-sitting co-operative, base relocation assistance and crisis counselling.

Ramstein, Germany

4-4. The Canadian contingent at Ramstein has been downsized over the past two years and now consists of 17 Regular Force members of which 14 are part of NATO, two are with CFSU(E) detachment and one is an exchange officer with ITMAC. There are a total of 57 Canadian military and family members there. Ramstein is a US Air Force Base with Canadian, French, British and German NATO representation which offers basic U.S. amenities such as medical, recreational, PX/Commissary, schooling and support programs, etc. in English. The deployment involvement of members is more and more present with 4 to 6 month deployments.

4-5. Because of a sense of cultural difference between Canadians and Americans, a Canadian MFRC program was begun in 1993 to meet local Canadian needs. There is one part-time position (20 hours/week) filled by the Coordinator. The MFRC is supported by an Advisory Board of 4 spouses, 1 military member, 2 ex-officios, one being the military representative and the other the Coordinator. The facilities are provided by CFSU(E) and funding for salaries and staff training is provided by DMFS. In these initial months of the MFRC, emphasis has been put on conducting a needs assessment, Information & Referral and the publication of a newsletter.

SHAPE, Casteau, Belgium

4-6. The Canadian contingent at Supreme Headquarters Allied Powers Europe (SHAPE) has 73 Regular Force members as well as five Canadian school teachers with a total Canadian population of approximately 230. SHAPE is located in Casteau, Belgium, approximately 60 km. south-west of Brussels, where representatives from the NATO countries and 23 “Partners for Peace” nations work together. CF members are in positions where they are under the supervision of other NATO nations. CF members and their families have access to amenities such as CF Medical and Dental Officers, a Canadian dependent school from grades 1-8 with access to an American High School or a Belgian High School, US PX/Commissary facilities, as well as SHAPE Community Services Fund (SCSF) sports facilities and programs.

4-7. The MFRC was established in August, 1993. It is presently supported by an Advisory Board of six spouses, one military member and the Military Representative (a CF member that

is designated by the CO to represent him) who holds an ex-officio status. There is the equivalent of 2.3 staff positions which consist of a full time Administrative Assistant and a Coordinator and Assistant Coordinator each working 35 hours a week. Funding for staff salaries and training is provided by DMFS, and the facilities are provided by the Canadian contingent. The MFRC provides programs such as Information & Referral, a travel library, Welcome Package, and the preparation of a newsletter.

NATO Headquarters, Brussels, Belgium

4-8. The Canadian Contingent in Brussels consists of 29 Regular Force members. With the exception of one CF member attending the Belgian Staff College, the other military members are working in the Canadian Joint College, the other military members are working in the Canadian Joint Delegation, the CFSU(E) Detachment and in NATO Headquarters and Agencies. Twelve of the 29 CF members are under the supervision of other NATO nations. The 90 CF and family members must travel one hour to SHAPE, Casteau, to access amenities such as CF Medical and Dental Officers, US PX/Commissary facilities, and other support programs. Most children of CF members attend International Schools located in Brussels.

4-9. The MFRC was established in 1992. At the time of the evaluation, it was managed by an Advisory Board of four: one spouse; two military members; and the ex-officio Military Representative. Staff salaries and training are provided by DMFS. The MFRC has recently moved from inside the secure area at NATO HQ to an apartment which provides much easier access for the family members. Rent, utilities and furnishings are provided by the Canadian contingent. There is the equivalent of 1.6 staff positions which are divided equally between a Coordinator and an Administrative Assistant. The MFRC offers programs such as Information & Referral, a newsletter, a Welcome Package, and Educational Workshops.

European Remote Staff

4-10. There is a European Remote Staff person who acts as a liaison for CF members and their families that are not concentrated in one of the principal locations. It is a part-time position that is funded by DMFS to provide support primarily through a newsletter. The person is supervised by the military Administration Officer at CFSU(E).

Daws Hill, Great Britain

4-11. There are three Commanding Officers at CDLS(L) who are responsible for the majority of the personnel serving in the UK. In this regard, CDLS(L) acts as CFB(UK) with the exception of those serving in NATO or at CFSU(E) Daws Hill. The 137 CF Regular Force members in Great Britain are in a different situation to those in Belgium and Germany in that they are primarily assigned to schools and exchange postings. They are divided approximately into: 67 members on exchange postings; 29 members are students; 7 are with the British Army on the Rhine; 12 are Liaison Staff at CDLS(London), 11 with NATO HQ - AF NORTHWEST, 4 with NATO HQ - Northwood; 3 with CFILO; and 7 with CFSU(E) (Daws Hill). CF members and their families are dispersed throughout Great Britain with the highest concentration being at Royal Air Force (RAF) Station Daws Hill, which is located approximately 50 km. west of London. Most amenities are obtained from the local community; schooling is provided through local British schools or International schools.

4-12. It is only since June 1996, that a MFRC has been established at RAF Station Daws Hill to serve the approximately 430 member CF community. The objective of the MFRC is to provide an outreach program which networks the Canadian Military families and acts as an information and referral centre, focusing less on providing a physical location which would serve as a drop-in centre. The Advisory Board consists of four spouses, one military member and an ex-officio Military Representative. There is one part-time staff position filled by the Coordinator who works 19.5 hours a week. Funding for this MFRC is provided by CFSU(E) (Daws Hill).

Rome, New York, USA

4-13. The Canadian contingent in Rome, NY is part of the Northeast Air Defence Sector (NEADS) HQ. There are 16 Regular Force military members, primarily Air Weapon Controllers, accompanied by their families. The contingent is located on an American base that was downsized from an US Air Force Base to a National Guard Base. This change precipitated the closing of the majority of support systems that would normally exist such as medical, recreational, housing, PX/Commissary, etc.

4-14. The Canadian MFRC was initiated in February 1996 and became operational in September 1996. It is supported by an Advisory Board of four spouses, one military member and two ex-officio members, one being the Military Representative and the other Coordinator. A part-time Coordinator works 20 hours a week. Funding for the staff's salary and training

is provided by DMFS; the facilities are provided and equipped by the New York National Guard. In this initial year of operation, program emphasis is on Information and Referral, a Welcome package, and publishing a Canadian newsletter.

RATIONALE

4-15. The objective of the Military Family Support Program (MFSP), both inside and outside Canada, is to support the military family and the CF member. The program was created, and still operates, to provide military spouses with a vehicle for direct input into family issues concerning the military community. In the case of military personnel and their families in Europe, perhaps the most important rationale for the existence of MFRCs is the increase in deployed operations, such as Deny Flight, Implementation Force (IFOR) and Stabilizing Force (SFOR) in which CF members frequently participate. Although CF members have always been deployable, until recently, being deployed while serving outside Canada was rare. Examples of this change in operations are: the NATO Airborne Early Warning Force members at Geilenkirchen who are no longer a "flying club", but are now deployed on average 120 days/year; at AFCENT where 25% of the Headquarters is deployed at any one time; some CF member are expected to spend two six month NATO tours in Bosnia, during a three or four year posting; and in one recent case a military member was deployed to Bosnia for six months, a week after his arrival in Great Britain.

4-16. According to some CF members, because Canada is one of the "sending" nations of the Status Of Forces Agreement (SOFA), and has English as one of its official languages, which is, for the most part the operating language of NATO, Canadian Forces members have an increased workload in the ongoing NATO operations. Therefore, even when not deployed, the present NATO work environment is one of very long hours. Added to the increased workload and the increased deployability, is the NATO working environment in which the CF members are supervised by members from another nation, each with their own standards and work ethics. Consequently, the CF member is assessed by another nation which sometimes creates uncertainty with regard to the CF member's evaluation. Similarly, the multi-national

work environment makes it difficult to put in place a Rear Party or support network for the deployed members' families. Some CF Commanding Officers (CO) of the Canadian contingents in Europe, in fact, have requested the creation of MFRCs to assist them in fulfilling their responsibilities towards the family members.

4-17. Some CF military members indicated that it is important to place the MFSP into the global picture of the new organization of the Canadian Forces. With the increased focus on "Force Generation" (which involves the recruitment, training and preparation of the military members) and "Force Employment" (which is the deployment, operations and redeployment back to home unit), the MFRC plays a valuable role both in Force Generation and Force Employment by facilitating support for the military family while the CF member is deployed.

4-18 Back in the "good ol' days of Lahr and Baden" in the 1980's, where most of the CF members and their families were located, numerous Canadian support services existed such as: the Bank of Montreal; CANEX; Canadian medical facilities/hospitals; Padres; Social Workers; and Canadian dependent schools. One did not need to integrate into the local German community to survive. The profile of the Canadian Forces in Europe has changed. The support facilities that were once available at the main bases of Lahr and Baden are now limited in quantity and not available to all communities. Families in Europe are required to be much more self sufficient. Nevertheless, it is felt by many CF members in Europe, that those at NDHQ believe that the "good ol' days" still exist; meaning, that a posting to Europe is a three to four year holiday, and that only limited family support services are required.

4-19. At the time of the evaluation, the National Military Representative (NMR) at SHAPE was in the process of sending out a memo to his military chain-of-command in Europe expressing his support for the MFRCs, and recognising the value of the family in enhancing the operational effectiveness of the CF members.

4-20. In terms of medical support, there are two Medical Officers (MO), one Nursing Officer (NO) and two Dental Officers (DO) to serve the CF members and their families in Europe. There are no longer any CF Social Workers in Europe. One MO and one DO are at SHAPE and the other MO, NO and DO are at Geilenkirchen. They work in the international NATO medical facilities and are required to provide services to all nationalities, not just the CF

members and their families. Even for those posted to SHAPE and Geilenkirchen, it is sometimes difficult to access these CF Medical Officers because of their international commitments. CF members and their families located in Ramstein, and Great Britain are required to seek medical services from an American facility or the local community.

4-21. Many years ago, DND established a process to identify potential problems that concerned CF members, or their families, that were posted outside of Canada. This "screening" process now appears to be relatively ineffective. Military members and their families are posted outside of Canada without them having a true understanding of, not only the challenges that await them, but the limited support available to them. Examples of this are: members whose children require special-needs programs at school being posted to an area where there are none; military members requiring major surgery upon arrival at the foreign posting when the condition was known before leaving Canada; and members requesting to have their postings changed after their house-hunting trip when they became aware of some of the difficulties they would encounter upon living outside Canada.

4-22. Part of the reason for the breakdown in the CF screening process lies in the fact that the onus to identify potential problems, that would screen them out of a posting to Europe, appears to lie on the CF members and their families. Many families are unwilling to do this because of the possible repercussion it may have on the CF member's career. Another weakness is the varied format that the screening takes. Some CF members interviewed stated that they were interviewed over the phone, others, in person without their family members.

4-23. Medical Officers, Commanding Officers and Coordinators, in general, feel there is a very strong requirement for access to a professional Social Worker who could provide support to the Canadian community. Military members identified the Crisis Intervention Program which exists as a core-program in MFRCs within Canada, as a possible solution. It was decided that, as there are no longer any CF Social Workers posted to Europe, the requirement would best be met through contracting a local civilian counterpart. As a result, the MFRC at Geilenkirchen contracted with a part-time Canadian civilian chartered psychologist to provide crisis intervention as well as an adult educator/facilitator to provide preventative programs on topics such as "Culture Shock", Family Violence and Parenting Skills. The psychologist not

only assists the family members, but also provides professional advice to COs when crises occur. The MFRC at Ramstein has made with a local therapist to provide any necessary services.

4-24. Based on the information gathered from the program evaluation, such as the reality of deployment and the limited availability of Canadian social support systems, there appears to be a valid need for MFRCs in Europe, Great Britain and the United States. In fact, the need is probably greater than that inside Canada because, while the CF member is deployed on operations, family members are forced to cope with difficulties in a foreign environment where cultural differences only exacerbate problems. The consequences of poor CF screening procedures only compounds their potential problems.

4-25. It is important that deployed CF members feel that their families are being well taken care of in their absence. This not only allows them to concentrate on the tasks at hand, but reduces the number of repatriations due to family problems. The military member is often the person who deals with the family's payment of bills and banking and other issues related to the administration of living in a foreign country. Living outside Canada offers unique challenges to the Canadian military family. Difficulties frequently arise because of an inability to communicate due to a lack of language skills, discrepancy in housing standards, differences in schooling for the children, contrast in driving habits, and a lack of support networks within the local host community. These challenges are accentuated when the members are deployed. Military families need somewhere, such as a MFRC, to address these needs because there is little other Canadian support network available to them. MFRCs not only provide information and referrals on issues that are difficult to resolve due to being in a foreign country, but equally importantly, the MFRC is a point of contact with Canada, ...with home. Both CF and family members expressed the importance of having a central location where they can speak their own language and be understood, and feel culturally comfortable with their surroundings.

4-26. Stress related to inaccurate expectations of life outside Canada combined with "culture shock" and the military members possible deployment, can accumulate into a crisis for the family. Crisis as defined by The Concise Oxford Dictionary is "...a turning point ... decisive or crucial time". Crisis intervention can take many forms, two of the more common being crisis telephone support lines or face-to-face counselling. The term "crisis intervention" is

relatively vague and therefore could be more clearly defined in order to facilitate its application as a MFRC program. Confidentiality is an essential component to the success of the support provided.

4-27. As illustrated above, the profile of the original Department of External Affairs' model, that was used to establish the CCOs/MFRCs outside of Canada, is now outdated and no longer meets the needs of the CF community. The flexible five-part model of: Information and Referral; Child Care Co-ordination; Volunteer Training & Management; Quality of Life Programming; and Crisis Intervention Counselling, that is used in many of the MFRCs within Canada, provides a more suitable format.

4-28. Evidence also indicated, that there is possibly a greater need for MFRCs in Great Britain and Europe. This is principally due to three main factors: increased deployments associated with the evolving NATO role; the limited family CF support available with the closure of the bases at Baden and Lahr; and the shortage of CF personnel available to handle the problems caused by an ineffective "screening" process for postings outside of Canada. In keeping with these changes, it is important to recognize the significant role the family unit plays in supporting the CF member during deployment, as well as the assistance provided to the families by the MFRCs in the CF members absence. Because of these circumstances, the MFSP deserves to be incorporated into the "Force Generation" concept for the Canadian Forces.

It is recommended that:

--- the MFRCs outside of Canada be continued, and the possibility of the need for greater funding be examined to ensure that services required by the CF members and their families outside of Canada are appropriately met.

MANAGEMENT OF THE PROGRAM

Identity

4-29. The CCOs / MFRCs outside of Canada all use different names, though most incorporated the word "Canadian" into it so as to distinguish them from the other NATO resource centres. Some MFRCs were clearly sign-posted outside the building to make them

easily identifiable while others gave no indication. In one location, the MFRC was located inside the highly secure area of an office building which made it very difficult for spouses and children to access the MFRC.

4-30. Another important issue was the language of the signage; few were bilingual. At one MFRC, there was confusion, by some CF members, over whether both English and French were to be used on the sign since the "working" language of the base was English. All MFRCs, however, did provide services in both English and French.

4-31. It is very important that the MFRC be well identified and easily accessible to all members of the Canadian community. Factors such as available parking and access by public transportation are important. Having MFRCs located near other facilities that are frequented by the Canadian community on a daily basis, such as the Post Office, appears to enhance their use. Location is key in the volume of flow through the MFRC.

4-32. If the MFRC acts more as a remote support network, then access through a type of "1-800" phone number, and/or the Internet, must be made available. Throughout Europe, the use of telephones are expensive. Users pay "per call" no matter the distance between the two parties and the basic rates are much more expensive than in Canada. It is therefore important, that military families have "free-of-charge" access to the MFRC when they are located at a distance.

4-33. Unless the MFRC is well identified and easily accessible by the whole community, especially spouses and children, then the MFRC is not able to fulfil its mission of supporting the CF members and their families.

It is recommended that:

--- all MFRCs outside of Canada be identified as the "Canadian Military Family Resource Centre (CMFRC)" followed by their geographic location, and that they have clear signage in both official languages.

Advisory Board

4-34. Although each of the six MFRCs has an Advisory Board, few have a standardized structure. The membership of the Advisory Board varied from a four-member Board with three of those members being military, to a seven-member Board where attempts were made to reflect local "military family profiles" (example, Francophone/officer/with children or Anglophone/NCM/without children, etc.) to ensure a cross-sectional representation of their community. Some Boards encouraged the participation of CF members and others refused to admit them. The process used to fill the Advisory Board positions also varied. One Board recruited representatives directly from the community, another, selected a nominating committee to run the election of the new Board members through a secret ballot open to the whole community. Regardless of the process, all Advisory Boards found a certain difficulty in filling the positions often because it was not clear to potential Board members what their responsibilities would be.

4-35. The effective functioning of the Advisory Boards also varied. Very few Advisory Board members had been trained in their responsibilities, or in the overall objectives of the MFRC. Some irregularities were: the case of the four member-Board where the Chair was the spouse of one of the military members on the Board; the Coordinator reporting directly to the Military Representative and not the Chair; the Coordinator refusing to take direction from the Advisory Board; and the CO reducing the salary of the Coordinator without discussing it with the Advisory Board. There were instances, nevertheless, where the Advisory Board did functioned well; they gave direction to the Coordinator and remained in close contact with the Commanding Officer.

4-36. The above mentioned discrepancies diminish the effectiveness of the support the MFRC provides to the CO and the Canadian military community and often negated the original philosophy of spousal empowerment. For the MFRCs to operate effectively, there must be a clearer definition of roles and an understanding of the affiliation required to support the CF members and their families. A standardized format for the Advisory Board would be advantageous. It could be comprised of 51% military spouses, with a Chairperson, Secretary, Treasurer, Military Representative (ex-officio), a military member and possibly a representative of the local Canadian civilian community. Board members could be elected for a two year period with half the Board rotating annually. This would enhance program stability.

4-37. Through the SOFA international agreement, the CO is responsible for the administration of the Canadian military and their families while outside of Canada. The MFRCs, therefore, can not be managed by an incorporated Board of Directors as are their Canadian counterparts. The only option is an "Advisory Board to the Commanding Officer". It is, therefore, of utmost importance that both the Board and the CO are fully cognisant of their roles and how they are to interact. The COs outside of Canada have ultimate authority for the CMFRC yet must, in keeping with the original philosophy of the MFSP maintain an "arms-length" approach and allow the management of the CMFRC by the Advisory Board and the staff. The CO's input would be through the Military Representative on the Advisory Board.

4-38. Standardization of the role and structure of the Advisory Board is required in order to eradicate the inconsistencies that presently exist and ultimately to assist in "stabilizing" the MFSP outside of Canada. Training and/or informational briefings are required to increase the Board members, and the CO's, understanding of their respective roles with the CMFRC.

It is recommended that:

--- outside of Canada, the CMFRCs be managed by "Advisory Boards to the Commanding Officer".

--- Advisory Boards function in a standardized manner, and that all Advisory Board members receive appropriate and complete training for their positions within two months of taking office.

Staff

4-39. In keeping with original model for the CCOs /MFRCs outside of Canada, borrowed from the Department of External Affairs, the senior staff person is called a "Community Coordinator". This title is too narrow and no longer represents the broader responsibilities assumed by the position. The title "Director" would better represent the work done by the senior staff person.

4-40. All staff are on a one-year contract signed by the CO and the staff person. However, there is no standardized contract with a Terms of Reference, job description and pay scale that is used by all six CMFRCs. It is not clear how the number of staff hours are determined, but most staff fill part-time positions. There are two CMFRCs where full-time positions are held, one by the

Coordinator and the other by the Administrative Assistant. Additionally, there does not appear to be equal pay for equal responsibilities across the six CMFRCs. This variance in pay created problems when comparisons were made by senior military officers, and staff at different CMFRCs. As the contracts are between the CO and the staff person, difficulties arose when the CO modified the hours of work and/or the salary level of the staff, without discussing it with the Advisory Board or the staff. The justification for the change was that the staff person was married to an officer, and did not require the established salary rate.

4-41. At some CMFRCs, Coordinators assumed the managerial and supervisory role very effectively, while for other CMFRCs the responsibilities of the staff were not always clearly defined. Some Coordinators refused to implement requests made by the Advisory Board, others felt that community outreach programs were not their responsibility. In some CMFRCs the CO was involved in the day-to-day decisions thus taking responsibility from the Advisory Board and creating problems for the staff. The high rate of turn-over of staff positions due to postings, combined with insufficient staff training and little formal hand-over, greatly limits the effectiveness of the Coordinator within CMFRCs.

4-42 CMFRCs are sometimes faced with the difficulty of finding qualified personnel to fill staff positions since military spouses' backgrounds do not always meet the necessary qualifications for CMFRC positions. Opening up CMFRC staff positions to any Canadian who possesses a good knowledge of the local Canadian military community, would increase the pool of potential candidates as well as offer continuity by some incumbents remaining in their positions longer. Therefore, the staffing of the positions must be done with care, and the group from which the selection is being made, should be as large as possible.

4-43. The need to offer bilingual services is another aspect of staffing that needs to be dealt with carefully. It is important that services be available in both official languages, yet this does not necessarily mean that the incumbent, of any specific position, must be fully bilingual. A danger in tying the bilingual requirement to a specific position, say for example that of Coordinator, is that language proficiency may take precedence over other equally, if not more important skills such community development, management and communication. Services must be available in both official languages, yet all staff need not required to be bilingual.

It is recommended that:

--- a significantly improved, standardized and effective method be used in the hiring and training of all staff.

--- the term "Director" be used to identify the senior staff person at the CMFRCs in Europe, Great Britain and the United States.

AWARENESS AND OWNERSHIP

4-44. Surprisingly, a large percentage of military members and spouses interviewed in the Focus Groups had never used the MFRCs in Canada, and equally significant, had never heard of the MFRCs before our visit. Some spouses had lived on bases such as CFB Borden, Gagetown, Winnipeg and in Ottawa and had not used the MFRC even though they had had a requirement for its services at the time. Many spouses were unaware that the program was created, and operates, to provide them with a vehicle for direct input into family issues concerning the military community. Various other reasons given as to why spouses did not participate in the MFRCs are: a) it was perceived to be run for and by officers' wives who did not encourage the participation of NCM's wives; b) there was a certain lack of confidentiality associated with the MFRCs; and c) there existed a rivalry over how much time volunteers contributed compared to the paid staff because paid positions are at a premium due to foreign regulation concerning work-permits. It appears that although military spouses have been empowered and funded by DND, many have not bought into the MFSP or taken ownership of it. There is limited information regarding the goals and objectives of the MFRC other than those found in the Canadian Forces Administration Orders (CFAO) which, in general, are not read by military spouses. Limited, or no marketing has been done directly to the military spouses.

4-45. The Military Family Resource Centres are encouraged to develop programs which are appropriate and desirable for their community. When the Military Family Support Program (MFSP) was approved and endorsed by the Associate Minister of National Defence, Mary Collins, in March 1991, one of the objectives of the MFSP was to delegate to the Canadian military spouses the responsibility of identifying needs in their community and creating programs to

address those needs. In essence, it was a forerunner of "Alternate Service Delivery". This empowerment of the spouse was to occur within the structure created by the Director of Military Family Support (DMFS), under the ADM (Personnel).

4-46. The fact that this empowerment has not fully occurred, indicates that either there is not a need for MFRCs, or they are not marketed properly within the community. As explained in the previous discussion regarding the "Rationale", a need for some form of resource centre does exist for the CF families living outside of Canada. The question, therefore, is how can military spouses who have traditionally **not** been encouraged to participate in the decision making process within DND, be shown the benefits of taking ownership of this program. The challenge is, how we can change D|Ws ("Dependent Wives") into active participants? The potential is tremendous, however, traditional expectations are limiting its exploitation.

It is recommended that:

--- the profile of the Military Family Support Program be drastically improved and properly marketed so as to enhance military spouses' ownership of and commitment to the Program.

THE BROADER CANADIAN COMMUNITY

4-47. The military community outside of Canada not only consists of the CF members and their families, but often includes Canadian civilians who work with the military as Locally Engaged Employees (LEE), Canadian school teachers, DND public civil servants, and NATO civilian employees. These people, although usually few in number, often make a large contribution to the local CMRFCs by volunteering their time, energy and talents.

4-48. Their participation in some CMRFCs has recently become an issue creating an environment of friction and a loss of "sense of community". There has been concern over the potential cost increase to the CMRFC by the provision of services to the Canadian civilians and their family members who form a part of the broader Canadian community.

4-49. The CMFRC provides a sense of national community that is necessary and important while one is living in a foreign country. Even if one integrates totally into the host country community, the CMFRC offers a refuge, through community, to share experiences with fellow Canadians. By expanding the community beyond the CF families, it helps to create an environment more similar to what one would experience in small town Canada. It is, therefore, important to balance the relatively minor additional costs that the CMFRC would incur by providing services to the "broader Canadian community", with the benefits provided by the "extended community". As is done with civilians joining CF Messes as "Associate Members", some financial arrangement can be made between the members of the community and the CMFRC when it is deemed that the increased financial burden has become too great and that DND cannot, or should not, bear the increased expenditures.

It is recommended that:

--- the broader Canadian civilian community outside of Canada be encouraged to participate in the local CMFRC activities. When the CMFRC incurs a discernible additional financial burden because of the participation of the Canadian civilian community, then the civilians that use the CMFRC be charged an appropriate user fee.

FUNDING

4-50. Funding, for all but one CMFRC outside of Canada, has been provided by DMFS. One CMFRC, opening its Centre in the middle of the year, received its funding directly from its Command HQ because it was more expedient. Following a requirements submission by the Advisory Board based on staff hours and not services provided, DMFS provides funding to cover staff salaries and training. The identification of the requirements take various formats as the Advisory Boards each function at different levels of effectiveness.

4-51. Because the CMFRCs outside of Canada are not a legal entity unto themselves, due to the SOFA agreement, and are thus, not incorporated, different arrangements must be made for the allocation of funds. For Europe, after the closing of the bases at Lahr and Baden, the financial and administrative support unit was centralised at CFSU(E) in Geilenkirchen, Germany. CFSU(E),

which falls under the command of the NMR at SHAPE, is providing financial administration for all the CMFRCs in Europe and Great Britain. In the United States, the NEADS CO is presently receiving funding for the CMFRC through CFSU (NORAD), Colorado.

4-52. The NMR in SHAPE and the Commander CDLS (London) are the senior military members ultimately responsible for CF members and their families in continental Europe and Great Britain respectively. Similarly, the unit CO at Headquarters NEADS, in Rome, NY is responsible for the local Canadian military community and its CMFRC. It would seem appropriate that DMFS allocate funding for the CMFRCs outside of Canada directly to these three responsible senior military officers.

4-53. Preparation of an annual Business Plan would be the joint responsibility of the Director, the Chair of the Advisory Board, and the Commanding Officer. The financial requirements and program objectives would be negotiated and agreed upon, within a spirit of the "partnering concept" and co-operation for the good of the whole military community. When preparing and approving a financial forecast, it is important to realise that there is no other source of funding for the CMFRCs, besides DMFS. Fundraising events within the international community, to meet Canadian needs, is difficult and usually frowned upon. When Canadians participate in fundraising activities, it is to support local host country charities (the Terry Fox Run where proceeds raised are donated to the host country cancer association), orphanages and other international children's projects (Chernoble). Another budget consideration is, all staff are employees of the Crown and all facilities are provided by the Crown or another government agency, as is the case in Rome, NY where the NY National Guard assumes the cost for the CMFRC facilities. Consequently, the CMFRCs require no insurance coverage on either the staff or the building. Whether or not volunteers were also covered was not 100% certain at the time of the evaluation and needs to be further clarified.

It is recommended that:

--- DMFS allocate the funds for the respective CMFRC directly to the NMR SHAPE and the Commander CDLS(London) and that they be held responsible for the financial accountability of the CMFRCs in continental Europe and Great Britain respectively, and that they use the already existing organization of CFSU(E) to administer it; and

--- DMFS allocate the funds for the CMFRC directly to the Commanding Officer at Headquarters NEADS, Rome, NY, and that he be held responsible for the financial accountability of the CMFRC in that location.

DMFS RESPONSIBILITIES

4-54. Although DMFS has paid periodic visits to each CMFRC outside of Canada, there appears to be no consistent mechanism for DMFS to evaluate the performance of, and provide feedback on, each of the CMFRCs. Coordinators have not received Staff Assistance Visit Reports delineating the CMFRCs' strengths and weakness and offering alternative approaches. CMFRC are struggling to evaluate their success in relation to European and national standards. The Coordinators and Chairs of the Advisory Boards are also looking for greater direction and training from DMFS in areas that are common to all CMFRCs. Some possible common needs are: templates for such items as the Terms of References for the hiring of staff; training packages for staff and Board members; procedures for writing a Business Plan; and a evaluative procedure that will provide performance feedback to the CMFRC. Particularly felt by the new CMFRCs, was the requirement for greater guidance in the administrative procedures of establishing a CMFRC, to allow for more time and energy to be dedicated to needs analysis, program design and program evaluation.

4-55. The original philosophy of the MFSP was one of empowerment of the military spouse as previously discussed. DMFS interpreted this statement to mean that spouses were to be given the freedom to identify their community needs and to develop a method to meet those needs, and provide only a loose CMFRC structure, general guidelines, and financial support. They very consciously did not provide precise direction on the set up and running of the CMFRCs because they felt it would be in conflict with the philosophy of empowerment. The reality is, that procedures and structure are required in every organization. When employees enter a new position they must either come fully trained, or more commonly, they must be trained to meet the specific needs of that organization. The organization must have established parameters so that its performance can be evaluated. By leaving the structure too vague it creates confusion for the new employee which can negatively effect the program. A military spouse is no different from a military member; when assuming a new position, she needs structure, training and the correct tools to come up to speed.

4-56. DND, through the MFSP, offers military spouses the opportunity to address community needs. DMFS, as Program Manager, must provide an organizational structure that will allow the spouses to better assume the responsibility for the management of the CMFRCs.

It is recommended that:

**--- DMFS establish a specific structure in which the CMFRCs can operate effectively;
and**

--- DMFS evaluate the effectiveness of each CMFRC.

CONFLICT RESOLUTION

4-57. There appears to be no established method or Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) to satisfactorily resolve issues of conflict that arise between either staff and the Advisory Board, or the Advisory Board and CO at the different CMFRCs. At present, the CMFRCs employ an ad hoc method which does not always adequately address personnel concerns. Some example of issues that were raised during the evaluation are: a CO, at the end of a Coordinator's contract, appointed another person to the position without allowing for an open competition; a Coordinator was prevented from seeing the results of a local needs assessment; and, a Military Representative felt responsible for the direct supervision of a Coordinator. A lack of understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the CO, the Chair and the staff, as well as, a lack of established procedures for conflict resolution produced varying degrees of satisfaction in the above mentioned cases.

4-58. It is important for the professional image of the CMFRCs, as well as their effectiveness in the community, that there be an established mechanism (SOPs) to use in the resolution conflict that may arise. It could provide a format by which issues of contention could be raised to different levels for arbitration. Issues that concern the staff could be arbitrated by the Advisory Board; issues that result from differences between the Board and its staff, could be arbitrated by the CO; and, issues that involve the CO and the CMFRC could be arbitrated by DMFS. All parties should be trained in the proper conflict resolution procedures.

4-59. During the evaluation it was found that those CMFRCs that possessed a sense of cooperation and team spirit, functioned well. These CMFRCs were well aware of its importance and attempted to foster it through open communication, respect and professionalism. Personalities and power struggles negatively affected several CMFRCs and, in one location, it became the lightning rod for community dissatisfaction. It is important that a more dynamic sense of cooperation exists within the CMFRCs outside of Canada. The CMFRCs' effectiveness in: addressing the needs of the military family; and supporting the CO depends on the amount of energy put into team-building between the staff, the Chair and the Commanding Officer.

4-60. The lack of a standardized method for addressing conflict has interfered with the successful functioning of several of the CMFRCs evaluated. Those CMFRCs that have cultured a sense of mutual respect and team spirit had not faced these difficulties. That is not to say, that at some point in the future, with a change in personnel, that they too will not require a conflict resolution mechanism.

It is recommended that:

--- an effective, standardized method for addressing conflict relating to CMFRCs be established by DMFS and that all parties be trained in the proper procedures .

NETWORKING SYSTEMS

4-61. Each CMFRC outside of Canada spends considerable energy and time struggling to find answers to the same problems. Common issues are such as: developing programs dealing with adjusting to a foreign country and home sickness; addressing education concerns for children graduating from high schools in Europe and wishing to do further studies in Canada; dealing with personal crisis in the community; developing an effective newsletter; and how to process an out of country medical claim. This latter would initially appear not to be a CMFRC concern, but it has become one because of the frustration and financial burden it has created for the community.

4-62. The networking and sharing of information between CMFRCs is sporadic and on an ad hoc basis. Annual regional conferences provided some exchange but not enough to meet the needs of the Centres. Coordinators are not totally familiar with each others programs and consequently

are not able to offer programs, that relate to common issues, to their own community that have already been shown effective. The limited networking and sharing of information also produces a lack of team-spirit between the Coordinators; each appears to be functioning individually.

4-63. The implication of not having an effective information sharing and networking process is important to the effectiveness of the CMFRC. Sharing of information not only provides solutions but also prevents Centres from wasting time and energy as they "re-invent the wheel". There is a common thread of living outside of one country and all that it entails. Coordinators can become more productive and efficient through building a team identity rather than operating in isolation. Access through the Internet might be one expedient method to address the problem. The existing lack of communication network between CMFRC is counterproductive to the MFSP and must be addressed.

It is recommended that:

--- a system be establish between all of the CMFRCs outside Canada, and also with DMFS, for the sharing of skills, expertise and information.

PART 5 - SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS MILITARY FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAM

RATIONALE FOR THE PROGRAM

5-1. It is recommended that:

--- funding for the Military Family Support Program be continued at its current level of \$12 million for a further 5 year period, and that additional funding be allocated in the future where the need can be justified.

OPIs: VCDS, ADM(Per)

5-2. It is recommended that:

--- the MFRCs outside of Canada be continued, and the possibility of the need for greater funding be examined to ensure that services required by the CF members and their families outside of Canada are appropriately met.

OPIs: VCDS, ADM(Per)

5-3. It is recommended that:

--- the current model whereby the MFRCs are operated at arms-length from DND, with majority control held by military spouses, who can tailor services to fulfil local needs, should be continued, however, it needs to be applied in a manner so that defined minimum services are available consistently and universally both within and outside Canada.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-4. It is recommended that:

--- the confusion regarding the priority between the two major perceptions as to why the MFRCs exist needs to be addressed and resolved. That is, do the MFRCs primarily exist to facilitate the deployment of military members on operations and

exercises, or is their primary function to contribute to the improvement of the quality of life for military members and their families, in view of the unique requirements and challenges to which they are subjected?

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-5. It is recommended that:

--- the complete Canadian Forces Chain of Command, demonstrate tangible and effective support for the MFRCs, and that they acknowledge the MFSP as a valuable contribution towards achieving the mission and objectives of the CF.

OPI: Comd MARCOM, Comd LFC, Comd AIRCOM, DCDS, ADM(DIS), ADM(Fin CS), ADM(Per)

5-6. It is recommended that:

--- all of the Military Family Resource Centres be operated under a common, national model as prescribed by DMFS on behalf of ADM(Per).

OPI: ADM(Per)

ACHIEVEMENT OF THE OBJECTIVES

5-7. It is recommended that:

--- the objectives of the MFSP be refined to be results-oriented and to more adequately reflect that which is reasonably achievable given the limited funding levels available in DND.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-8. It is recommended that:

--- specific performance indicators and an internal quality control process must be implemented to ensure that in the longer term, the stated objectives are in fact being realized.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-9. It is recommended that:

--- a National Advisory Board be established at the NDHQ level, reporting to the ADM(Personnel), consisting of a selection of stakeholders, but especially military spouses, to undertake the required revision and refinement of the objectives of the MFSP so that they reflect the broader views of the military and civilian communities and to provide ongoing direction and advice to the ADM(Personnel) and his staff.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-10. It is recommended that:

--- the profile of the Military Family Support Program be drastically improved and properly marketed so as to enhance military spouses' ownership of and commitment to the Program.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-11. It is recommended that:

--- the size and location of each of the MFRCs and CCOs must be rationalized, and those that are of marginal contribution to achievement of the revised objectives must be closed or merged where appropriate and more cost-effective.

OPI: ADM(Per)

MANAGEMENT OF THE PROGRAM

5-12. It is recommended that:

--- the titles "Military Family Support Program" and "Director Military Family Support" be changed to replace the word "support" with a more appropriate term.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-13. It is recommended that:

--- the title “Military Family Resource Centre” be used consistently, and in bilingual format, across Canada in order to reflect the integrated nature of the MFSP; to eliminate the confusion which exists when military families are posted from base to base; and to provide for a recognizable identity which conforms to Federal Government and DND policies.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-14. It is recommended that:

--- all MFRCs outside of Canada be identified as the “Canadian Military Family Resource Centre (CMFRC)”, followed by their geographic location, and that they have clear signage in both official languages.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-15. It is recommended that:

--- DND should continue to own/lease all the MFRC facilities and equipment at each Base/Wing/Unit and a formal agreement be prepared which specifies the agreed to level of services, utilities, supplies and security which will be provided by the Base/Wing/Unit.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-16. It is recommended that:

--- DMFS should, in conjunction with each Base/Wing Commander, negotiate and approve a formal contract/agreement with an appropriate provincially or federally incorporated not-for profit corporation to operate each MFRC on behalf of DND.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-17. It is recommended that:

--- outside of Canada, the CMRFCs be managed by “Advisory Boards to the Commanding Officer”.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-18. It is recommended that:

--- Advisory Boards function in a standardized manner, and that all Advisory Board members receive appropriate and complete training for their positions within two months of taking office.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-19. It is recommended that:

--- a significantly improved, standardized and effective method be used in the hiring and training of all staff.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-20. It is recommended that:

--- the term “Director” be used to identify the senior staff person at CMFRCs in Europe, Great Britain and the United States.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-21. It is recommended that:

--- efforts be devoted to ensuring that there is in fact a productive, mutually supportive, and professional partnership between each Base/Wing Commander, the Chair of the Board of Directors, and the Executive Director of the MFRC.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-22. It is recommended that:

--- as part of the formal contract/agreement, DND/CF must agree to provide to their MFRC the names of all military members and their spouses, with their local mailing address within 5 days of the member or family arriving on the Base/Wing.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-23. It is recommended that:

--- DND/CF provide to the MFRCs the names of military members deployed on operations, major exercises or long training courses as soon as the information is made public, and certainly within 5 days of their departure.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-24. It is recommended that:

--- DND funding for all the MFRCs be managed centrally by DMFS on behalf of ADM(Per) and distributed as earmarked funds through Command and Group Principal comptrollers directly to the contractor, i.e. the Not-for Profit Corporation.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-25. It is recommended that:

--- DMFS allocate the funds for the respective CMFRC directly to the NMR SHAPE and the Commander CDLS(London) and that they be held responsible for the financial accountability of the CMFRCs in continental Europe and Great Britain respectively, and that they use the already existing organization of CFSU(E) to administer it.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-26. It is recommended that:

--- DMFS allocate the funds for the CMFRC directly to the Commanding Officer at Headquarters NEADS, Rome, NY, and that he be held responsible for the financial accountability of the CMFRC in that location.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-27. It is recommended that:

--- funding for the MFRCs be extended beyond the current year to year basis, possibly with initial funding for a three year period, with an option for two additional years.

OPI: ADM(Per), ADM(Fin) CS

5-28. It is recommended that:

--- MFRCs should be funded on the basis of a combination of the level and nature of services to be provided, and the number of military families being served, as opposed to the current method of providing funds for a specific number of staff positions.

OPI: ADM(Per)

DMFS RESPONSIBILITIES

5-29. It is recommended that:

--- DMFS be tasked with a significantly more active role as the focal point for the management and control of the MFSP, and as the DND/CF arbitrator and authority for all matters concerning the Program.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-30. It is recommended that:

--- an effective, standardized method for addressing conflict relating to MFRCs and CMFRCs be established by DMFS and that all parties be trained in the proper procedures.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-31. It is recommended that:

--- DMFS establish a specific structure in which the CMFRCs can operate effectively.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-32. It is recommended that:

--- in order to adequately manage the MFSP, DMFS staff must collectively have expertise in, or direct access to:

- a) the military spouse's perspectives
- b) military operations, practices, and lifestyle
- c) community development
- d) social services development and delivery
- e) evaluation of social program delivery
- f) contract negotiation and management
- g) financial management
- h) small business management practices

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-33. It is recommended that:

--- DMFS staff should conduct an annual visit to each MFRC/CMFRC to ensure that the terms of the contract/agreement are being adhered to by both DND and the Board; to identify any corrective action required; and to evaluate the effectiveness of each Centre. Such visits must be documented in writing with copies being provided to the Base/Wing Commander, Chair of the Board of Directors, and the Executive Director in a timely manner.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-34. It is recommended that:

--- DMFS should negotiate national standing offers for common services utilized by the MFRCs and CMFRCs, i.e., payroll and financial services, employee benefit packages, liability and professional indemnity insurance, audit services, purchase of supplies, etc., and, where these are more cost effective, MFRCs/CMFRCs should be encouraged to utilize them.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-35. It is recommended that:

--- a mechanism be established whereby the vast knowledge and expertise possessed by the MFRC Executive Directors, their staffs, Board members, DMFS staff, and Base/Wing Commanders can be easily and productively be exchanged and shared in order to collectively gain from the lessons learned by others.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-36. It is recommended that:

--- a system be established between all of the CMFRCs outside Canada, and also with DMFS, for the sharing of skills, expertise and information.

OPI: ADM(Per)

MFRC CORPORATION RESPONSIBILITIES

5-37. It is recommended that:

--- DND “contract” with only Not-for Profit Corporations in Canada which are provincially or federally incorporated which have, as a minimum, 51% of the Board of Directors as military spouses, with the balance made up of members of both the local military and civilian communities.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-38. It is recommended that:

--- the MFRCs and CMFRCs provide regular information reports to both their Base/Wing Commander and DMFS on the activities of their Centre.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-39. It is recommended that:

--- at a minimum, three scheduled meetings be held between the Base/Wing Commander, the Chair of the Board, and the Executive Director each fiscal year to discuss the level and nature of services being provided to families, to assess the level of satisfaction with the services provided, and to facilitate any required changes.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-40. It is recommended that:

--- as part of the formal “contract”, DMFS must be assured that adequate training and development is provided to all Board members of the Not-for-Profit Corporations which DND contracts with to operate the MFRCs.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-41. It is recommended that:

--- a three year Business Plan be prepared and updated annually by each MFRC and CMFRC, in consultation with their Base/Wing Commander and DMFS, which adequately reflects the agreed to funding levels, describes the current and future levels and nature of service which will be provided locally, and the facilities and

equipment requirements which the MFRC/CMFRC would require from the Base/Wing Commander or Commanding Officer.

OPI: ADM(Per)

PROGRAM DELIVERY

5-42. It is recommended that:

--- military families moving across the country and outside of Canada be assured that they will receive at least a common minimum level service from each MFRC and CMFRC that they visit, and that where a given MFRC/CMFRC does not provide a given service in-house, the MFRC/CMFRC will have taken steps to ensure that the family can access the service in the local community.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-43. It is recommended that:

--- DMFS must, in consultation with the Base/Wing Commanders/Commanding Officer and the respective Board, determine what the minimum level and nature of services are that are required for their respective MFRC/CMFRC, and what additional services, tailored to local needs, DND is prepared to pay for where the need exists.

OPI: ADM(Per)

OTHER

5-44. It is recommended that:

--- the Canadian civilian community outside of Canada be encouraged to participate in the local CMFRC activities. When the CMFRC incurs a discernible additional financial burden because of the participation of the Canadian civilian community, then the civilians that use the CMFRC be charged an appropriate user fee.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-45. It is recommended that:

--- where staff at a given MFRC/CMFRC have not had any significant previous exposure to military life, or the roles and functions of DND and the CF, the

Base/Wing Commander and the Executive Director should undertake to provide an appropriate amount of orientation training to ensure that staff can adequately relate to the situations experienced by military members and their families.

OPI: ADM(Per)

5-46. It is recommended that:

--- a follow-up Program Evaluation study be conducted at the end of four years (fiscal year 2000/2001) to determine if all the necessary improvements to the MFSP have been undertaken, and to determine the requirements for and extent of continued funding by DND.

OPI: CRS

ANNEX A EVALUATION DIRECTIVE

**ANNEX A
EVALUATION DIRECTIVE**

1258-112 (CRS)

15 December 1995

Distribution List

PROGRAM EVALUATION E4/95 -
MILITARY FAMILY SUPPORT
PROGRAM

Reference: 2900-94 (CRS) 6 July 1995 –
Chief Review Services Plan 1995/96

1. The Chief Review Services Plan for 1995/96 contains the Program Evaluation Plan as approved by the Chief of the Defence Staff and the Deputy Minister. Included in this plan is a review of the Military Family Support Program. For reference purposes, an extract from the 1995/96 CRS Review Plan is attached as Annex A.

2. A team has been formed to identify the major issues which would be central to a review of this program. To ensure that senior management's concerns are addressed, we will be scheduling interviews with you, and members of your staff to solicit input in order to determine the precise scope and objectives of the review study.

ANNEXE A

1258-112 (CS Ex)

Le 15 décembre 1995

Liste de distribution

ÉVALUATION DE PROGRAMME E4/95–
PROGRAMME DE SOUTIEN AUX
FAMILLES DES MILITAIRES

Référence : 2900-94 (CS Ex) 6 juillet 1995- Plan c
1995-1996 du Chef – Service
d'examen

1. Le Plan du Chef – Service d'examen pour 1996 renferme le Plan d'évaluation de programme par le Chef d'état-major de la Défense et le Sous- On y trouve un examen un Programme de Soutien : familles des militaires. À titre indicatif, un extrait d d'examen du CS Ex pour 1995-1996 se trouve à l' A.

2. On a mis sur pied une équipe qui sera charg d'établir les grandes orientations d'un futur examen programme. Afin de bien prendre en compte les préoccupations de la haute direction, nous tiendron entrevues avec vous-même et votre personnel; les observations recueillies nous permettront de précis portée et les objectifs d'un examen.

3. The Director Social and Economic Analysis (DSEA) at NDHQ is currently conducting a study for LFCHQ regarding family support for personnel deployed on operations. To the maximum extent possible, information and data will be shared by DSEA and DGPE and interviews will be conducted together to prevent duplication.

4. We will be contacting your staff shortly to schedule the interviews. Your assistance and support in arranging these interviews, which are vital to the success of the review is appreciated.

5. The Team Leader is Dr. A. A. Clark, Director, Program Evaluation, who can be reached at (613) 996-4886.

6. The review is scheduled for completion by end of June 1996.

Chef-Service d'examen
Le contre-amiral

K.J. Summers
Rear-Admiral
Chief Review Services

Annex A Extract from Chief
Review Services
Plan 1995/96
(2900-94 (CRS)
6 July 1995)

3. Le Directeur – Analyse socio-économique (DAS) du QGDN étudie actuellement, à l'intention du QC CFI soutien aux familles des militaires affectés aux opérations. Chaque fois que cela sera possible, les renseignements et données seront communiqués par le DASE et le DGEP, des entrevues auront lieu afin d'éviter le double emploi.

4. Nous communiquerons sous peu avec votre personnel pour organiser les entrevues. Nous vous saurions gré de nous assister et de nous appuyer dans cette tâche indispensable au succès de l'examen.

5. Le chef d'équipe est Dr. A. A. Clark, directeur de l'Évaluation du programme, que vous pouvez joindre au (613) 996-4886.

6. Nous prévoyons terminer la phase de l'examen d'ici la fin juin 1996.

Annexe A Extrait du plan du Chef-
Service d'examen pour
1995/1996
(2900-94 (CS Ex)
6 juillet 1995)

DISTRIBUTION LIST

External

Commander, Maritime Command
Commander, Land Forces Command

Commander, Air Command

Internal

VCDS
DCDS
ADM (Per)
DGPE

LISTE DE DISTRIBUTION

Externe

Commandant, Commandement maritime
Commandant, Commandement de la Force
terrestre

Commandant, Commandement aérien

Interne

VCEMD
SCEMD
SMA (Per)
DGEP

ANNEX B LIST OF PERSONS INTERVIEWED

National Defence Headquarters - ADM(Personnel)

MGen R. Dallaire	Chief of Staff
BGen I. Popowych	Director General Personnel Services
LCol J. Jamieson	Director Military Family Support (DMFS)
Maj L. Tyrell	DMFS-2
Ms L. Climie	DMFS-3
Ms D. Demers	DMFS-4
LCol G. Pearson	Project Manager, PSP Plan

CFB Esquimalt

RAdm B. Johnson	Commander MARPAC
Capt(N) S. Verran	Base Commander
LCdr S. Larsen	Executive Director, MFRC
Ms Elizabeth Sparling	Chair, Advisory Board

CFB Calgary

Col R. Romses	Base Commander
LCol R. Williams	Base Admin Officer
Ms S. Biemer	A/Executive Director, MFRC
Ms Mary Saint-Ivany	Chair, Board of Directors

CF Detachment Dundurn

Maj D. Johnson	Detachment Commander
Ms D. Mutch	Executive Director, SDCRC
Ms M. Rocheleau	Chair, Board of Directors

CFB Winnipeg

Col G.E. Sharpe	Wing Commander
Mr D. Brennan	Executive Director, MFRC
Ms C. Mayor	Chair, Board of Directors

CFB Halifax

Capt(N) R. Bowers	Base Commander
Cdr L. Edmunds	Base Admin Officer
LCdr Phil Stow	Director, MFRC
Mr B. Murphy	Asst. Director, MFRC
Ms Keitha Cameron	Chair, Advisory Board

CFB Shearwater

Col M. Aruga	Wing Commander
Ms C. Gotell	Executive Director, MFRC
Ms I. Hildebrandt	Chair, Board of Directors

CFB Greenwood

Col T. Johnson	Wing Commander
Mr F. Illingworth	Executive Director, MFRC
Ms M. McKellar	Chair, Board of Directors
Ms L. Maudsley	Member, Board of Directors

National Capital Region

Capt(N) A.J. Cormier	Commandant, CFSU/O
LCol M. LaPierre	Sr Admin Officer, CFSU/O
Ms L. Gunning	Executive Director, MFRC
Ms C. Woermke	Chair, Board of Directors

CFB Kingston

Col B. Richard	Base Commander
Mr L. Withers	Executive Director, KFRC
CPO B. Mann	Chair, Board of Directors

CFB Trenton

Col M. Dumais	Wing Commander
Ms K. Richie	Executive Director, TMFRC
Capt G. Haggie	President, Board of Directors

CFB Borden

Col I. Nichols	Base Commander
Ms L. Sorel	Executive Director, BMFRC
WO J. MacEachern	President, Board of Directors

MTSC Meaford

LCol M. Zuwerkalow	Commanding Officer
Ms L. Jackson	Executive Director, MSFSC

CFB Petawawa

LCol M. Newman	A/Base Commander
Ms T. Sabourin	Executive Director, PFRC
Ms D. Hamsey	Chair, Board of Directors

Northeast Air Defence Sector HQ (NEADS), Rome, New York, USA

LCol W.P. Motruik	Canadian Contingent Comd Officer
Capt D. Agar	Military Rep. for MFRC
Ms. C. Motriuk	Chair, Advisory Board
Ms. N. Stuckless	Community Coordinator, MFRC

Military Spouses' Focus Group

Ms. L. Dunn
Ms. J. Stakes
Ms. J. Eshaya
Ms. D. Merrill
Ms. K. Hinko
Ms. J. Agar
Ms. S. Richard

Military Members' Focus Group:

Capt G. Dunn
Capt R. Stakes
Capt L. Gibbard
Capt J. Abbot
Capt R. Eshaya
WO T. Stuckless

Geilenkirchen, Germany and AFCENT, The Netherlands

Col B. Abbott	Senior Canadian Officer
Col J. Simpson	Senior Canadian Officer, AFCENT
LCol P. Lamontagne	Commanding Officer, CFSU(E)
LCol T. Johnston	AJAG(E)
LCol D. Bastien	Commanding Officer, CFSU(E), (1993-96)
LCol J.P. Cyr	BAdmO, CFSU(E), (1994-96)
Maj N. Baum	Chief National Liaison Staff, AFCENT
Maj J. Taillefer	Military Rep. for MFRC, CFSU(E)
Maj M. Thompson	Senior Medical Officer
Maj S. Johnstone	Chaplain
Capt --- Villeneuve	Senior Nursing Officer
CWO J.W. Stevenson	Base Chief Warrant Officer
Ms. N. Prystai	Chair, Advisory Board
Ms. B. Grant	Community Coordinator, MFRC
Ms. M. Dick	Crisis Counsellor
Mr. L. Dick	Adult Educator

Military Spouses' Focus Group

Ms. F. Vaudrin
Mr. B. Fougere
Ms. L. Grant Fouffard
Ms. S. R. Lopez
Ms. D. Asselin
Ms. P. Van Boeschoten
Ms. L. Truswell
Ms. P. Walsh
Ms. V. Cooper
Ms. W. Synnott
Ms. E. Synott

Military Youth's Focus Group

Ms. N. Godwin
Mr. L. Whitburn
Mr. D. Theverge
Mr. R. Prystai
Ms. S. Raileau
Ms. A. Brackin
Ms. J. Kirkley
Ms. K. Prystai
Mr. J. Gauthier
Mr. Jon Gauthier

Military Members' Focus Group

Maj R. Alexander
Maj R. Anscomb
Capt L. Bonneville
MWO K. Kirkey
WO R. Gauthier
Sgt G. Marcil-Dallaire
Sgt B. Wood
PO2 P. Mullins

USAF Base Ramstein, Germany

Col A.M. Lee	Senior Canadian Officer
Ms. J. MacKay	Chair, Advisory Board
Ms. M. Lalonde	Community Coordinator, MFRC
Ms. T. March	British HIVE Organiser
Ms. B. Coggan	British Home-Start Consultant

(Focus Groups at Ramstein cancelled due to snowstorm)

SHAPE, Casteau, Belgium

BGen B. Archibald	National Military Representative SHAPE
LCol W. Pierson	Senior Canadian Officer
LCol (Ret'd) J. Caverson	Senior Canadian Officer (1994-96)
Maj C. Georgantopoulos	Canadian Medical Officer
Ms. S. Considine	Chair, Advisory Board
Ms. E. Caverson	Chair, Advisory Board (1993 - 94)
Ms. D. Sabourin	Community Coordinator, MFRC
Ms. L. Parsons	Community Coordinator, MFRC (12/93---?/95)
Ms. G. Villeneuve	Community Coordinator, MFRC (12/93- 04/94)
Ms. M. Mullaie	Assistant Community Coordinator, MFRC
Ms. P. Turner	Assistant Coordinator MFRC (12/94-04/96)
Ms. B. Martin	Assistant Community Coordinator, MFRC (05/96-11/96)
Ms. --- Santerre	Principal, Canadian School
Ms. B. DiBattista	Teacher, Canadian School

Military Spouses' Focus Group

Ms. T. Lessard
Ms. J. McAlea
Ms. P. Heath
Ms. C. Gagne
Ms. L. Parsons
Ms. C. Levesque
Ms. D. Caisse
Ms. D. Rene

Military Youth's Focus Group

Mr. N. Guimond
Ms. D. Morneault
Mr. M. Allard
Ms. L. Geier
Ms. S. Jackson

Military Members' Focus Group

LCol J.A.N. Couturier
LCol J.P. Lefebre
Maj G. Dery
Maj P. Fontaine
Capt C. Dann
MWO J. Lessard
Sgt S.R. Ells
Sgt J.W.D. Lachance
MCpl J.R.M. Gauthier

NATO Brussels, Belgium

LGen P. Addy	Canadian Military Representative
Col Y. Sarrazin	Senior Canadian Officer
LCol E.S. Hill	Member, Advisory Board
LCol P. Denis	Military Rep. for MFRC
Maj K.R.R. Goodall	Treasurer, Advisory Board
Ms. A. M. Goodall	Chair, Advisory Board
Ms. F. Senechal	Community Coordinator, MFRC
Ms. F. Goyotte	Administrative Assistant, MFRC
Ms. I. Dhavernas	Community Coordinator, Canadian Embassy Brussels
Ms. M. van der Horden	Locally Employed Canadian (LEE)
Mr. T. Whiteside	DND civilian with NATO
Dr. M. Tomkin	DND civilian with NATO
Ms. P. Savage	Volunteer in Quality of Life Programs

Military Spouses' Focus Group

Ms. S. Vey
Ms. T. Murray
Ms. N. Cardinal
Ms. W. Dennis
Ms. H. Gervais

Military Members' Focus Group

LCol M.P. Jeffcott
Maj S.J. Murray
MCpl D.J. Scott

Great Britain

Cmdre D. Miller	Commander CDLS(London)
Col P. Tanton	Air Force Advisor
Capt (N) D. Jacobson	Navy Advisor
LCol M. Swan	Assistant Army Advisor
Col M. Morrison	Senior Canadian Officer, NATO HQ AFNORTHWEST
Maj R.A.A. Blair	Officer Commanding, CFSU(E) Det. Daws Hill
WO C. Haynes	Military Rep for MFRC
Ms. H. Lait	Chair, Advisory Board
Ms. C. Craig	Community Coordinator, MFRC
Flight Lt I. Harrison	RAF Rep to the HIVE, High Wycombe
Ms. J. Hunt	HIVE Organiser, High Wycombe

Military Spouses' Focus Group

Ms. S. Briand
Ms. L. Gray
Ms. B. Wall
Ms. A. Dubois
Ms. F. Rispin
Ms. M. Corrigan
Ms. B. Perry
Ms. E. Shaw
Ms. L. Whiteley
Ms. L. Cass
Mr. D. Blair

Military Members' Focus Group

LCol D.L. Craig

LCol G.J. Dubois

LCol B.E. Harding

Maj T.M. Hoffart

Sgt K.M. Rispin

MS. R. Beaucage

MS J.C. Briand

MCpl M.S. Cannon

MCpl S. Michel

AFSOUTH Naples , Italy

LCol J.R. Boucher Canadian Liaison Officer

ANNEX C MILITARY FAMILIES: ARE THEY UNIQUE?

by Mary H. Mitchell

INTRODUCTION

1. What is similar and what is unique about military families? The definition of military family given by the Canadian Forces is “a serving military member and his or her spouse and their children or a single/separated/divorced military member with children.” (CFAO 56-40). A variety of means was employed to study the question: talking with military wives, reviewing research reports and journal articles, reading anecdotal accounts and visiting Military Family Resource Centres at three Canadian Forces Bases and one U.S. Army Base. The focus is on Canadian military families although ideas were gleaned from the American experience which has been documented for a longer time. Of Canada’s Regular Force members today, 71.6% report they are married. Women comprise 10.6% of the Canadian Forces and many of them are single parents, dual service parents or parents married to civilian spouses. Yet most of the literature relates to families in which the father is the military member and the mother is a civilian wife.

SIMILARITIES

2. Military families are similar to civilian families in all the ways that any Canadian family is similar to any other Canadian family. They face the same joys, heartaches, economic pressures and societal changes. Like society in general, the military community has undergone some drastic changes in composition and structure in recent years (Barrette-Mozes, 1994:8). Civilian and military families come in a variety of types and sizes with an increase in single-parent families, blended families and dual income families. They proceed through the same stages in the family life cycle from newlyweds to the empty nest. They are both experiencing the shift from traditional to non-traditional family roles. A growing body of literature from popular self-help books to university research results is available to guide all families. As support from the close extended family has decreased in society, we have witnessed an increase in formal and informal play groups, toy libraries, drop-in centres, family enrichment networks, co-operatives and resource centres, all providing support to families. Civilian employers are beginning to recognize changing attitudes to work and family life and are now focusing on the impact of the employee’s family on performance, productivity, retention, absenteeism and morale (Barrette-Mozes, 1994). MacBride-King states that on one level the situation of military wives is not unique; at the same time their

situation is different by degree (MacBride-King, 1986:207). The same could be said of military families. American research data indicate that Air Force youth are the same as their civilian counter parts in adapting to change (Orthner, 1986).

DIFFERENCES: LIFESTYLE

3. As Linda Gunning of the Military Family Resource Centre, National Capital Region expressed it, “what’s different about military families is a smaller question of what’s different about the military, why can’t we employ members as if they were public servants.” Doctors are on call and police officers wear uniforms but it is difficult to find another occupation which places such all-encompassing demands on members and their families as does the military. More than with civilians, a soldier’s community life appears to be connected to work life (Orthner, 1990:18). It is a lifestyle, a way of life, a culture with its own language rather than a job and, until very recent changes in attitudes, it took precedence over the family. Military wives knew that their husbands were married first to the Armed Forces and secondly to them. Sometimes members are closer to their units than to their families which can create a communication gap between them. In her thesis, *Whose job is it anyway?*, MacBride-King defines the military organization as a “greedy institution” whose boundaries reach out to include the wives of military members. She argues that all women married to men in the Canadian Forces are drawn in or incorporated within those boundaries and that the military holds certain expectations of all wives. The findings of her survey indicate that the military is more greedy with respect to some groups of individuals than others, specifically officers’ wives and wives of combatants (MacBride-King, 1986).

4. Segal states that the Armed Forces are nearly unique in the combination of demands they place on their service members and their families: risk of injury and death, frequent geographic relocation, family separations, long duty hours and shift work, unpredictability of work hours, residence in foreign countries, and sometimes isolation from civilian society (Segal, 1993:3). Even if you don’t move, each new posting is like a new job which does have an impact on the families. Early retirement from the military coincides with the midlife transition stage of life and requires a major readjustment for all family members. The nature of the work itself exposes members to more life and death situations. Military families experience more highs and lows than

most families, both from the death or disability risk factor and from the constant change and continual adjustment required. The variety of lifestyle experiences is exciting, challenging and provides opportunities for personal growth, but is sometimes overwhelming.

DIFFERENCES: FREQUENT GEOGRAPHIC RELOCATION

5. One major component of constant change for military families is frequent geographic moves with all their associated stressors. Military families are much more likely to relocate than are civilian families. In the United States military families move twice as often as their civilian counterparts and are, therefore, especially impacted by relocation issues (Orthner, 1990:13). Relocation has been identified as one of the major stress-inducing events of life, similar in effects to the death of a loved one or to divorce (Orthner, 1990a:12). Frequent relocation usually adversely affects the family financially in the costs associated with the move, damages, need for child care before and after a move, inadequate compensation and loss of a second income. Spouses often have to quit a job and have difficulty obtaining another job or transferring professional credentials from one province to another. There is also discrimination in the job market because of military spouses' transiency even when looking for work on military bases (MacBride-King, 1986)! The wife usually sacrifices her career which makes divorce particularly difficult (Collier, 1994:53). When you can't put down roots, you have to pay more; for example, travel costs and phone calls to distant family relatives.

6. Moving is a big stressor for wives: dealing with movers, insurers, real estate agents, the hassles of changes in banks, mail, personal records. Often the posting notice is not given far enough in advance for special needs such as school registration, and day care waiting lists. The continuity and quality of family medical and dental care may suffer. The quality and consistency of education may vary across the country and there may be some barriers to post-secondary education in moving from province to province. Frequent moves cause a loss of free family leisure time in preparing a house to sell, preparing to move, unpacking and redecorating a new house. Base Housing assumes the wife is at home for inspections and repairs which often take months to complete.

7. It is a well documented research finding that people prefer informal sources of support (Bell, 1996:30). However, because of frequent moves, informal supports for military personnel and their families may have less chance to develop and may, therefore, need more help than in civilian communities. Formal support systems may be more important for military families than for civilian families; they can replace some functions of informal systems where these do not exist or are weak (Orthner, 1990:5). No doubt, frequent moves cause disruption of social support networks for the family and changes in the standard of living. With each move, family members experience some form of culture shock, although it is mitigated somewhat by the built-in support group of other military families and the broader military culture itself (lacking for civilian families who move frequently). Mobile children find it unusually difficult to settle down and commit themselves to a stable way of life (Werkman, 1992).

8. Tarzier and Tribe note the differences between military and civilian moves: civilians can usually turn down a transfer, military cannot; most military moves are across state or national boundaries; military moves require more out-of-pocket expenses than corporate moves; civilians have more opportunity to stabilize in one area; and tour locations for military families are remote, isolated, or in foreign locations more often than for the civilian population (Tarzier).

DIFFERENCES: FAMILY SEPARATION

9. Another major component of constant change for military families is frequent periods of family separation caused by deployments, unaccompanied postings, training and field exercises. Family separations have a negative impact on families' ability to adapt to military life. Six areas of stress affect wives during peace-time separations: 1) physical illness and pregnancy, 2) affective conditions (depression, anger, loneliness, tension/irritability, emotional aspects of sex), 3) marital adjustment, 4) practical aspects of maintaining car and home, 5) having to assume sole responsibility for family life and dual role as mother and father, and 6) making adjustments upon the husband's return. Forty-one percent of families have at least moderate trouble with their children during separations, according to a 1989 survey (Segal, 1993:36).

10. Given the fact that the military member's separation from family may also involve increased risk of death or disability, the separation is doubly stressful. Wives and, to some extent, children become more independent, resourceful and play many roles when the husband/father is away. Then they have to give up some of these new roles when he returns. The husband must

also adjust to the change from field conditions with military buddies to life at home. A navy wife reports that “it takes him about a week to get out of that ‘him-and-the-boys’ thing, and get back into the structure of the family life again.” Another feels that you have to have trust that goes beyond what civilian marriages require (Taylor, 1985:155).

11. Families may experience problems communicating during deployments although modern technology such as the Internet, audio and videotapes may provide an easier channel. Traditionally families were supported during deployments by the regimental system and the rear party but this breaks down when a member is deployed individually without the regiment (as happens in many UN postings). With current downsizing the rear parties may be smaller and less able to support the large number of families in need. The attitude of Base support staff regarding the wife’s need to conduct her husband’s business may be a real hindrance. Several wives experienced hassles in correcting pay and administrative problems during a deployment even when they had planned for it and obtained power of attorney. Added stress occurs with back to back deployments, when a move is necessary during a deployment, when children are under five years of age and when both parents of a dual serving couple are deployed at the same time. Short but frequent separations can be as disruptive to family life as extended separations (Barrette-Mozes, 1994:20).

OTHER DIFFERENCES

12. Military members are easily identifiable; they wear a uniform and often live in segregated housing. Thus they may be a target of prejudices and negative attitudes by local civilians. Recent press coverage of the Somalia issue has not helped the Canadian soldier’s image. Military members are rarely understood by the rest of society which creates a communication gap between civilian and military families. However, Orthner states that “increasingly the barriers between the military post and the off-post community are becoming much more permeable” (Orthner, 1990a:31). The Canadian Forces decision to turn its primary and secondary schools over to local school boards is one example of a convergence of the two worlds.

13. The military environment is characterized by masculine norms which place high value on efficiency, hierarchy, dominance, power and control of emotions, norms which are not always compatible with family life (Segal, 1993:3). Gimbel and Booth report a significant, positive relationship between combat experience and marital adversity which includes divorce, separation for reasons other than divorce, abuse, and infidelity (Gimbel, 1994). Military personnel learn a model of “quick action” and response in combat and have been exposed to war-time experiences, which may lead to behaviours recognized and encountered in both spouse and child abuse (Muller, 1993). Indeed military families report a higher frequency of spousal violence than civilian families (Cronin, 1995). Perhaps the increasing role of peacekeeping and the skills required for it will reinforce more appropriate responses to stressful situations in the home. Review of the literature identified factors that contribute to increased alcohol abuse within the military as compared to the civilian population but numbers of military personnel who engage in heavy drinking have been declining (Devine, 1992:5). A 1985 study found that the amount of unpaid consumer debt was considerably larger for U.S. Army families than for comparable U.S. households (Thoresen, 1985).

14. Adults choose the military lifestyle; children do not. That military children should suffer more problems than their civilian counterparts is to be expected given the number of repeated stressors to which these children are exposed. Yet these stressful factors are effectively counterbalanced. A series of other supports appears to moderate the effects of these stressors on children’s adjustment and adaptation: educational, legal, medical, social and community services. Even in a large metropolitan area, military families who live on post tend to have some of the advantages of a small community, given the cohesive nature and relative geographic insulation of these communities (Werkman, 1992). Statistical comparisons show there are more similarities within military families than within civilian families (Department of Defense, 1984). Many military family members mention the positive aspects of the lifestyle: comradeship, a close sense of community, travel and experience of different cultures, handy and affordable recreation facilities. The military connection adds a bit of spice to life. Some wives actually enjoy the separations: “to be apart keeps us closer together” (Taylor, 1985:174). It does tend to make family members adaptable and resilient with a high tolerance for frustration and a strong sense of self.

15. The partial loss of control of your life brought on by military demands creates a dependency relationship between military families and the Canadian Forces. Wives have been denied adult status (MacBride-King, 1986:211) and, in fact, are still called dependents on some Bases/Wings. The attitude persists that the behaviour of wives will reflect back on their husband's career and is especially disturbing when this perception on the part of wives stops them from seeking assistance. A group of Canadian military wives (OSSOMM) organized in the late 1980s in order to have a voice and to take back some control of their lives. The negative effects of low levels of personal freedom and the interference of military work requirements with family activities are tolerated because of the job security provided by the military career and the desire to stay in long enough to be eligible for retirement benefits. However, the current downsizing environment has meant a loss of job security, and uncertainty regarding continued retirement benefits. So the Canadian Forces must provide alternate sources of commitment to a military career for future service members. Much research demonstrates clearly the importance of family issues in the retention of military personnel (Segal, 1993:16).

(References are included in the Bibliography at the end of the Program Evaluation Report)

ANNEX D U.S. ARMY - FORT DRUM VISIT REPORT

by Mary H. Mitchell

INTRODUCTION

1. As part of the Program Evaluation of the DND Military Family Support Program (MFSP), Dr. Ainslie Clark and Mrs. Mary Mitchell visited Fort Drum near Watertown, New York on 7, 8 May 1996. The purpose of the visit was to gain insight and information on the manner in which the U.S. Army helps and cares for its families in order to better evaluate our family support programs. Mr. David Ciechanowski, Chief Army Community Service (ACS), was an excellent host. He arranged for a bus tour of the installation, meetings with Mr. David Bush, the Deputy Garrison Commander, Colonel Williamson, the Garrison Commander, and briefings by members of various groups: Family Support Groups, Rear Detachment Commanders, ACS staff, Medical Department Activity (MEDDAC), and Army Family Team Building staff.

FORT DRUM

2. The U.S. Army has been using Fort Drum as a training site since 1908. Pine Camp, as it was known, was selected for a major expansion with the outbreak of World War II. In 1951 Pine Camp became Camp Drum and was redesignated Fort Drum in 1974. On 11 September 1984, the Department of the Army announced that Fort Drum would house a new light infantry division which became the 10th Mountain Division (Light Infantry). Today, Fort Drum consists of 107,265 acres, modern infrastructure, brick office buildings and housing for 10,640 soldiers. In addition, 50,000 troops train at Fort Drum each summer. It is the most expensive post in the United States to station a soldier partly because of third party contracts for heat, water, sewage and housing.

3. There was less money when Fort Drum was rebuilt in 1985 so they rely on outside civilian agencies; for example, there is a medical clinic on post (with a staff of 340) but no hospital with overnight beds, and 2000 units of housing in three counties off-post are leased from a contractor who built and maintains them. This is a new concept for the U.S. Army which creates close ties

with the surrounding communities. Even though the installation was entirely rebuilt in the late 1980s, it was on the list for possible closure in 1991. The civilian communities raised \$100,000 to lobby Washington to keep it open.

HISTORY OF U.S. ARMY COMMUNITY SERVICES (ACS)

4. ACS developed in 1965 in response to a crisis with two battalions sent to Vietnam. Many installations were isolated at that time. Changing demographics are a big factor in the growth of ACS. Married soldiers made up only 20% of the Army in the 1960s. In 1971 the U.S. Army changed from a draft to a voluntary army. Soldiers choose the career and of those who stay in today, more than 60% are married. General Wickham, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, declared 1984 the “Year of the Military Family”. He established a Command and produced a White Paper in which families were officially recognized as part of the U.S. Army. “We recruit soldiers and we retain families.” The 1994 publication, Organization of the United States Army, states in its preface, “The Army is soldiers in uniform, civilian employees, and family members.” ACS has its own emblem with the cross, a symbol for help, the gyroscope, a symbol for equilibrium and stability combined with a heart to reflect the program as a living sustaining force in the lives of Army personnel and their families. Its corporate identity is further reinforced with the slogan, “Self-help, Service and Stability.”

ACS PROGRAMS

5. ACS program objectives, criteria, eligibility, resources, and responsibilities of key staff are all outlined in detail in Army Regulation 608-1. To achieve a standard program, ACS program tasks consist of three levels as follows: Level I contains required tasks (includes a standing operating procedure (SOP), command information and education, data collection and training) to be done uniformly by ACS in each community; Level II contains required tasks that also must be done but can be waived if done by a civilian agency or some other military activity (an MOU or other official written documentation must be on file in ACS and updated annually to ensure provision of service); Level III contains tasks considered essential by the local commander based on a needs assessment. No ACS resources will be used on Level III services until Level I and II tasks are met.

6. The ACS program is established to ensure that specific sub-programs, considered essential to the life support of soldiers and their families, are provided. These sub-programs include the following:

- a) Information, Referral, and Follow up
- b) Relocation Assistance
- c) Exceptional Family Member
- d) Foster Care
- e) Financial Counselling and Consumer Affairs
- f) Family Member Employment Assistance
- g) Outreach
- h) Family Advocacy (for family violence).

7. Two ACS staff members also coordinate Army Emergency Relief which is a nonprofit organization incorporated in 1942 to provide interest free loans or grants to soldiers, families and retirees for valid emergencies. The Family Advocacy and Relocation programs were deemed to be so vital that their funding is “fenced”, i.e., direct from the Department of Defense. Other program funds are sent “earmarked” from the Department of the Army to Forces Command to the Garrison Commander. In all ACS programs the emphasis is on prevention and education rather than treatment. Families are referred to other military and civilian agencies for treatment.

INCENTIVES

8. It is interesting to note how the U.S. Army encourages commanders and soldiers to feel that families are an important part of the Defense team. First of all, it is mandated from the top of the organization; the Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army says it’s important. The second main incentive is that the Commander understands the readiness argument. Colonel J. Williamson, the Garrison Commander, stated that: “the mission is degraded if the soldier doesn’t feel the family is supported; taking care of families is a combat multiplier.” All phases of soldier training include family support values; in fact, it is discussed in the recruitment interview. For many leadership courses such as the Pre-Commander’s Course, the spouses are given a parallel course of

instruction. Commanders are evaluated on their family support role. Rear Detachment Commanders must not be single, must stay in the job for a year and are told that family support is their main function.

9. As part of the Soldier Readiness Check (SRC), every single parent or dual service parent soldier must have a detailed executable Family Care Plan within 30 days of the SRC. This ensures that every military member is deployable within 96 hours and that their children will be cared for. If they do not have such a plan, they are subject to, and are discharged from the U.S. Army. As an incentive to get spouses to attend the family support briefings, the soldier is given the next morning off if the spouse attends an evening session. Volunteers anywhere on the installation are given one hour of child care on-base for every hour of volunteer time.

OTHER RELATED PROGRAMS

Mayor Program

10. The Mayor is a volunteer, usually a family member, in each housing area who represents the Garrison Commander. This person is trained to welcome newcomers, organize spring cleanup, social events and neighbourhood watch and play a vital role during deployments. The mayors are coordinated by the ACS Community Life Officer which is not a core program.

Family Support Groups (FSG)

11. Family Support Groups are run by family members for family members and are organized at the company, battalion, and brigade levels. They work closely with the Rear Detachment Commanders, and are supported by the ACS which provides training, advice and assistance. Their only source of funds is fundraising, although the Garrison provides space for an FSG Resource Center with a library, computer and classroom facility.

Army Family Team Building (AFTB)

12. This is a relatively new program (two to three years old) also run by family members for family members. AFTB does have a paid coordinator to lead it but maintains a separate identity with support from ACS. Its motto is: "The Army takes care of its own, by teaching its own to take care of themselves." The focus is on empowering healthy families through a series of courses taught by trained volunteers. All U.S. Army civilian supervisors must take the AFTB courses which are college accredited by the National Education Association. AFTB is run by a decision-

making Board with advice on how to make things happen from an AFTB Council formed by order of the Commander General. Large corporations have asked to model this program for their employees.

Family Symposium

13. A Family Symposium is held every year with a cross section of delegates who identify quality of life issues at Fort Drum and make realistic recommendations. A Symposium Steering Council meets quarterly to address the issues. For the first time ever Forces Command is also having a Family Symposium. It is the middle organization between Fort Drum and the Department of the Army which also holds a Symposium and publishes a Family Action Plan.

CONCLUSIONS

14. The American and Canadian Armies face similar pressures from within and outside the military environment: downsizing, privatization, world politics, changing demographics and new family patterns. Many of the same needs and problems face our family members and, consequently, many of the programs are very similar. The ACS programs do not include child care which is covered by another organization under the same Director.

15. The U.S. Army has recognized the military family as an integral part of the Defense community. Family support values are inculcated in the military society. Terminology reflects the philosophy: family member is used in place of dependent and spouse in place of wife. The ACS has easy access to the names and addresses of family members of soldiers new to the post and soldiers being deployed. Each soldier must complete a family support information form. There appear to be close ties to the local community. One of the Commanding General's goals is to integrate into the local community with the result that Mr. David Ciechanowski, Chief of Army Community Services, works that into his goals and is, in fact, evaluated on his community partnerships.

16. Mr. Ciechanowski feels that with the focus on prevention, different methods of evaluation are needed. If we evaluate or reward on the basis of the numbers coming in the door, do we then drag in the healthy families? Fort Drum examines the impact of ACS programs on soldier performance and soldier readiness. Fewer and fewer families leave to go home with each deployment and there hasn't been a child murder on post since 1992, both signs that preventive

programs are achieving success. Overall service levels are monitored by Department of the Army/Forces Command through quarterly and annual reports and progress reports. Finally, family support programs and services are different across the U.S. Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines due to the different missions, environments and demographics. They seem to operate in isolation from each other with no formal ties between them.

ANNEX E INTERVIEW / DISCUSSION GUIDES

Interview Questions for Visits to Selected MFRCs

Questions for the Base/Wing Commander:

1. How valuable is the MFRC to you as the B/WComd; if it was eliminated, what would be the impact, could you exist without it?
2. How do you ensure that your MFRC is providing a valuable and high quality of service to the military families, what feedback mechanisms do you have?
3. How do you ensure that the MFRC is not duplicating services which are available in the local civilian community?
4. What is the relationship between the MFRC and other social services on base such as the padres, social workers, military police, etc?
5. Given the fact that military members move constantly from base to base, how do you ensure that the type of services your MFRC provides is consistent with that provided by the other 39 MFRCs across the country?
6. Funding of the 39 MFRCs across the country seems to be of major concern. What is your perception of each of the following alternatives:
 - a) funding level for each MFRC identified by DMFS, earmarked in each Cmd's budget allocation, MFRC gets funds locally?
 - b) funds divided 3 ways & given to each Cmd, each BComd allocates \$ locally?
 - c) funding level determined by DMFS, and each MFRC receives \$ directly from DMFS?
7. Does the MFRC prepare a Business Plan covering a three to five year time frame, if yes, what is your involvement with it, if no, should they be preparing one?

8. Briefly, what do you see as the roles & responsibilities of the:
 - a) Executive Director
 - b) Chair of the Board of Directors
 - c) Board of Directors
 - d) Base/Wing Commander
 - e) B/WComd's Representative on the Board?

9. How does your MFRC know who has been posted in or out, or when military members have been deployed and that their families may need help?

10. Some people working at the MFRC may not be familiar with military life. What military-related orientation training is provided to them when they have no previous experience with the military lifestyle?

11. Are you satisfied with the type and amount of training that is provided to members of the Board of Directors?

12. What conflict resolution mechanisms exist to address potential MFRC management and organization problems or issues?

13. Do you have any major concerns or problems regarding your MFRC, or with the MFSP in general? Could you elaborate?

Questions for the Executive Director and Chair of the Board:

Organization

1. How is your MFRC organized, who does what?
2. What are the roles & responsibilities of the:
 - a) Executive Director
 - b) Chair of the Board of Directors
 - c) Board of Directors
 - d) Base/Wing Commander
 - e) Base Admin Officer
 - f) BComd's Representative ?
3. What is the relationship between the MFRC and other social services on base such as the padres, social workers, military police, etc?
4. What linkages are there between the MFRC and the local civilian community? Are professionals from the local community used, i.e., social workers, etc? How are they employed, i.e., on contract, etc., and what are they hired to do?
5. How do you ensure that the MFRC is not duplicating services which the families could obtain in the local civilian community?
6. What is the professional background of the Executive Director, i.e., social worker, business manager, retired military, etc?
7. What is the employment status of the Executive Director, ie., serving military member, federal government employee, other?
8. What is the employment status of the other persons working in the MFRCs?

Information re families/deployments

9. How does the MFRC know who has been posted in or out of the base?
- 10 . How does the MFRC know when military members have been deployed and that their families may need help?
11. When a member is posted to another base, is any information about the family, especially regarding any special needs, transferred to the receiving base, and how is this done?

Consistency of Services

12. Which of the following services do you provide to families in this area?
 - a) Information and Referral
 - b) Quality of Life Enhancement
 - c) Children's Services
 - d) Crisis Intervention
 - e) Volunteer Development
13. What services do you provide that are beyond the core required services?
14. How do you ensure that the type of services your MFRC provides is consistent with that provided by the other 34 MFRCs across the country? If they are different what criteria are used to determine services?

Quality control

15. How are the needs of the military families identified and incorporated into the services provided?
16. How do you determine if what you are currently providing is what the families need?
17. How do you ensure that the MFRC is providing a high quality of service to the families

18. What performance indicators system is in place for the MFRC?
19. Does your MFRC publish an Annual Report, if yes, who receives it?

Funding:

20. Does the MFRC prepare a Business Plan covering a three to five year time frame, if yes, could we obtain a sample copy?
21. Part of the funding for the MFRC comes from NDHQ allotments.
 - a) How much do you receive and how is the amount of funding decided?
 - b) How is the funding given to the MFRC, i.e., is it part of the Base Commander's budget?
 - c) What authority is there at the base level to change (either increase or decrease) the level of funding for the MFRC?
 - d) What limitations are there on what the DND funds can be used for?
 - e) How is the base handling downsizing regarding the funding of MFRCs?
 - f) What would be your perception if the funds were sent directly from NDHQ to the MFRC?
22. What other sources of funds are there for the MFRCs and how important are they?
23. Who performs an audit on the MFRC funds and how frequently is this done?

Other

24. What military-related orientation training is provided to civilians working with the MFRC when they have no previous experience with the military lifestyle?
25. What training is provided to members of the MFRC Board of Directors?
26. What conflict resolution mechanisms exist to address potential MFRC management and organization problems or issues?

27. What major concerns or problems do you have at this MFRC or with the MFSP?
28. What would be the impact on DND/CF and the families if the MFSP was cancelled?
29. Are there any other significant questions which we should have asked you?

ANNEX F THE BRITISH “HIVE” ORGANIZATION

by Deborah Watkins

INTRODUCTION

1. The HIVE is a Help Information Volunteer Exchange organization in the British Ministry of Defense (MOD) which is run by military wives, for military wives. It is organized as an information/advice centre and is the focus for voluntary activities for the community it supports. It was begun in 1984 when attention was drawn to the need to improve the provisions of Welfare Support to families of the British Army, and has subsequently been expanded to all three services stationed in Germany, Cyprus, Gibraltar, Northern Ireland, Hong Kong and the United Kingdom.

THE HIVE ORGANIZATION

2. The HIVE organization champions the essential principle of wives helping wives. It provides a source of welcome for all the new arrivals, a centre for employment and training opportunities and acts as a point of referral linking in with existing professional agencies. It also strives to develop a community spirit through voluntary and social services. Recruitment of volunteers is one of the prime aims of all HIVEs, both to support the Garrison activities and to assist in the running of the HIVE itself. Volunteers learn about the HIVEs under the direction and guidance of the paid HIVE Organizer as well as being encouraged to seek training courses offered by other organizations.

3. The Ministry of Defense partially funds the HIVEs with a limited budget on a yearly basis. The aim of MOD is to pay the honorarium for all Organizers of validated HIVEs, and an additional amount for expenses including those of volunteers. Each HIVE is expected to fundraise to supplement its activities. Although the emphasis is on being independent and non-military, the influence and support of the Garrison Commander and his staff are essential. A close working relationship must be maintained between the HIVE Organizer and the Garrison personnel.

CONCLUSION

4. British and Canadian families face similar pressures while living outside their respective countries. The British HIVE and the Canadian Military Family Resource Centre were both conceived as programs to empower the military spouse, to create programs for spouses run by

spouses. They share a similar ethos. Nevertheless, the cultural difference between Great Britain and Canadian are strong enough to justify the requirement for a Canadian support mechanism for the Canadian military families stationed there. Close cooperation between the two organizations would be an asset to both parties.

ANNEX G DATA COLLECTION SURVEY INSTRUMENT

1258-112 (CRS)

1258-112 (CS Ex)

4 March 1996

Le 4 mars 1996

All MFRC Executive Directors

Tous les directeurs administratifs de
CRFM

SURVEY ON MILITARY FAMILY
SUPPORT PROGRAM

SONDAGE SUR LE PROGRAMME
DE SOUTIEN DES FAMILLES DE
MILITAIRES

Reference: 1258-112 (CRS)

15 December 1995 (attached)

Référence : 1258-112 (CS Ex)

15 décembre 1996 (ci-jointe)

1. As per the enclosed Directive, CRS has been asked to conduct a Program Evaluation of the Military Family Support Program (MFSP). To assist in the evaluation, I would appreciate your taking the time to complete the enclosed questionnaire, and returning it to us by FAX at 613-995-2720.

1. Conformément à la directive ci-jointe, le CS Ex s'est vu confier la tâche d'évaluer le Programme de soutien des familles de militaires (PSFM). Pour ce faire, je vous saurais gré de bien vouloir prendre le temps de remplir le questionnaire ci-joint et de nous le renvoyer par télécopieur au 613-995-2720.

2. Your input will be of great benefit in assessing the MFSP. If you have any questions or concerns with regard to the survey, please contact Mrs. Mary Mitchell at 613-996-0192.

2. Votre participation nous sera précieuse pour évaluer le PSFM. Si vous avez des questions ou des préoccupations concernant ce sondage, n'hésitez pas à communiquer avec M^{me} Mary Mitchell au 613-996-0192.

3. Thank you for your

cooperation. Your reply by
29 March 1996 would be appreciated.

Administrateur,
Évaluation du Programme

(Original signed by:)

Dr. A.A. Clark
Director, Program Evaluation

Enclosures: 2

3. Nous vous prions de bien
vouloir répondre d'ici le **29 mars 1996**
et nous vous en remercions d'avance.

Pièces jointes : 2

DND Military Family Support Program Questionnaire

Please report information for the current fiscal year, 1 April 1995 to 31 March 1996.

I Centre's Identity and Reporting Relationships

1. Official name _____
2. Initials of name (acronym commonly used) _____
3. Number of years the Centre has been providing services _____
4. Date (year) of provincial or federal incorporation _____
5. Responsible command _____ Base _____
6. Does the Centre have a:
Board of Directors ___ an Advisory Board _____ or other (please specify)

7. Number of Board members:
 - a. Total (not counting ex-officio) _____
 - b. Spouses of military members _____
 - c. Military members _____
 - d. Members who are both b and c _____
 - e. Other/Ex-officio _____
8. Number of hours of training provided to each Board member _____
9. Number of scheduled meetings held by the Board _____
10. Number of scheduled meetings held between:
 - a. Chair of Board and Executive Director (ED) _____
 - b. Chair of Board and Base/Wing Commander _____
 - c. Chair of Board and DMFS representative _____
 - d. ED and Base/Wing Commander _____
 - e. ED and Base/Wing Commander's representative _____
 - f. ED and DMFS representative _____
 - g. Chair of Board, ED and Base/Wing Commander _____
 - h. Chair of Board, ED and DMFS representative _____
11. What conflict resolution mechanism(s) exist(s) between (please list):

- a. Chair of Board and ED

- b. Chair of Board and Base/Wing Commander

- c. Base/Wing Commander and ED

- d. Centre staff and ED

II Families Served

- 12. Number of Regular Force military members in the geographic area served by your Centre _____
- 13. Number of military families in the geographic area which could be served by your Centre _____
- 14. Number of military families actively using your Centre _____
- 15. Number of non-military families actively using your Centre _____
- 16. Number of PMQs served by your Centre _____
- 17. Number of families living in PMQs _____
- 18. Number of families living off Base _____
- 19. Ease of access to the names of families being posted in/out (please circle one):

not available					readily available
1	2	3	4	5	
- 20. Ease of access to the names of military members being deployed
(please circle one):

not available					readily available
1	2	3	4	5	
- 21. Date (year) of most recent survey of client needs _____
- 22. How do you ensure that families are served in the language of their choice?

III Resources

23. Professional background of the Executive Director (ED) (i.e., social worker, child care worker, retired military, etc.)

24. Is the ED a (please check one)

- a. Employee of the Board _____
- b. Serving military member _____
- c. Public servant _____
- d. NPF employee _____
- e. Other (specify) _____

25. Number of days of professional development/training taken by the ED _____

26. Dollars spent on professional development/training for the ED (tuition and travel)

27. Total number of hours contributed by volunteers _____

28. Staff assistance visits by DMFS

a. Date of most recent visit by DMFS

b. Which DMFS staff member conducted the visit?

29. Number of full time equivalent (FTE) staff positions (please convert part time positions into FTE)

a. Paid from DMFS funds _____

b. Paid from other funding sources _____

30. Budget for the Centre

a. Total budget for the Centre _____

b. From DMFS: Salaries _____

O&M _____

Prof Dev./Training _____

Other _____

Total _____

c. From all other sources: Total _____

31. Base/Wing Commander's resources

- a. Dollar value provided in infrastructure and utilities _____
 - b. Total square footage of accommodation provided _____
 - c. Number of different buildings occupied _____
32. Annual financial audit(s)
- a. Conducted by _____
 - b. Cost to Centre _____
 - c. Date of most recent _____
33. What are the major concerns or problems for your Centre?

ANNEX H COMPARATIVE DATA FROM MFRC SURVEY

Notes:

1. The information and data in the following tables was provided by the 41 MFRCs and CCOs. In most cases it was the Executive Director who completed the survey form questionnaire. The Program Evaluators have not verified the accuracy of the information provided and take no responsibility for any incorrect information. Draft copies of these tables were provided to the Executive Directors and Community Coordinators on two different occasions for verification and correction purposes.

2. Data for the MFRCs in Canada was provided in March 1996. Data for the CCOs outside of Canada was updated in November 1996.

3. Table 1 was prepared by the Program Evaluators using the data supplied directly by the MFRCs and the CCOs.

TABLE 1

COMPARATIVE DATA: PROGRAM EVALUATION OF MILITARY FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAM

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	TOTAL DMFS DOLLARS PER NO. OF REGULAR FORCE MILITARY MEMBERS IN THE AREA SERVED BY YOUR CENTRE	TOTAL DMFS DOLLARS PER NO. OF MILITARY FAMILIES IN THE AREA	TOTAL DMFS DOLLARS PER NO. OF MILITARY FAMILIES ACTIVELY USING YOUR CENTRE	% OF TOTAL BUDGET FROM DMFS
BRITISH COLUMBIA				
CFS Aldergrove	1019	1473	2725	94
CFB Chilliwack	258	545	818	84
CFB Comox	173	225	900	92
CFB Esquimalt	90	159	322	77
CFS Masset	551	751	1570	70
ALBERTA				
CFB Calgary	133	207	933	47
CFB Cold Lake	66	75	125	44
CFB Edmonton	463	463		88
CFB Suffield	474	522	838	98
CF Det Wainwright	366	332	1219	73

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	TOTAL DMFS DOLLARS PER NO. OF REGULAR FORCE MILITARY MEMBERS IN THE AREA SERVED BY YOUR CENTRE	TOTAL DMFS DOLLARS PER NO. OF MILITARY FAMILIES IN THE AREA	TOTAL DMFS DOLLARS PER NO. OF MILITARY FAMILIES ACTIVELY USING YOUR CENTRE	% OF TOTAL BUDGET FROM DMFS
SASKATCHEWAN				
CF Det Dundurn	2227	330	1392	66
CFB Moose Jaw	300	176	1997	91
MANITOBA				
CFB Shilo	265	284	406	88
CFB Winnipeg	111	204	774	98
ONTARIO				
CFB Borden	323	364	485	50
CFB Kingston	85	159	410	99
CFB North Bay	386	411	1032	94
NDHQ/Ottawa	77	77	174	94
CFB Petawawa	86	86	130	48
CFB Toronto	259		998	91
CFB Trenton	114	227	852	50
MTSC Meaford	617	1602	4112	98

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	TOTAL DMFS DOLLARS PER NO. OF REGULAR FORCE MILITARY MEMBERS IN THE AREA SERVED BY YOUR CENTRE	TOTAL DMFS DOLLARS PER NO. OF MILITARY FAMILIES IN THE AREA	TOTAL DMFS DOLLARS PER NO. OF MILITARY FAMILIES ACTIVELY USING YOUR CENTRE	% OF TOTAL BUDGET FROM DMFS
QUEBEC				
CFB Bagotville	205	200		63
CFB Montreal	242	117	3875	99.7
CFB Valcartier	97	164		96
NEW BRUNSWICK				
CFB Gagetown	87	87	980	99.8
CFB Moncton				
NOVA SCOTIA				
CFS Debert	1110	1110	1537	89
CFB Greenwood	158	299	430	97
CFB Halifax	71	71	114	90
CFB Shearwater	179	155	582	72

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	TOTAL DMFS DOLLARS PER NO. OF REGULAR FORCE MILITARY MEMBERS IN THE AREA SERVED BY YOUR CENTRE	TOTAL DMFS DOLLARS PER NO. OF MILITARY FAMILIES IN THE AREA	TOTAL DMFS DOLLARS PER NO. OF MILITARY FAMILIES ACTIVELY USING YOUR CENTRE	% OF TOTAL BUDGET FROM DMFS
NEWFOUNDLAND				
CFB Gander	452	603	753	99.6
CFB Goose Bay	517	400	618	98
CFS St. John's	571	571	635	97
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES				
Yellowknife	902	1293	2079	95
OUTSIDE OF CANADA				
Brussels, Belgium	3850	3850	3850	100
Geilenkirchen, Germany	575	526	1215	100
Ramstein, Germany	1882	1882	1882	100
SHAPE, Belgium	1130	1130	1461	100
Great Britain	202	202	N/A	100
Rome, New York	1875	1875	1875	100

TABLE 2

COMPARATIVE DATA: PROGRAM EVALUATION OF MILITARY FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAM

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 1 OFFICIAL NAME	Q# 2 INITIALS	Q# 3 YEARS OF SERVICE	Q# 4 DATE OF INCORP.	Q# 5 RESPONSIBLE COMMAND	Q# 5 RESPONSIBLE BASE
BRITISH COLUMBIA						
CFS Aldergrove	Oak Tree Family Resource Centre	OTFRC	3	1993	MARCOM	CFB Chilliwack
CFB Chilliwack	Chimo Family Resource Centre	Chimo FRC	4.5	1991	LFC	CFB Chilliwack
CFB Comox	Comox Military Family Resource Centre	CMFRC	5	1993	AIRCOM	19 Wing Comox
CFB Esquimalt	CFB Esquimalt Military Family Resource Centre	MFRC Esquimalt	6.5	1993	MARCOM	CFB Esquimalt
CFS Masset	Masset Family Resource Centre	MFRC	5	1992	ADM(DIS)	CFS Masset
ALBERTA						
CFB Calgary	CFB Calgary Family Support Society	FSC	6	1991	LFC	CFB Calgary
CFB Cold Lake	Medley Family and Community Services	MFCS	13	1992	AIRCOM	CFB Cold Lake
CFB Edmonton	CFB Military Family Resource Centre	MFRC	6	1990	LFC	CFB Edmonton
CFB Suffield	CFB Suffield Family Resource Centre	FRC	4	1992	LFC	CFB Suffield
CF Det Wainwright	Camp Wainwright Family Resource Centre	FRC	1	1995	LFC	Camp Wainwright

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 1 OFFICIAL NAME	Q# 2 INITIALS	Q# 3 YEARS OF SERVICE	Q# 4 DATE OF INCORP.	Q# 5 RESPONSIBLE COMMAND	Q# 5 RESPONSIBLE BASE
SASKATCHEWAN						
CF Det Dundurn	Saskatoon Dundurn Community Resource Centre	SDCRC	3	1992	AIRCOM	15 Wing Moose Jaw
CFB Moose Jaw	Military Community Resource Centre of Moose Jaw	MCRC	4	1991	AIRCOM	15 Wing Moose Jaw
MANITOBA						
CFB Shilo	Larkhill Family Resource Centre	LFRC	6	1991	LFC	CFB Shilo
CFB Winnipeg	Winnipeg Military Family Resource Centre	MFRC	6	1992	AIRCOM	CFB Winnipeg
ONTARIO						
CFB Borden	Borden Family Resource Centre/Centre de ressources à la famille de Borden	BFRC/CR FB	2.5	1993	CFRETS	CFB Borden
CFB Kingston	Kingston Military Family Resource Centre, Inc./Centre des Ressources pour Familles Militaires de Kingston, Inc.	KMFRC/CRFMK	2	1994	LFC	CFB Kingston
CFB North Bay	CFB North Bay Multi-Service Family Resource Centre	MSFRC	6.5	1992	AIRCOM	CFB North Bay
NDHQ/Ottawa	Military Family Resource Centre of the National Capital Region	MFRC/ NCRCRF M/RCN	4	1992	CFSU(O)	NDHQ

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 1 OFFICIAL NAME	Q# 2 INITIALS	Q# 3 YEARS OF SERVICE	Q# 4 DATE OF INCORP.	Q# 5 RESPONSIBLE COMMAND	Q# 5 RESPONSIBLE BASE
CFB Petawawa	Pemico Family Resource Centre	PFRC	8.5	1992	LFC	CFB Petawawa
CFB Toronto	Toronto Military Family Resource Centre	TMFRC	4	1992	LFC	Support Unit Toronto
CFB Trenton	Canadian Forces Base Trenton Family Resource Centre	FRC	7	1992	AIRCOM	8 Wing Trenton
MTSC Meaford	Meaford Service Family Resource Centre	MSFRC	.75	1995	LFC	MTSC Meaford
QUEBEC						
CFB Bagotville	Centre Multi-Services	CMS	4	1989	AIRCOM	BFC Bagotville
CFB Montréal	Centre de Soutien des Familles Militaires-BFC Montréal	CSFM	4	1992	LFC	BFC Montréal
CFB Valcartier	Centre de la famille Valcartier		5	1991	LFC	CFB Valcartier
NEW BRUNSWICK						
CFB Gagetown	Family Resource Centre for the Military Community	FRC	3.5	1991	LFC	CFB Gagetown
CFB Moncton	Moncton Military Family Resource Centre	MMFRC			LFC	SSE Det Moncton

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 1 OFFICIAL NAME	Q# 2 INITIALS	Q# 3 YEARS OF SERVICE	Q# 4 DATE OF INCORP.	Q# 5 RESPONSIBLE COMMAND	Q# 5 RESPONSIBLE BASE
NOVA SCOTIA						
CFS Debert	Debert Military Community Resource Centre Association	DMCRCA	3	1993	MARCOM	CFB HALIFAX
CFB Greenwood	Greenwood Multi-Service Family Resource Centre	MSFRC	10	1992	AIRCOM	14 Wing Greenwood
CFB Halifax	Military Family Resource Centre/Centre de Ressources pour les Familles des Militaires	MFRC/CR FM	10	N/A	MARCOM	CFB Halifax
CFB Shearwater	Shearwater Community Resource Centre	SCRC	4	1992	AIRCOM	12 Wing
NEWFOUNDLAND						
CFB Gander	CFB Gander Family Resource Centre	FRC	5.5	1992	AIRCOM	CFB/9 Wing Gander
CFB Goose Bay	CFB Goose Bay Family Resource Centre	CFBGB FRC	5	1991	AIRCOM	5 Wing Goose Bay
CFS St. John's	Canadian Forces Station St. John's Family Resource Centre	CFS St. John's Family Resource Centre	3	1993	MARCOM	CFS St. John's
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES						
Yellowknife	Yellowknife Military Family Resource Centre	YKMFRC	3	1993	CFNA	CFNAHQ

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 1 OFFICIAL NAME	Q# 2 INITIALS	Q# 3 YEARS OF SERVICE	Q# 4 DATE OF INCORP.	Q# 5 RESPONSIBLE COMMAND	Q# 5 RESPONSIBLE BASE
OUTSIDE OF CANADA						
Brussels, Belgium	Military Family Resource Centre-Brussels, Belgium/Centre de Ressources des Familles Militaires-Bruxelles	MFRC-B/CRFM-B	5	N/A	DCDS	NATO/HQ, Brussels
Geilenkirchen, Germany	Canadian Contingent Family Resource Services	CCFRS	3	N/A	DCDS	CC-NAEWI, NAB GK
Ramstein, Germany	Ramstein Canadian Family Resource Centre	RCFRC	2.5	N/A	DCDS	Ramstein Air Force Base
SHAPE, Belgium	SHAPE Canadian Resource Centre/Centre de ressource canadien à SHAPE	SCRC/CRCS	4	N/A	DCDS	CFSU(E) Det SHAPE
Great Britain	Military Family Resource Centre - UK	MFRC-UK	1/2	N/A	CDLS/L	CFSU(E) DEI-Daws Hill
Rome, New York	Rome Community Coordinator Organization	RCCO	1/2	N/A	NORAD, Colorado	CANSUP, Rome

TABLE 3

COMPARATIVE DATA: PROGRAM EVALUATION OF MILITARY FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAM

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 6 TYPE OF BOARD	Q# 7a TOTAL NO. OF BOARD MEMBERS	Q# 7b SPOUSES OF MILITARY MEMBERS	Q# 7c MILITARY MEMBERS	Q# 7d BOARD MEMBERS WHO ARE BOTH b AND c	Q# 7e OTHER/EX -OFFICIO	Q# 9 NO. OF SCHEDULED MEETINGS HELD BY THE BOARD
BRITISH COLUMBIA							
CFS Aldergrove	Board of Directors	8	5	3	0	2	11
CFB Chilliwack	Board of Directors	9	7	2	0	4	12
CFB Comox	Board of Directors	7	7	0	0	1	13
CFB Esquimalt	Board of Directors	18	12	5	0	1	11
CFS Masset	Board of Directors	8	2	5	2	1	12
ALBERTA							
CFB Calgary	Board of Directors	11	6	5	2	5	12
CFB Cold Lake	Board of Directors	14	8	6	0	3	12
CFB Edmonton	Board of Directors	11	7	4	1	1	10
CFB Suffield	Board of Directors	7	5	2	0	2	11
CF Det Wainwright	Board of Directors	9	5	4	4	2	15

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 6 TYPE OF BOARD	Q# 7a TOTAL NO. OF BOARD MEMBERS	Q# 7b SPOUSES OF MILITARY MEMBERS	Q# 7c MILITARY MEMBERS	Q# 7d BOARD MEMBERS WHO ARE BOTH b AND c	Q# 7e OTHER/EX-OFFICIO	Q# 9 NO. OF SCHEDULED MEETINGS HELD BY THE BOARD
SASKATCHEWAN							
CF Det Dundurn	Board of Directors	9	5	4	0	2	10
CFB Moose Jaw	Board of Directors	11	7	4	2	2	12
MANITOBA							
CFB Shilo	Board of Directors	9	7	2	0	7	11
CFB Winnipeg	Board of Directors	10	8	2	3	5	12
ONTARIO							
CFB Borden	Board of Directors	12	4	8	6	4	15
CFB Kingston	Board of Directors	12	8	4	0	5	11
CFB North Bay	Board of Directors	11	7	4	4	2	11
NDHQ/Ottawa	Board of Directors	12	9	3	2	2	10
CFB Petawawa	Board of Directors	8	5	3	0	2	16
CFB Toronto	Board of Directors	9	5	3	0	2	10
CFB Trenton	Board of Directors	12	7	5	1	3	10
MTSC Meaford	Board of Directors	10	6	2	2	1	8

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 6 TYPE OF BOARD	Q# 7a TOTAL NO. OF BOARD MEMBERS	Q# 7b SPOUSES OF MILITARY MEMBERS	Q# 7c MILITARY MEMBERS	Q# 7d BOARD MEMBERS WHO ARE BOTH b AND c	Q# 7e OTHER/EX -OFFICIO	Q# 9 NO. OF SCHEDULED MEETINGS HELD BY THE BOARD
QUEBEC							
CFB Bagotville	Board of Directors	7	4	2	0	2	7
CFB Montreal	Board of Directors	9	3	4	1	2	12
CFB Valcartier	Board of Directors	9	9	0	2	0	13
NEW BRUNSWICK							
CFB Gagetown	Board of Directors	11	6	5	1	1	26
CFB Moncton	Steering Committee	10	7	3	1	0	24
NOVA SCOTIA							
CFS Debert	Board of Directors	7	5	2	0	3	6
CFB Greenwood	Board of Directors	6	4	2	2	1	13
CFB Halifax	Advisory Board	15	8	7	0	2	12
CFB Shearwater	Board of Directors	12	7	5	1	6	10

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 6 TYPE OF BOARD	Q# 7a TOTAL NO. OF BOARD MEMBERS	Q# 7b SPOUSES OF MILITARY MEMBERS	Q# 7c MILITARY MEMBERS	Q# 7d BOARD MEMBERS WHO ARE BOTH b AND c	Q# 7e OTHER/EX -OFFICIO	Q# 9 NO. OF SCHEDULED MEETINGS HELD BY THE BOARD
NEWFOUNDLAND							
CFB Gander	Board of Directors	12	9	3	1	2	13
CFB Goose Bay	Board of Directors	10	9	2	1	1	12
CFS St. John's	Board of Directors	12	7	5	0	3	12
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES							
Yellowknife	Board of Directors	7	5	2	0	2	12
OUTSIDE OF CANADA							
Brussels, Belgium	Advisory Board	3	1	2	0	1	11
Geilenkirchen, Germany	Advisory Board	10	6	4	0	2	12
Ramstein, Germany	Advisory Board	4	3	1	0	1	6
SHAPE, Belgium	Advisory Board	7	6	1	0	1	26
Great Britain	Advisory Board	5	4	1	0	2	3
Rome, New York	Advisory Board	5	4	1	0	2	12

TABLE 4

COMPARATIVE DATA: PROGRAM EVALUATION OF MILITARY FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAM

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 10a NO. OF SCHEDULED MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN CHAIR OF THE BOARD AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (ED)	Q# 10b BETWEEN CHAIR AND BASE/ WING COMD	Q# 10c BETWEEN CHAIR AND DMFS REP	Q# 10d BETWEEN ED AND BASE/ WING COMD	Q# 10e BETWEEN ED AND BASE/ WING COMD'S REP	Q# 10f BETWEEN ED AND DMFS REP	Q# 10g BETWEEN CHAIR, ED AND BASE/ WING COMD	Q# 10h BETWEEN CHAIR, ED AND DMFS REP
BRITISH COLUMBIA								
CFS Aldergrove	12	0	1	2	12	1	0	0
CFB Chilliwack	24	0	0	0	52	2	0	0
CFB Comox	52	1	2	1	78	2	2	2
CFB Esquimalt	12	3	2	3	24	4	2	6
CFS Masset	52	12	12	6	52	12	6	6
ALBERTA								
CFB Calgary	36	0	1	1	6	2	0	1
CFB Cold Lake	24	24	2	5	12	2	2	2
CFB Edmonton	10	0	0	2	50	1	0	0
CFB Suffield	52	0	1	12	52	1	0	0

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 10a NO. OF SCHEDULED MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN CHAIR OF THE BOARD AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (ED)	Q# 10b BETWEEN CHAIR AND BASE/ WING COMD	Q# 10c BETWEEN CHAIR AND DMFS REP	Q# 10d BETWEEN ED AND BASE/ WING COMD	Q# 10e BETWEEN ED AND BASE/ WING COMD'S REP	Q# 10f BETWEEN ED AND DMFS REP	Q# 10g BETWEEN CHAIR, ED AND BASE/ WING COMD	Q# 10h BETWEEN CHAIR, ED AND DMFS REP
CF Det Wainwright	40	12	1	20	40	1	10	1

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 10a NO. OF SCHEDULED MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN CHAIR OF THE BOARD AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (ED)	Q# 10b BETWEEN CHAIR AND BASE/ WING COMD	Q# 10c BETWEEN CHAIR AND DMFS REP	Q# 10d BETWEEN ED AND BASE/ WING COMD	Q# 10e BETWEEN ED AND BASE/ WING COMD'S REP	Q# 10f BETWEEN ED AND DMFS REP	Q# 10g BETWEEN CHAIR, ED AND BASE/ WING COMD	Q# 10h BETWEEN CHAIR, ED AND DMFS REP
SASKATCHEWAN								
CF Det Dundurn	12	3	2	3	6	3	2	2
CFB Moose Jaw	10	4	1	0	0	1	0	1
MANITOBA								
CFB Shilo	15	0	1	0	52	1	0	0
CFB Winnipeg	156	1	2	2	20	4	1	3
ONTARIO								
CFB Borden	12	2	0	8	52	1	2	1
CFB Kingston	30	1	1	3	48	2	1	1
CFB North Bay	52	0	0	1	52	0	0	0
NDHQ/Ottawa	12	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
CFB Petawawa	26	0	1	0	6	1	0	0
CFB Toronto	5	1	1	0	5	1	0	1

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 10a NO. OF SCHEDULED MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN CHAIR OF THE BOARD AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (ED)	Q# 10b BETWEEN CHAIR AND BASE/ WING COMD	Q# 10c BETWEEN CHAIR AND DMFS REP	Q# 10d BETWEEN ED AND BASE/ WING COMD	Q# 10e BETWEEN ED AND BASE/ WING COMD'S REP	Q# 10f BETWEEN ED AND DMFS REP	Q# 10g BETWEEN CHAIR, ED AND BASE/ WING COMD	Q# 10h BETWEEN CHAIR, ED AND DMFS REP
CFB Trenton	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	1

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 10a NO. OF SCHEDULED MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN CHAIR OF THE BOARD AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (ED)	Q# 10b BETWEEN CHAIR AND BASE/ WING COMD	Q# 10c BETWEEN CHAIR AND DMFS REP	Q# 10d BETWEEN ED AND BASE/ WING COMD	Q# 10e BETWEEN ED AND BASE/ WING COMD'S REP	Q# 10f BETWEEN ED AND DMFS REP	Q# 10g BETWEEN CHAIR, ED AND BASE/ WING COMD	Q# 10h BETWEEN CHAIR, ED AND DMFS REP
MTSC Meaford	3	1	1	2	3	1	1	1
QUEBEC								
CFB Bagotville	24	2	2	52	52	2	1	2
CFB Montreal	52	0	2	3	3	0	2	0
CFB Valcartier	15	0	1	2	12	1	2	1
NEW BRUNSWICK								
CFB Gagetown	4	0	1	0	8	1	4	0
CFB Moncton	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
NOVA SCOTIA								
CFS Debert	24	2	2	1	52	2	2	2
CFB Greenwood	25	1	3	4	25	3	1	3
CFB Halifax	8	4	1	0	0	2	1	1
CFB Shearwater	24	2	1	4	24	0	1	1

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 10a NO. OF SCHEDULED MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN CHAIR OF THE BOARD AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (ED)	Q# 10b BETWEEN CHAIR AND BASE/ WING COMD	Q# 10c BETWEEN CHAIR AND DMFS REP	Q# 10d BETWEEN ED AND BASE/ WING COMD	Q# 10e BETWEEN ED AND BASE/ WING COMD'S REP	Q# 10f BETWEEN ED AND DMFS REP	Q# 10g BETWEEN CHAIR, ED AND BASE/ WING COMD	Q# 10h BETWEEN CHAIR, ED AND DMFS REP
NEWFOUNDLAND								
CFB Gander	52	2	1	52	52	1	2	1
CFB Goose Bay	12	2	1	2	12	1	1	1
CFS St. John's	24	1	2	0	6	2	0	1
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES								
Yellowknife	16	1	1	3	20	1	1	0
OUTSIDE OF CANADA								
Brussels, Belgium	24	1	1	2	52	2	1	0
Geilenkirchen, Germany	52		1	0	26	2	2	1
Ramstein, Germany	12	1	1	4	1	1	2	1
SHAPE, Belgium	48	4	1	2	5	1	1	1
Great Britain	7	0	0	2	52	0	1	0

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 10a NO. OF SCHEDULED MEETINGS HELD BETWEEN CHAIR OF THE BOARD AND EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR (ED)	Q# 10b BETWEEN CHAIR AND BASE/ WING COMD	Q# 10c BETWEEN CHAIR AND DMFS REP	Q# 10d BETWEEN ED AND BASE/ WING COMD	Q# 10e BETWEEN ED AND BASE/ WING COMD'S REP	Q# 10f BETWEEN ED AND DMFS REP	Q# 10g BETWEEN CHAIR, ED AND BASE/ WING COMD	Q# 10h BETWEEN CHAIR, ED AND DMFS REP
Rome, New York	24	1	1	1	12	1	as needed	as needed

TABLE 5

COMPARATIVE DATA: PROGRAM EVALUATION OF MILITARY FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAM

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 11a CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CHAIR OF BOARD AND ED	Q# 11b CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CHAIR OF BOARD AND BASE/WING COMD	Q# 11c CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN BASE/WING COMD AND ED	Q# 11d CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CENTRE STAFF AND ED
BRITISH COLUMBIA				
CFS Aldergrove	N/A, appropriate policy under development by Board Personnel Committee	N/A	N/A	Grievance procedure with appeal/referral to Board, under review by Board Personnel Committee
CFB Chilliwack	Nothing formal in place	Nothing formal in place	Nothing formal in place	Personnel Committee as a subcommittee reporting directly to the Board of Directors

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 11a CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CHAIR OF BOARD AND ED	Q# 11b CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CHAIR OF BOARD AND BASE/WING COMD	Q# 11c CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN BASE/WING COMD AND ED	Q# 11d CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CENTRE STAFF AND ED
CFB Comox	Discussion, refer to Board	Verbal and written communications	No formal mechanism, ED deals with WAdminO to resolve issues, routine matters are staffed or actioned through WPers	Discussion, refer to subcommittee of Board, refer to Board, with regard to employment issues, staff can go to Minister of Employment (Employment Standards Act)
CFB Esquimalt	BAdmO/BComd arbitration	DMFS arbitration	Through formal meeting	Outside arbitration/investigation as required, arranged via BAdmO
CFS Masset	Regular meetings, information sharing, open communication, support of both roles	Information sharing, regular meetings	Information sharing, regular meetings	Open communication, team work, safe environment to voice concerns, respect for differences in opinions

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 11a CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CHAIR OF BOARD AND ED	Q# 11b CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CHAIR OF BOARD AND BASE/WING COMD	Q# 11c CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN BASE/WING COMD AND ED	Q# 11d CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CENTRE STAFF AND ED
ALBERTA				
CFB Calgary	Formal and informal meetings on a regular basis	A formal meeting would be called if a conflict arose	A formal meeting would be called if a conflict arose	Bi-weekly staff meetings, open door policy otherwise
CFB Cold Lake	Communication is openly flexible and appropriate, identify issue, brainstorm, negotiation, chain of command	Chain of command, discussion, negotiation	Through the Chairperson and/or the Wing Commander's rep - discussion, negotiation	Chain of command, i.e., supervisor to manager, discussion, negotiation, brainstorming, mediation
CFB Edmonton			Open communication and clarification	Openness, clarification of roles precludes conflict
CFB Suffield	Communication is our policy and agreements are reached through this procedure	N/A	N/A	Grievance procedure in personnel policy, however, communication is the best resolution
CF Det Wainwright	Discussion and if not resolved, the Chair rules	Mutual agreement on shared goals and discussion	Discussion and agreement on shared goals for FRC and Base	Integration of goals, after discussion, decision by authority

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 11a CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CHAIR OF BOARD AND ED	Q# 11b CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CHAIR OF BOARD AND BASE/WING COMD	Q# 11c CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN BASE/WING COMD AND ED	Q# 11d CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CENTRE STAFF AND ED
MANITOBA				
CFB Shilo	Personnel Policy Manual	None	None	Personnel Policy Manual Grievance procedure
CFB Winnipeg	DMFS has been used in this capacity, or rather in conducting an investigation of ED. Continuous discussion, face-to-face meeting and sharing of info eliminates issue	OPI has pivotal position as info conduit/mediator - must be excellent communicator	Again, OPI is imperative	Written policy, as well Staff Relations Committee should represent an unbiased body to sort out difficulties not resolved in-house
ONTARIO				
CFB Borden	Approved roles and responsibilities reviewed yearly, clear position descriptions, personnel policies, grievance procedures/update regular contact, open communication, monthly progress report to Board, issues via Human Resource Committee to Board	Clear roles and responsibilities/info to and from Board of Directors via BCommander's Rep to address issues, available upon request following Board approval	Info/updates/issues forwarded via Bcommander's Rep direction following Executive Director recommendations provided by Board of Directors	Clear position descriptions and organizational structure reviewed annually, conflict resolved between parties or direct supervisor or not resolved to ED to HR Committee to independent arbitrator to Board of Directors, collective input process, mechanisms (regular performance reviews/clear personnel policies identifying policies, procedures), regular (2xmonth) team meetings, monthly individual Program

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 11a CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CHAIR OF BOARD AND ED	Q# 11b CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CHAIR OF BOARD AND BASE/WING COMD	Q# 11c CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN BASE/WING COMD AND ED	Q# 11d CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CENTRE STAFF AND ED
				staff/supervisor meetings, open door policy, establishment of ad hoc committees and staff Task Groups to ensure collective input
CFB Kingston	Personnel Committee	None	None	Personnel Policy and Board grievance procedure
CFB North Bay	Open communication, problem identification, attempt win/win solution and Chair will represent Board's point of view	Open communication, respect Wing Commander's view point as final	Open communication, respect Wing Commander's view point as final	Open door policy, open communication, problem identification, attempt win/win solution, final decision stops with ED. For a formal grievance, we follow the grievance procedure as set out in our Personnel Policy
NDHQ/Ottawa	Personnel Committee, DMFS rep, outside facilitator/negotiator	DMFS rep, DMFS, MND	Board Chair, DMFS	Personnel Committee, outside facilitator
CFB Petawawa	Discussion occurs at point of conflict, no issues have ever progressed further	None have occurred	Usually handled through rep, however, no issues have been unresolvable	Grievance procedure outlined in Personnel Policy. All conflicts must be directed first to the individual concerned
CFB Toronto	Personnel Policy	Amiable relationships have always existed, would consult DMFS	Amiable relationships have always existed, would consult DMFS	Personnel Policy
CFB Trenton	Personnel Directives and process, Chair of Human	Wing Commander's rep	Personnel Directives and process	

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 11a CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CHAIR OF BOARD AND ED	Q# 11b CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CHAIR OF BOARD AND BASE/WING COMD	Q# 11c CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN BASE/WING COMD AND ED	Q# 11d CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CENTRE STAFF AND ED
	Resources			

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 11a CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CHAIR OF BOARD AND ED	Q# 11b CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CHAIR OF BOARD AND BASE/WING COMD	Q# 11c CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN BASE/WING COMD AND ED	Q# 11d CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CENTRE STAFF AND ED
MTSC Meaford	Frequent formal/informal sessions that are solution focused, brainstorming, opportunities to mutually share feedback, policy and procedure	Nothing formal in place except for BComd's Rep on Board and a good working relationship	Nothing formal in place, open lines of communication and stated willingness to address concerns/issues	Regular staff meetings and interaction which encourages feedback and mutually constructive brainstorming/solution focused ideas, grievance procedure, policy and procedure
QUEBEC				
CFB Bagotville	Représentant du commandant		Conseil d'administration	Politiques de travail prévues pour le processus de plainte entre le personnel et la directeur(trice)
CFB Montreal	Selon les normes du travail en vigueur au Québec	Quoique le CSFM soit autonome comme organisme, nous reconnaissons l'importance de maintenir de bonnes relations avec tous nos partenaires de la base	Toutes préoccupations à cet égard doit être acheminée au Conseil d'administration	Quoique dans le passé il y ait eu certaines ingérences de la part du CA, nous avons prévu respecter les normes du travail en vigueur au Québec
CFB Valcartier	Oui	Oui	Oui	Oui

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 11a CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CHAIR OF BOARD AND ED	Q# 11b CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CHAIR OF BOARD AND BASE/WING COMD	Q# 11c CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN BASE/WING COMD AND ED	Q# 11d CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CENTRE STAFF AND ED
NEW BRUNSWICK				
CFB Gagetown	Formal policy re chain of command	Chain of command	Chain of command	Chain of command, staff - ED - Board
CFB Moncton				
NOVA SCOTIA				
CFS Debert	As per our personnel policy the ED must attempt to resolve the issue with the Chair directly and if this cannot be achieved it goes to the personnel committee for arbitration and vice versa	Nothing formal or in writing. We assume that basic sound communication skills will prevail. We operate under the understanding of the necessity to maintain professional and cordial relations with our partner in the delivery of this service. Occasionally we will look to DMFS staff to assist us with our negotiations	No real formal relationship here, no line of supervision and therefore no requirement for conflict resolution guidelines. However, if the CO has any concerns with the performance of the ED, the approach would be to have the OPI address the issue with the Board Chair who is the immediate supervisor of the ED, who would in turn take the issue to the Personnel Committee. If the ED felt that there were problems with the CO it would be discussed with the Board Chair and	In accordance with Personnel Policy, the grievance is put to the ED first for resolution with specified time lines. If a resolution is not achievable then the staff can forward the grievance to the Personnel Committee. An arbitration may take place. If the employee still feels that the issue has not been resolved, they may take their case to the Human Rights Commission or the Labour Relations Board

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 11a CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CHAIR OF BOARD AND ED	Q# 11b CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CHAIR OF BOARD AND BASE/WING COMD	Q# 11c CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN BASE/WING COMD AND ED	Q# 11d CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CENTRE STAFF AND ED
			the OPI and, if necessary, mediation might occur	

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 11a CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CHAIR OF BOARD AND ED	Q# 11b CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CHAIR OF BOARD AND BASE/WING COMD	Q# 11c CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN BASE/WING COMD AND ED	Q# 11d CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CENTRE STAFF AND ED
CFB Greenwood	Open door policy	Open door policy	Open door policy	Quarterly personal interviews, weekly staff meetings, open door policy
CFB Halifax	Chair of Board has direct access to BComd in the event of conflict with ED	Chair of Board can consult with Command OPI or DMFS	ED is military and works for Base Commander	Centre staff are military and DND civilians, normal chain of command route is used
CFB Shearwater	No set policy in place, however, our Wing Commander's rep and Board Vice-President would be advised of any conflict should it arise	Role of Wing Commander's rep is to liaise with Wing Commander on behalf of the Board	Wing Commander's rep on Board would be apprised of any conflict that could not be resolved	Personnel Policy allows staff to grieve to Board through Executive Committee

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 11a CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CHAIR OF BOARD AND ED	Q# 11b CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CHAIR OF BOARD AND BASE/WING COMD	Q# 11c CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN BASE/WING COMD AND ED	Q# 11d CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CENTRE STAFF AND ED
NEWFOUNDLAND				
CFB Gander	Board of Directors manual and guidelines and Personnel Policy guidelines (normal conflict resolution similar to civil servants)	Advisory only	Advisory only	Personnel Policy manual details conflict resolution (similar to civil servants)
CFB Goose Bay	Robert's Rules of Order, Grievance policy (attached)	None (rely on our Constitution and By-Laws)	None (rely on our Constitution and By-Laws)	Grievance policy (attached)
CFS St. John's	See attached policy re grievance procedures	No formal conflict resolution mechanisms. In the covered period this has not presented a problem	No formal conflict resolution mechanisms. In the covered period this has not presented a problem	See attached policy re grievance procedures
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES				
Yellowknife	Open communication is the Centre's policy. CFNA is a small military community, therefore all parties listed communicate regularly - no official conflict resolution mechanisms	Open communication is the Centre's policy. CFNA is a small military community, therefore all parties listed communicate regularly - no official conflict resolution mechanisms exist	Open door policy via military OPI	Centre only has 2 employees who work closely together, Personnel Policies exist to deal with grievance issues

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 11a CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CHAIR OF BOARD AND ED	Q# 11b CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CHAIR OF BOARD AND BASE/WING COMD	Q# 11c CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN BASE/WING COMD AND ED	Q# 11d CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CENTRE STAFF AND ED
	exist			

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 11a CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CHAIR OF BOARD AND ED	Q# 11b CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CHAIR OF BOARD AND BASE/WING COMD	Q# 11c CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN BASE/WING COMD AND ED	Q# 11d CONFLICT RESOLUTION MECHANISM BETWEEN CENTRE STAFF AND ED
OUTSIDE OF CANADA				
Brussels, Belgium	None	None	None	None
Geilenkirchen, Germany	Third party consultation	None	None	Third party consultation
Ramstein, Germany	Meeting where issues are discussed and resolved, both present their side of issue, solution is decided by both	Meeting where issues are discussed and resolved, both present their side of issue, solution is decided by both	Meeting where issues are discussed and resolved, both present their side of issue, solution is decided by both	N/A
SHAPE, Belgium	We meet and discuss about the issues	I am welcome and can access his office fairly easily but he has a high authority	None	Staff meetings, immediate discussion, mediation with the Chairperson
Great Britain	discussion, mediation	discussion, mediation	discussion, mediation	discussion, mediation
Rome, New York	none as yet. It is being developed	None	None	N/A

TABLE 6

COMPARATIVE DATA: PROGRAM EVALUATION OF MILITARY FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAM

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 12 NO. OF REGULAR FORCE MILITARY MEMBERS IN THE AREA SERVED BY YOUR CENTRE	Q# 13 NO. OF REGULAR FORCE MILITARY FAMILIES IN THE AREA WHICH COULD BE SERVED	Q# 14 NO. OF REGULAR FORCE MILITARY FAMILIES ACTIVELY USING YOUR CENTRE	Q# 15 NO. OF NON-MILITARY FAMILIES ACTIVELY USING YOUR CENTRE	Q# 16 NO. OF PMQS SERVED BY YOUR CENTRE	Q# 17 NO. OF FAMILIES LIVING IN PMQS	Q# 18 NO. OF FAMILIES LIVING OFF BASE
BRITISH COLUMBIA							
CFS Aldergrove	107	74	40	35	50	42	32
CFB Chilliwack	950	450	300	0	380	350	100
CFB Comox	1300	1000	250	50	300	275	725
CFB Esquimalt	4636	2637	1300	0	700	700	1937
CFS Masset	285	209	100	25	200	200	10
ALBERTA							
CFB Calgary	2800	1800	400	40	998	998	800
CFB Cold Lake	3500	3104	1860	789	1400	1226	371
CFB Edmonton	1200	1200			1200		
CFB Suffield	398	361	225	30	183	183	180
CF Det Wainwright	300	330	90	30	137	137	193

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 12 NO. OF REGULAR FORCE MILITARY MEMBERS IN THE AREA SERVED BY YOUR CENTRE	Q# 13 NO. OF REGULAR FORCE MILITARY FAMILIES IN THE AREA WHICH COULD BE SERVED	Q# 14 NO. OF REGULAR FORCE MILITARY FAMILIES ACTIVELY USING YOUR CENTRE	Q# 15 NO. OF NON-MILITARY FAMILIES ACTIVELY USING YOUR CENTRE	Q# 16 NO. OF PMQS SERVED BY YOUR CENTRE	Q# 17 NO. OF FAMILIES LIVING IN PMQS	Q# 18 NO. OF FAMILIES LIVING OFF BASE
SASKATCHEWAN							
CF Det Dundurn	75	506	120	30	28	28	40
CFB Moose Jaw	1000	1700	150	10	285	285	925
MANITOBA							
CFB Shilo	967	900	630	30	696	655	260
CFB Winnipeg	3500	1900	500	50	571	571	1350
ONTARIO							
CFB Borden	1688	1500	1125	50	1350	1231	130
CFB Kingston	3195	1700	661	6	805	767	933
CFB North Bay	801	754	300	5	477	430	324
NDHQ/Ottawa	6800	6800	3000	15	1488	1440	5000
CFB Petawawa	3800	3800	2500	200	1700	1700	1200
CFB Toronto	704		183	7	296	295	
CFB Trenton	3000	1500	400	20	750	750	750

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 12 NO. OF REGULAR FORCE MILITARY MEMBERS IN THE AREA SERVED BY YOUR CENTRE	Q# 13 NO. OF REGULAR FORCE MILITARY FAMILIES IN THE AREA WHICH COULD BE SERVED	Q# 14 NO. OF REGULAR FORCE MILITARY FAMILIES ACTIVELY USING YOUR CENTRE	Q# 15 NO. OF NON-MILITARY FAMILIES ACTIVELY USING YOUR CENTRE	Q# 16 NO. OF PMQS SERVED BY YOUR CENTRE	Q# 17 NO. OF FAMILIES LIVING IN PMQS	Q# 18 NO. OF FAMILIES LIVING OFF BASE
MTSC Meaford	200	77	30	15	0	0	77

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 12 NO. OF REGULAR FORCE MILITARY MEMBERS IN THE AREA SERVED BY YOUR CENTRE	Q# 13 NO. OF REGULAR FORCE MILITARY FAMILIES IN THE AREA WHICH COULD BE SERVED	Q# 14 NO. OF REGULAR FORCE MILITARY FAMILIES ACTIVELY USING YOUR CENTRE	Q# 15 NO. OF NON-MILITARY FAMILIES ACTIVELY USING YOUR CENTRE	Q# 16 NO. OF PMQS SERVED BY YOUR CENTRE	Q# 17 NO. OF FAMILIES LIVING IN PMQS	Q# 18 NO. OF FAMILIES LIVING OFF BASE
QUEBEC							
CFB Bagotville	1462	1500			370	370	1166
CFB Montreal	2000	4126	125	6	257	257	1743
CFB Valcartier	5000	2975		0	958	18	2017
NEW BRUNSWICK							
CFB Gagetown	3400	3400	300	0	2108	2100	1300
CFB Moncton	170	160			75	75	50
NOVA SCOTIA							
CFS Debert	90	90	65	20	120	65	45
CFB Greenwood	2186	1150	800	20	1145	850	300
CFB Halifax	8000	8000	5000	0	1300	1200	6800
CFB Shearwater	1300	1500	400	10	300	300	700
NEWFOUNDLAND							
CFB Gander	500	375	300	100	225	225	153

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 12 NO. OF REGULAR FORCE MILITARY MEMBERS IN THE AREA SERVED BY YOUR CENTRE	Q# 13 NO. OF REGULAR FORCE MILITARY FAMILIES IN THE AREA WHICH COULD BE SERVED	Q# 14 NO. OF REGULAR FORCE MILITARY FAMILIES ACTIVELY USING YOUR CENTRE	Q# 15 NO. OF NON-MILITARY FAMILIES ACTIVELY USING YOUR CENTRE	Q# 16 NO. OF PMQS SERVED BY YOUR CENTRE	Q# 17 NO. OF FAMILIES LIVING IN PMQS	Q# 18 NO. OF FAMILIES LIVING OFF BASE
CFB Goose Bay	418	541	350	150	741	689	2
CFS St. John's	340	340	306	10	109	109	231
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES							
Yellowknife	106	74	46	3	75	74	0
OUTSIDE OF CANADA							
Brussels, Belgium	29	29	29	11	0	0	29
Geilenkirchen, Germany	226	247	107	13	0	0	247
Ramstein, Germany	17	17	17	2	0	0	17
SHAPE, Belgium	75	75	58	18	0	0	75
Great Britain	123	123	N/A	0	0	0	123
Rome, New York	16	16	16	0	0	0	16

TABLE 7

COMPARATIVE DATA: PROGRAM EVALUATION OF MILITARY FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAM

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 19 EASE OF ACCESS TO NAMES OF FAMILIES BEING POSTED IN/OUT (5 IS READILY AVAILABLE, 1 NOT AVAILABLE)	Q# 20 EASE OF ACCESS TO NAMES OF MILITARY MEMBERS BEING DEPLOYED	Q# 21 DATE OF MOST RECENT SURVEY OF CLIENT NEEDS	Q# 22 HOW DO YOU ENSURE THAT FAMILIES ARE SERVED IN THE LANGUAGE OF THEIR CHOICE?The term, bilingual, is assumed to mean fluent in both English and French
BRITISH COLUMBIA				
CFS Aldergrove	5	5	1995	CFS Aldergrove is an ELU. Bilingual volunteers and Translation Unit Services
CFB Chilliwack	3	4	1995	Three bilingual staff, one coordinator speaks fluent German
CFB Comox	4	4	1995	Bilingual volunteers and liaison with local Francophone Society
CFB Esquimalt	2	3	1995	Second language ability is preferential in hiring staff. Some bilingual capability on staff: Francophone, three functionally bilingual, reference/assistance
CFS Masset	5	5	1995	NA
ALBERTA				
CFB Calgary	3	3	1995	Inform them we have bilingual staff
CFB Cold Lake	4	5	1994	Bilingual staff in each service, many delivered in both languages. Francophone rep on Board of Directors, Francophone volunteers, information in both languages

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 19 EASE OF ACCESS TO NAMES OF FAMILIES BEING POSTED IN/OUT (5 IS READILY AVAILABLE, 1 NOT AVAILABLE)	Q# 20 EASE OF ACCESS TO NAMES OF MILITARY MEMBERS BEING DEPLOYED	Q# 21 DATE OF MOST RECENT SURVEY OF CLIENT NEEDS	Q# 22 HOW DO YOU ENSURE THAT FAMILIES ARE SERVED IN THE LANGUAGE OF THEIR CHOICE?The term, bilingual, is assumed to mean fluent in both English and French
CFB Edmonton	1	1	1996	Bilingual administrative assistant

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 19 EASE OF ACCESS TO NAMES OF FAMILIES BEING POSTED IN/OUT (5 IS READILY AVAILABLE, 1 NOT AVAILABLE)	Q# 20 EASE OF ACCESS TO NAMES OF MILITARY MEMBERS BEING DEPLOYED	Q# 21 DATE OF MOST RECENT SURVEY OF CLIENT NEEDS	Q# 22 HOW DO YOU ENSURE THAT FAMILIES ARE SERVED IN THE LANGUAGE OF THEIR CHOICE?The term, bilingual, is assumed to mean fluent in both English and French
CFB Suffield	5	5	1995	Translators are provided when requested from the families
CF Det Wainwright	5	5	1993	Ask. Volunteers available to converse in French, German, Ukrainian, Norwegian
SASKATCHEWAN				
CF Det Dundurn	3	3	1993/94	We contact any French families, discuss their needs and put a plan of action in place to ensure their needs are met
CFB Moose Jaw	3	3	1993	Form from the Base states their preferred language, bilingual administrative assistant answers the phone in both languages
MANITOBA				
CFB Shilo	4	4.5	1995/96	Two bilingual staff, one English/French, the other English/German
CFB Winnipeg	3	2	1995	Outreach offers services in either official language
ONTARIO				
CFB Borden	3	4	1996	All services, publicity and programs are offered in French and English. 95% of our staff are bilingual, requirement of position. Board composition policy dictates representation from both cultures. Base policy regarding the provision of services in both

<p>MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES</p>	<p>Q# 19 EASE OF ACCESS TO NAMES OF FAMILIES BEING POSTED IN/OUT (5 IS READILY AVAILABLE, 1 NOT AVAILABLE)</p>	<p>Q# 20 EASE OF ACCESS TO NAMES OF MILITARY MEMBERS BEING DEPLOYED</p>	<p>Q# 21 DATE OF MOST RECENT SURVEY OF CLIENT NEEDS</p>	<p>Q# 22 HOW DO YOU ENSURE THAT FAMILIES ARE SERVED IN THE LANGUAGE OF THEIR CHOICE?The term, bilingual, is assumed to mean fluent in both English and French</p>
				<p>official languages</p>

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 19 EASE OF ACCESS TO NAMES OF FAMILIES BEING POSTED IN/OUT (5 IS READILY AVAILABLE, 1 NOT AVAILABLE)	Q# 20 EASE OF ACCESS TO NAMES OF MILITARY MEMBERS BEING DEPLOYED	Q# 21 DATE OF MOST RECENT SURVEY OF CLIENT NEEDS	Q# 22 HOW DO YOU ENSURE THAT FAMILIES ARE SERVED IN THE LANGUAGE OF THEIR CHOICE?The term, bilingual, is assumed to mean fluent in both English and French
CFB Kingston	1	2	1996	Two full time bilingual staff, five staff on French language training (weekly) and one part time bilingual employee. All information in both official languages
CFB North Bay	3	3	1995	Bilingual staff and volunteers
NDHQ/Ottawa	2	2	1993	All information provided in both languages, all programs can be offered in either English or French. Bilingual staff. Francophone crisis worker also does community development
CFB Petawawa	5	4	1994	Trained staff available to meet Anglo and Francophone needs, also utilize volunteer or professional assistance
CFB Toronto	2	2	1995	At least one member of staff speaks French, a Francophone currently sits on the Board, German speaking volunteers, a Francophone group has met for two years
CFB Trenton	4	4	1994	Bilingual staffing
MTSC Meaford	5	5	1995	Bilingual program coordinator, bilingual Board member who is French Director on the Board, accessible resource material in both languages

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 19 EASE OF ACCESS TO NAMES OF FAMILIES BEING POSTED IN/OUT (5 IS READILY AVAILABLE, 1 NOT AVAILABLE)	Q# 20 EASE OF ACCESS TO NAMES OF MILITARY MEMBERS BEING DEPLOYED	Q# 21 DATE OF MOST RECENT SURVEY OF CLIENT NEEDS	Q# 22 HOW DO YOU ENSURE THAT FAMILIES ARE SERVED IN THE LANGUAGE OF THEIR CHOICE?The term, bilingual, is assumed to mean fluent in both English and French
QUEBEC				
CFB Bagotville	3	3	1994	Majorité du personnel bilingue ainsi que la travailleuse sociale pré-maternelle anglophone, halte-garderie et parents-enfants, accueil bilingue
CFB Montreal	4	4	1996	Accueil, info, ressources bilingues. Services offerts soient bilingue ou en français et en anglais
CFB Valcartier	3	4	1993	Embauche personnel bilingue, services bilingues, documentation bilingue. Activités offertes en anglais selon la demande
NEW BRUNSWICK				
CFB Gagetown	2	2	1995	All information created and disseminated by FRC is bilingual. If we are unsure of language preference we ask them in both French and English which they prefer
CFB Moncton	5	5	1996	By ensuring bilingual staff are hired and activities are scheduled in both official languages

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 19 EASE OF ACCESS TO NAMES OF FAMILIES BEING POSTED IN/OUT (5 IS READILY AVAILABLE, 1 NOT AVAILABLE)	Q# 20 EASE OF ACCESS TO NAMES OF MILITARY MEMBERS BEING DEPLOYED	Q# 21 DATE OF MOST RECENT SURVEY OF CLIENT NEEDS	Q# 22 HOW DO YOU ENSURE THAT FAMILIES ARE SERVED IN THE LANGUAGE OF THEIR CHOICE?The term, bilingual, is assumed to mean fluent in both English and French
NOVA SCOTIA				
CFS Debert	5	5	1995	No access to translation services but we attempt to acquire French versions of resource materials, also attempt to have a Francophone on the Board
CFB Greenwood	3	3	1995	Bilingual staff and volunteers
CFB Halifax	2	2	1993/94	Active offer of service in both languages in telephone responses, PR material, briefings. Two designated bilingual staff positions, active participation on Board
CFB Shearwater	3	3	1994	Three staff positions are designated bilingual
NEWFOUNDLAND				
CFB Gander	5	5	1996	Gander is an ELU, however, one of our two front line persons is bilingual
CFB Goose Bay	2	4	1995	Administrative assistant/receptionist is the first line of contact at the Centre and must be bilingual. Translation of all services is available
CFS St. John's	5	4	1995	Very small Francophone population. Several of our volunteers are bilingual and, where necessary, these families translate

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 19 EASE OF ACCESS TO NAMES OF FAMILIES BEING POSTED IN/OUT (5 IS READILY AVAILABLE, 1 NOT AVAILABLE)	Q# 20 EASE OF ACCESS TO NAMES OF MILITARY MEMBERS BEING DEPLOYED	Q# 21 DATE OF MOST RECENT SURVEY OF CLIENT NEEDS	Q# 22 HOW DO YOU ENSURE THAT FAMILIES ARE SERVED IN THE LANGUAGE OF THEIR CHOICE?The term, bilingual, is assumed to mean fluent in both English and French
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES				
Yellowknife	5	4	1995	Bilingual staff and/or volunteers
OUTSIDE OF CANADA				
Brussels, Belgium	5	N/A	1995	Provide services in both languages as our population is half and half. Bilingual Staff
Geilenkirchen, Germany	5	5	1995	Provide bilingual services
Ramstein, Germany	5	5	1995	At present no French speaking families, always someone available to speak French if requested
SHAPE, Belgium	4	2	1996	The staff is bilingual. We publish in the language submitted and translate various booklets and bulletins
Great Britain	5	5	1996	Newsletter published in both official languages. Bilingual volunteers work in office.
Rome, New York	5	N/A	1996	The staff is bilingual as well as as one Advisory Board member.

TABLE 8

COMPARATIVE DATA: PROGRAM EVALUATION OF MILITARY FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAM

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 23 PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND OF THE ED	Q# 24 EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF THE ED	Q# 25 NO. OF DAYS OF PROF. DEV./ TRAINING TAKEN BY ED	Q# 26 DOLLARS SPENT ON PROF.DEV. / TRAINING FOR ED	Q# 8 NO. OF HOURS OF TRAINING FOR EACH BOARD MEMBER	Q# 27 NO. OF HOURS BY VOLUNTEERS
BRITISH COLUMBIA						
CFS Aldergrove	Retired military	Employee of the Board	8	250	2	723
CFB Chilliwack	Social worker	Employee of the Board	1	50	0	6500
CFB Comox	Retired military	Employee of the Board	8	1050	8	600
CFB Esquimalt	Unknown	Employee of the Board	5	1200	10	4000
CFS Masset	Teacher	Employee of the Board	10	1550		2000
ALBERTA						
CFB Calgary	Social worker	Employee of the Board	12	800	9	3000
CFB Cold Lake	Business administration	NPF employee	10	500	20	4000
CFB Edmonton	Retired CF social worker	Employee of the Board	5		0	3400
CFB Suffield	Social worker (BA)	Employee of the Board	10	1000	5	825
CF Det Wainwright	Administration	Employee of the Board	3	1185	20	1800

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 23 PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND OF THE ED	Q# 24 EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF THE ED	Q# 25 NO. OF DAYS OF PROF. DEV./ TRAINING TAKEN BY ED	Q# 26 DOLLARS SPENT ON PROF.DEV. / TRAINING FOR ED	Q# 8 NO. OF HOURS OF TRAINING FOR EACH BOARD MEMBER	Q# 27 NO. OF HOURS BY VOLUNTEERS
SASKATCHEWAN						
CF Det Dundurn	Early childhood education	Employee of the Board	5	1007	6	1039
CFB Moose Jaw	Administration	Employee of the Board	7	963	0	1200
MANITOBA						
CFB Shilo	Recreation administration	Employee of the Board	15	1000	17	4455
CFB Winnipeg	Retired military Pers Adm	Employee of the Board	25	1000	7	1812
ONTARIO						
CFB Borden	Early childhood education	Employee of the Board	8	990	30	3500
CFB Kingston	Chaplain	Employee of the Board	3	249	12	3632
CFB North Bay	Education	Employee of the Board	14	1140	12	1045
NDHQ/Ottawa	Community development	Employee of the Board	8	500	6	3000
CFB Petawawa	Child care worker	Public service employee	10	1500	2	3500
CFB Toronto	Social worker	Employee of the Board	10	1324	6	371

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 23 PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND OF THE ED	Q# 24 EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF THE ED	Q# 25 NO. OF DAYS OF PROF. DEV./ TRAINING TAKEN BY ED	Q# 26 DOLLARS SPENT ON PROF.DEV. / TRAINING FOR ED	Q# 8 NO. OF HOURS OF TRAINING FOR EACH BOARD MEMBER	Q# 27 NO. OF HOURS BY VOLUNTEERS
CFB Trenton	Child care worker	Employee of the Board	7	350	0	2000
MTSC Meaford	Social worker	Employee of the Board	8	250	0	60
QUEBEC						
CFB Bagotville	Agent dev. regional sciences sociales	Employee du Conseil	22		5	
CFB Montreal	Psychologue	Employee du Conseil	11	790	15	1424.5
CFB Valcartier	Gestion de ressources communautaires et communication	Employee du Conseil	12	3000	20	11580
NEW BRUNSWICK						
CFB Gagetown	Finance	Employee of the Board	12	350	12	1600
CFB Moncton	In process of hiring	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	80
NOVA SCOTIA						
CFS Debert	Recreation administration	Employee of the Board	15	960	12	1750
CFB Greenwood	Retired military	Employee of the Board	28	1118	16	2124
CFB Halifax	Military	Serving military member	8		0	
CFB Shearwater	Social worker	Employee of the Board	23	3500	9	4400

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 23 PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND OF THE ED	Q# 24 EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF THE ED	Q# 25 NO. OF DAYS OF PROF. DEV./ TRAINING TAKEN BY ED	Q# 26 DOLLARS SPENT ON PROF.DEV. / TRAINING FOR ED	Q# 8 NO. OF HOURS OF TRAINING FOR EACH BOARD MEMBER	Q# 27 NO. OF HOURS BY VOLUNTEERS
NEWFOUNDLAND						
CFB Gander	Retired military	Employee of the Board	12	800	8	5700
CFB Goose Bay	Nursing	Employee of the Board	10	0	4	1625
CFS St. John's	Social worker (MSW)	Employee of the Board	8	500	3	1800
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES						
Yellowknife	Social worker	Employee of the Board	9	900	16	800
OUTSIDE OF CANADA						
Brussels, Belgium	Business administration	Contract with CO	0	0	0	
Geilenkirchen, Germany	Business administration, ESL educator	Contract with CO	4	225	8	110/month
Ramstein, Germany	Teacher/Counsellor	Contract with CO	3	685	3	20/month
SHAPE, Belgium	Business/Human Relations	Contract with CO	10	2000	0	60/month
Great Britain	BA(Education)	Contract with CFSU(E)	5	2600	0	61
Rome, New York	Economics, Retired military	Contract with CO	4	105	5	200/month

TABLE 9

COMPARATIVE DATA: PROGRAM EVALUATION OF MILITARY FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAM

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 30a TOTAL BUDGET FOR THE CENTRES\$	Q# 30b FROM DMFS - SALARIES\$	Q# 30b FROM DMFS - O&M\$	Q# 30b FROM DMFS - PROF. DEV./ TRAINING \$	Q# 30b FROM DMFS - OTHERS\$	Q# 30b FROM DMFS - TOTAL\$	Q# 30c FROM ALL OTHER SOURCES\$
BRITISH COLUMBIA							
CFS Aldergrove	116,150	102,857	4,848	920	375	109,000	7,150
CFB Chilliwack	290,400	219,000	20,980	1,500	3,920	245,400	45,000
CFB Comox	243,635	206,400	12,000	4,100	2,500	225,000	186,345
CFB Esquimalt	541,833	359,300	52,200	7,000	0	418,500	123,333
CFS Masset	157,000	127,000	14,500	4,000	11,500	157,000	47,300
ALBERTA							
CFB Calgary	800,000	349,000	16,000	8,000	0	373,000	427,000
CFB Cold Lake	525,920	220,000	9,000	3,000	0	232,000	293,920
CFB Edmonton	633,000	523,000	26,000	6,000	0	555,000	78,000
CFB Suffield	191,475	170,500	11,000	3,475	3,500	188,475	3,000
CF Det Wainwright	150,900	93,400	6,000	2,060	8,240	109,700	41,200
SASKATCHEWAN							
CF Det Dundurn	252,951	157,859	6,000	3,202	0	167,061	85,890

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 30a TOTAL BUDGET FOR THE CENTRES\$	Q# 30b FROM DMFS - SALARIES\$	Q# 30b FROM DMFS - O&M\$	Q# 30b FROM DMFS - PROF. DEV./ TRAINING \$	Q# 30b FROM DMFS - OTHER\$	Q# 30b FROM DMFS - TOTAL\$	Q# 30c FROM ALL OTHER SOURCES\$
CFB Moose Jaw	329,500	272,500	12,000	6,800	8,200	299,500	30,000

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 30a TOTAL BUDGET FOR THE CENTRES\$	Q# 30b FROM DMFS - SALARIES\$	Q# 30b FROM DMFS - O&M\$	Q# 30b FROM DMFS - PROF. DEV./ TRAINING \$	Q# 30b FROM DMFS - OTHER\$	Q# 30b FROM DMFS - TOTAL\$	Q# 30c FROM ALL OTHER SOURCES\$
MANITOBA							
CFB Shilo	292,000	236,000	14,000	6,000	0	256,000	36,000
CFB Winnipeg	393,784	342,737	37,300	6,747	0	386,784	7,000
ONTARIO							
CFB Borden	1,100,000	471,000	49,000	11,000	15,000	546,000	554,000
CFB Kingston	287,798	246,930	18,792	5,278	0	271,000	3,531
CFB North Bay	329,841	292,272	12,000	5,228	0	309,500	20,341
NDHQ/Ottawa	548,103	461,000	22,000	9,025	29,000	521,025	27,078
CFB Petawawa	680,863	303,788	16,000	6,076	0	325,863	355,000
CFB Toronto	200,193	171,400	8,000	3,242	0	182,642	17,551
CFB Trenton	680,250	290,000	20,000	5,750	25,000	340,750	339,500
MTSC Meaford	123,400	116,050	5,000	2,321	0	123,371	2,025
QUEBEC							
CFB Bagotville	482,400	248,000	37,000	6,400	14,000	299,400	177,000
CFB Montreal	580,000	448,538	26,000	9,794	0	484,332	4,303
CFB Valcartier	506,000	440,000	37,000	10,000	0	487,000	19,000

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 30a TOTAL BUDGET FOR THE CENTRES\$	Q# 30b FROM DMFS - SALARIES\$	Q# 30b FROM DMFS - O&M\$	Q# 30b FROM DMFS - PROF. DEV./ TRAINING \$	Q# 30b FROM DMFS - OTHER\$	Q# 30b FROM DMFS - TOTAL\$	Q# 30c FROM ALL OTHER SOURCES\$
NEW BRUNSWICK							
CFB Gagetown	296,500	273,200	14,000	6,800	0	294,000	2,500
CFB Moncton							
NOVA SCOTIA							
CFS Debert	112,211	89,690	8,408	1,773	0	99,871	12,340
CFB Greenwood	354,240	294,400	14,000	6,400	29,440	344,240	10,000
CFB Halifax	820,000	500,000	70,000	0	0	570,000	80,000
CFB Shearwater	319,147	218,601	10,000	4,198	0	232,800	88,000
NEWFOUNDLAND							
CFB Gander	230,400	203,614	12,000	4,072	6,314	226,000	4,400
CFB Goose Bay	216,205	196,707	15,400	4,098	0	216,205	4,500
CFS St. John's	200,770	169,973	10,000	3,175	11,013	194,161	6,608
Yellowknife	100,650	89,700	4,000	1,950	0	95,650	5,000

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 30a TOTAL BUDGET FOR THE CENTRES\$	Q# 30b FROM DMFS - SALARIES\$	Q# 30b FROM DMFS - O&M\$	Q# 30b FROM DMFS - PROF. DEV./ TRAINING \$	Q# 30b FROM DMFS - OTHER\$	Q# 30b FROM DMFS - TOTAL\$	Q# 30c FROM ALL OTHER SOURCES\$
OUTSIDE OF CANADA							
Brussels, Belgium	111,660	109,500	5,000	2,125	0	111,660	0
Geilenkirchen, Germany	130,000	125,000	5,000	3,125	0	130,000	0
Ramstein, Germany	32,000	25,000	5,000	0	2,000	32,000	0
SHAPE, Belgium	84,788	77,968	5,000	1,820	0	84,788	0
Great Britain	24,883	24,276	0	506	0	24,883	0
Rome, New York	30,000	23,475	5,000	525	1,000	30,000	0

TABLE 10

COMPARATIVE DATA: PROGRAM EVALUATION OF MILITARY FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAM

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 28a DATE OF MOST RECENT STAFF ASSISTANCE VISIT BY DMFS	Q# 28b DMFS STAFF MEMBER WHO CONDUCTED THE VISIT	Q# 29a NO. OF FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STAFF POSITIONS FROM DMFS FUNDS	Q# 29b NO. OF FTE STAFF POSITIONS FROM OTHER FUNDING SOURCES	Q# 31a DOLLAR VALUE PROVIDED BY BASE/WING COMD	Q# 31b TOTAL SQUARE FOOTAGE OF ACCOMMODATION PROVIDED	Q# 31c NO. OF DIFFERENT BUILDINGS OCCUPIED
BRITISH COLUMBIA							
CFS Aldergrove	1994	DMFS2	2.9	0	39,780	1197	2
CFB Chilliwack	Nov 1995	LCol Jamieson	10	9			2
CFB Comox	Oct 1995	Maj Tyrrell	5.8	14	300,000	5886	2
CFB Esquimalt	Dec 1995	LCol Jamieson	11	8.5	413,240	16,463	4
CFS Masset	1992	Maj Tyrrell	3.5	6	4,500	2500	3
ALBERTA							
CFB Calgary	Feb 1996	Leslie Climie	8	5			4
CFB Cold Lake	Feb 1996	Leslie Climie	6	30		7800	4
CFB Edmonton	Dec 1995	Leslie Climie	10	0			4
CFB Suffield	Feb 1995	Leslie Climie	3	6	30,000	1200	3
CF Det Wainwright	Nov 1995	Leslie Climie	3.5	1	10,000	6983	1
SASKATCHEWAN							
CF Det Dundurn	Oct 1995	Leslie Climie	4.25	4.5	24,000	8200	2

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 28a DATE OF MOST RECENT STAFF ASSISTANCE VISIT BY DMFS	Q# 28b DMFS STAFF MEMBER WHO CONDUCTED THE VISIT	Q# 29a NO. OF FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STAFF POSITIONS FROM DMFS FUNDS	Q# 29b NO. OF FTE STAFF POSITIONS FROM OTHER FUNDING SOURCES	Q# 31a DOLLAR VALUE PROVIDED BY BASE/WING COMD	Q# 31b TOTAL SQUARE FOOTAGE OF ACCOMMODATION PROVIDED	Q# 31c NO. OF DIFFERENT BUILDINGS OCCUPIED
CFB Moose Jaw	Oct 1995	Leslie Climie	6	2			1

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 28a DATE OF MOST RECENT STAFF ASSISTANCE VISIT BY DMFS	Q# 28b DMFS STAFF MEMBER WHO CONDUCTED THE VISIT	Q# 29a NO. OF FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STAFF POSITIONS FROM DMFS FUNDS	Q# 29b NO. OF FTE STAFF POSITIONS FROM OTHER FUNDING SOURCES	Q# 31a DOLLAR VALUE PROVIDED BY BASE/WING COMD	Q# 31b TOTAL SQUARE FOOTAGE OF ACCOMMODATION PROVIDED	Q# 31c NO. OF DIFFERENT BUILDINGS OCCUPIED
MANITOBA							
CFB Shilo	Mar 1996	Leslie Climie	7	1			2
CFB Winnipeg	Jan 1995	Leslie Climie	8	1		3000	3
ONTARIO							
CFB Borden	Mar 1994	Maj Bellemare	10	40	405,184	22,875	3
CFB Kingston	1994	Maj Bellemare	7	.25		2040	2
CFB North Bay	1994	Maj Bellemare	6	.6		2483	1
NDHQ/Ottawa	Sep 1995	Leslie Climie	11	2	82,000	4400	6
CFB Petawawa	Mar 1996	DMFS4	8	1			5
CFB Toronto	Dec 1995	LCol Jamieson	4	0	52,000	1300	1
CFB Trenton	Apr 1995	Maj Bellemare	8	6			3
MTSC Meaford	Jul 1995	LCol Jamieson	2	0	5,000	1000	1
QUEBEC							
CFB Bagotville	Jun 1995	Maj Bellemare	7	10		8000	2
CFB Montreal	Mar 1995	LCol Jamieson	12	5			
CFB Valcartier	Jun 1995	DMFS6	13	0	0	7500	2

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 28a DATE OF MOST RECENT STAFF ASSISTANCE VISIT BY DMFS	Q# 28b DMFS STAFF MEMBER WHO CONDUCTED THE VISIT	Q# 29a NO. OF FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STAFF POSITIONS FROM DMFS FUNDS	Q# 29b NO. OF FTE STAFF POSITIONS FROM OTHER FUNDING SOURCES	Q# 31a DOLLAR VALUE PROVIDED BY BASE/WING COMD	Q# 31b TOTAL SQUARE FOOTAGE OF ACCOMMODATION PROVIDED	Q# 31c NO. OF DIFFERENT BUILDINGS OCCUPIED
NEW BRUNSWICK							
CFB Gagetown	Mar 1996	Diane Demers	7	1	43,000	6400	3
CFB Moncton							
NOVA SCOTIA							
CFS Debert	Aug 1995	Maj Tyrrell	2	2	10,000	3000	1
CFB Greenwood	July 1995	Maj Tyrrell	7	1	38,000	4334	5
CFB Halifax	Feb 1996	LCol Jamieson	12	5	10,000	7500	5
CFB Shearwater	Aug 1995	Maj Tyrrell	6.5	4			2
NEWFOUNDLAND							
CFB Gander	Mar 1995	Leslie Climie	6	1	220,000	3736	1
CFB Goose Bay	Feb 1995	Leslie Climie	5	0	23,116	11,389	2
CFS St. John's	Feb 1995	Leslie Climie	4.25	0	12,684	2049	1

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 28a DATE OF MOST RECENT STAFF ASSISTANCE VISIT BY DMFS	Q# 28b DMFS STAFF MEMBER WHO CONDUCTED THE VISIT	Q# 29a NO. OF FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE) STAFF POSITIONS FROM DMFS FUNDS	Q# 29b NO. OF FTE STAFF POSITIONS FROM OTHER FUNDING SOURCES	Q# 31a DOLLAR VALUE PROVIDED BY BASE/WING COMD	Q# 31b TOTAL SQUARE FOOTAGE OF ACCOMMODATION PROVIDED	Q# 31c NO. OF DIFFERENT BUILDINGS OCCUPIED
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES							
Yellowknife	Nov 1995	Leslie Climie	2	0	20,000	1300	1
OUTSIDE OF CANADA							
Brussels, Belgium	1993	LCol Jamieson	1.6	0	N/A	1,200	1
Geilenkirchen, Germany	Nov 1995	Maj Tyrrell	2.5	0	N/A	7.00	1
Ramstein, Germany	Nov 1995	Maj Tyrrell	1	0	16,440	516	1
SHAPE, Belgium	Oct 1994	Maj Tyrrell	2.3	0	N/A	N/A	1
Great Britain	none	N/A	0.5	0	N/A	N/A	1
Rome, New York	Aug 1995	Maj Tyrell	0.5	0	N/A	300	1

TABLE 11**COMPARATIVE DATA: PROGRAM EVALUATION OF MILITARY FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAM**

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 32a ANNUAL FINANCIAL AUDIT - CONDUCTED BY	Q# 32b - COST TO THE CENTRES\$	Q# 32c - DATE OF MOST RECENT FINANCIAL AUDIT
BRITISH COLUMBIA			
CFS Aldergrove	Harrison Pankratz & Co., CGA	750	June 1995
CFB Chilliwack	Base personnel		1993/94
CFB Comox	Never done before	2500	May 1996
CFB Esquimalt	Harley J. Crabbe & Co.	2022	May 1995
CFS Masset	Wayne Williamson, PO1		Sept 1995
ALBERTA			
CFB Calgary	McKinnon & Co.	3300	Spring 1994
CFB Cold Lake	Local auditor	200	Mar 1995
CFB Edmonton	Coopers & Lybrand	3000	Jan 1995
CFB Suffield	NPF	0	Mar 1995
CF Det Wainwright	Meyers, Norris Penny & Co.	500	Mar 1996

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 32a ANNUAL FINANCIAL AUDIT - CONDUCTED BY	Q# 32b - COST TO THE CENTRES\$	Q# 32c - DATE OF MOST RECENT FINANCIAL AUDIT
SASKATCHEWAN			
CF Det Dundurn	Wing Audit Officer	0	May 1995
CFB Moose Jaw	15 Wing	0	May 1995
MANITOBA			
CFB Shilo	Kelleher & Co., CA Firm	1000	June 1995
CFB Winnipeg	Kuhtey & Co.	1000	June 1995
ONTARIO			
CFB Borden	Alan Martin Assoc., CA	4600	Mar 1995
CFB Kingston	Collins Blay	1500	Feb 1995
CFB North Bay	Doane Raymond & Assoc.	3076	May 1995
NDHQ/Ottawa	Welch & Co.	1500	June 1995
CFB Petawawa	KPMG	2500	Apr 1995
CFB Toronto	L.D. Robertson, CGA	700	Nov 1995
CFB Trenton	Reynolds & Jeffery (Picton)	1200	Oct 1995
MTSC Meaford			
QUEBEC			
CFB Bagotville	Vérificateurs de l'Escadre		Avr 1995
CFB Montreal	Besner, Massie, Pharand, Sédillot	1500	Mar 1996
CFB Valcartier	Biron Latouche	2500	Avr 1995

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 32a ANNUAL FINANCIAL AUDIT - CONDUCTED BY	Q# 32b - COST TO THE CENTRES\$	Q# 32c - DATE OF MOST RECENT FINANCIAL AUDIT
NEW BRUNSWICK			
CFB Gagetown	Doane Raymond, CA	1200	1995
CFB Moncton			
NOVA SCOTIA			
CFS Debert	Volunteer (CWO Fin Sec)	250	Apr 1995
CFB Greenwood	WCompt for public funds, civilian for charitable funds	350	May 1995
CFB Halifax	Audit Section BCompt	0	Aug 1994
CFB Shearwater	Deloitte & Touche	1200	Apr 1995
NEWFOUNDLAND			
CFB Gander	NPF and Command	0	June 1995
CFB Goose Bay	Walters Hoffe & Assoc.	700	Apr 1995
CFS St. John's	Cook Morrisey	1320	Mar 1995
NORTHWEST TERRITORIES			
Yellowknife	Lt Bird, CFNA Compt	0	Mar 1995

MILITARY FAMILY RESOURCE CENTRES	Q# 32a ANNUAL FINANCIAL AUDIT - CONDUCTED BY	Q# 32b - COST TO THE CENTRES\$	Q# 32c - DATE OF MOST RECENT FINANCIAL AUDIT
OUTSIDE OF CANADA			
Brussels, Belgium	NATEX-GK	0	1996
Geilenkirchen, Germany	NATEX-GK	0	1995
Ramstein, Germany	CWO F. Churchill	0	Oct 1995
SHAPE, Belgium	CFSU(E) Det Finance	0	Nov 1995
Great Britain	N/A	N/A	None
Rome, New York	N/A	N/A	None

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Australian Department of Defence, *Report on the Review of ADF Personnel and Family Support Services*, Canberra, ACT, September 1994.
- Barrette-Mozes, Susan. *Military Family Resource Centre of the National Capital Region Report on Military Family Support*. Ottawa: MFRC/NCR, 1994.
- Bell, D. Bruce, Mary L Stevens, and Mady W. Segal. *How to Support Families During Overseas Deployments: a Sourcebook for Service Providers (Research report 1687)*.
- Alexandria, Va.: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 1996.
- Bell, D. Bruce, Joel M. Teitelbaum and Colonel Walter R. Schumm, "Keeping the Home Fires Burning: Family Support Issues", *U.S. Army Military Review*, Mar-Apr 1996.
- Bennett, Holly, "One Common Agenda: Children Always Come First", in *Strengthening Families, Cherishing Children*, Ottawa: The Canadian Association of Toy Libraries and Parent Resource Centres, 1989, p. 92-95.
- Boyle, Major John, *Military Family Resource Centres: Luxury or Necessity*, unpublished paper prepared at the Canadian Forces Command and Staff College, Toronto, Ontario, 3 April 1996.
- Canadian Association of Toy Libraries, *Caring About Families: The "How To" Manual for Developing Canadian Family Resource Programs*, Ottawa, 1990.
- Collier, Dianne. *Hurry Up and Wait: an Inside Look at Life as a Canadian Military Wife*. Carp, Ontario: Creative Bound Inc., 1994.
- Cronin, Christopher. "Adolescent Reports of Parental Spousal Violence in Military and Civilian Families." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 10, 1 (1995): 117-122.
- Department of the Army, *Chief of Staff White Paper 1983: The Army Family* Washington, DC, 1983.
- Department of the Army, *Organization of the United States Army*, Pamphlet 10-1, Washington, DC, 14 June 1994.
- Department of the Army, *1995 Survey of Army Families III, Quick Summary*, Washington, DC, October 1995.
- Department of Defense, *Directive: Family Policy*, No. 1342.17, Washington, DC, December 30, 1988.
- Department of Defense, "Quality People: Lifeblood of a Quality Force", *Defense Issues*, Vol 11, No. 27, March 1996.
- Department of Defense, *Your Air Force: Family Support Center* (no other information available).
- Department of Defense, Manpower, Installations and Logistics. *Presentation for the NATO Symposium on Motivation and Morale*. Washington, DC:

- Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense, 1984.
- Department of National Defence, *NDHQ Policy Directive P2/93, Military Family Support*, Director Military Family Support Program, Ottawa, February 1993.
- Department of National Defence, *The Military Family Support Program: Background, Structure, Principles, Funding*, Director Military Family Support Program, Ottawa: National Defence Headquarters, no date.
- Department of National Defence, *Study Report on Family Support*, Family Support Program Project, Ottawa: National Defence Headquarters, May 1989.
- Department of National Defence, CFAO 22-4 *Security and Military Police Services*.
- Department of National Defence, CFAO 33-11 *Responsibilities and Duties of Chaplains*.
- Department of National Defence, CFAO 50-2 *Recreation*.
- Department of National Defence, CFAO 56-15 *Canadian Forces Social Work Services*.
- Department of National Defence, CFAO 56-31 *Financial Counselling Program*.
- Department of National Defence, CFAO 56-40 *Canadian Forces Military Family Support Program*.
- Department of the Navy, "Management and Operational Overview", *Family Service Center Desk Guide*, Vol. 1, Washington: Navy Family Support Program, 1988, (NAVPERS 15568).
- Department of the Navy, "Family Assistance: Help is never far away for Navy people", *All Hands*, No.907/908, Oct 01 1992, p. 41-47.
- Devine, P., Bullman, S., & Gaston, M., *Army Community Support Programs: Needs and Access Among Army Families*, United States Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, October 1992.
- Director Military Family Support, *DMFS Policy Guideline #11: Funding of Multi-Service Family Resource Centres (MSFRCs) and Community Coordinator Organizations (CCOs) By the Canadian Forces (CF)*, May 1995.
- Fort Drum of the U.S. Army, *Family Action Plan*, Fort Drum, NY, 1992.
- Fort Drum of the U.S. Army, *Family Assistance Handbook: Where to Turn*, Fort Drum, NY, August 1992.
- Fort Drum of the U.S. Army, *Deployments: What You Should Know, A Handbook for Commanders, Soldiers, and Family Members*, Fort Drum, NY, August 1994.
- Gimbel, Cynthia, and Alan Booth. "Why Does Military Combat Experience Adversely Affect Marital Relations?" *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 56, 3 (1994): 691-703.
- Kelley, M.L., "Military-Induced Separation in Relation to Maternal Adjustment and Children's Behaviours", *Military Psychology*, Vol. 6 No. 3, 1994, p. 163-76.
- Kelley, M.L., Herzog-Simmer, P.A., & Harris, M.A., "Effects of Military-Induced Separation on the Parenting Stress and Family Functioning of Deploying Mothers", *Military Psychology*, Vol. 6 No. 2, 1994, p. 125-138.

- Land Force Command, *Family Support Handbook: Land Force Command Support Plan: Peacekeeping Operations*, December 1994.
- Operational Research and Analysis Establishment, DSEA, *Military Family Support Programme Project: Inventory Survey*, Ottawa: National Defence Headquarters, October 1988.
- MacBride-King, Judy L. *Whose Job Is It Anyway?: an Exploratory Study of the Relationship Between the Military Organization and the Military Wife (Thesis (MA) Concordia University)*. Montreal: Judy L. MacBride-King, 1986.
- MacInnis, Ann. "It's War Time: Do You Know Where Your Children Are?" *Vanguard*, 2, 2 (1996): p 24-25.
- Miller, Thomas W., and Lane J. Veltkamp. "Family Violence: Clinical Indicators Among Military and Post-Military Personnel." *Military Medicine*, 158, 12 (1993): 766-771.
- Orthner, Dennis K., Martha M. Giddings, and William H. Quinn. *Youth in transition: a study of adolescents from Air Force and civilian families*. Washington, DC: Department of the Air Force, Office of Family Matters, 1986.
- Orthner, Dennis K., et al. *Building Strong Army Communities (ARI Research Note 90-110)*. Alexandria, Va.: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 1990.
- Orthner, Dennis K., Paula Early-Adams, and David Pollack. *Community Support Programs: Review of the Literature (ARI Research Note 90-125)*. Alexandria, Va.:
- U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 1990a.
- Pehrson, Col K.L., "Helping the Helpers: Family Support for Social Workers Mobilized during Desert Storm/Shield", *Military Medicine*, Vol.158, July 1993, p. 441-45.
- Pitman, Theresa, "Funding Concerns: The Bottom Line", *Strengthening Families, Cherishing Children*, Ottawa: The Canadian Association of Toy Libraries and Parent Resource Centres, 1989, p. 96-99.
- Segal, Mady Wechsler, and Jesse J. Harris. *What We Know About Army Families (Special Report 21)*. Alexandria, Va.: U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences, 1993.
- Tarzier, Ann, and Ray Tribe. *The mobile military lifestyle: "a larger issue"*. Alexandria, Va.: Army Community and Family Support Center, no date.
- Taylor, Dianne J. *There's No Wife Like It*. Victoria, BC, Braemar Books Ltd., 1985.
- Thoresen, Robert J. *Financial management practices of families in the United States Army: impacts on family life*. Florida State University, College of Home Economics(Thesis), 1985.
- Vanier Institute of the Family, "What Matters for Canadian Families", 1994.
- Waruszynski, B., "Military Family Support During and Following Peacekeeping Operations:

Phase One - Review of the Literature and Analysis of Feedback from Service Providers on Military Family Support Services”, Directorate of Social and Economic Analysis, Department of National Defence, Ottawa, April 1966.

Werkman, Sidney, and Peter S. Jensen. “Resolved: Military Family Life is Hazardous to the Mental Health of Children.” *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 31, 5 (1992): 984-987.