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ABSTRACT

Positive Youth Development: The Effects of a Resiliency-Based Afterschool Program

Lindsey Brown
State University of New York at Cortland
2010

The purpose of this study was to examine the impact of an afterschool program instituted at a local elementary school in Central New York. The program was developed using concepts promoted by research experts in the fields of resiliency, benefits-based programming, afterschool programming and aggressive behavior. The goals of the program are three-fold: (1) to increase resiliency among participants, (2) reduce the occurrences of aggressive behaviors (i.e., bullying), and (3) increase academic performance across the target population (5th and 6th graders). A self-report survey measuring one’s perceived levels of resiliency was given to 129 students. A nonequivalent control group quasi-experimental design was used. Of the students that completed the survey, 19 were eligible to participate in the study; 13 as participants in the afterschool program, and six as non-participants in the afterschool program. The mean scores were compared using paired samples t-tests and gain scores were compared using independent t-tests. The results of the paired samples t-tests indicated that those who participated in the afterschool program showed a significant increase ($p = 0.045$) in resiliency scores from pretest to post-test. The program had a positive impact on aggressive behavior as evidenced by the 62% decrease of referrals during the program. It was concluded that 5th and 6th graders who participate in a program, such as the one developed and tested in this study, have a heightened perception of their own levels of resiliency. Moreover, qualitative feedback indicated that the program was academically beneficial to the students.
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Traditionally, professionals have focused on the shortcomings of children, and thereby neglecting to foster strengths, thus inhibiting their growth. More recently, the youth development movement has taken a more strengths-based approach to achieve positive developmental outcomes. The strengths-based technique is a constructivist approach that deemphasizes pathology and instead builds interventions based on the strengths of the individuals (Cheon, 2008). Particular attention is paid to values, strengths, potential within the child, school and community, and self-determination (Cheon). Positive psychology is another approach where these types of psychologists do not deny or ignore the problems that young people face; rather, they strive to supplement the traditional psychology practices by offering positive life engagements, including subjective experiences, individual traits, relationships, groups and institutions (Park, 2008). Moreover, programs that incorporate positive prevention principles into their programs have been found to be significantly more effective in achieving their goals with at-risk youth (Cheon).

The concept of resiliency is more than being able to respond to difficult situations; it is the realization of cognitive capabilities, self-regulating behaviors and building of social support networks (Brennan, 2008). Recreation and leisure professionals promote youth development in part, by designing programs to build protective factors
that use the concepts of resiliency (Ellis, Braff & Hutchinson, 2001). Resiliency is described as the ability to “bounce back,” to withstand hardship and repair one’s self-reparation (Wolin & Wolin, 1993). In Wolin and Wolin’s conceptualization of resiliency, there are seven constructs that must be present in order to exude resiliency: insight, independence, relationships, initiative, creativity, humor and morality. In order to measure the level of perceived resiliency that an individual senses, Hurtes (1999) developed is a 40 item, likert type scale called the Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile (RASP).

Though some research argues that resiliency is innate, it is imperative for some children to be exposed to “protective factors” (e.g., positive role model, strong friendships, etc.) that help combat “risk factors,” (e.g., abusive upbringing, low socioeconomic status, etc.) thus assisting them in fostering their own resiliency (Allen, Stevens, Hurtes & Harwell, 1998). Through partnerships between youths and adults, young people can establish proper coping skills and adults can learn new and innovative ways to approach situations (Brennan, 2008). By providing the means for establishing these partnerships within a recreation program, the facilitator is encouraging both types of resiliency; in this example, the presence of a positive mentor would be an example of a protective factor. Additionally, some researchers (Fallon, 2007; Grothaus, 2004) indicate that there is a positive correlation with individuals who exhibit resilient mannerisms and elevated academic performance; providing them with better skills in listening, as well as, giving them scholarly confidence.

In order to implement programs with a targeted goal in mind, it would be beneficial to utilize the programming model of the Benefits Movement. This movement
seeks to shift the perception of recreation as a discretionary service to an essential preventive, developmental, and rehabilitative human service (Allen et al., 1998). From the Benefits Movement, three aspects emerged, Benefits-Based Management (BBM), Benefits-Based Awareness (BBA) and Benefits-Based Programming (BBP). The Benefits-Based Programming model includes four steps: (a) outcome oriented program goals should be identified that are meaningful to the agency, the participants, and other stakeholders; (b) program components should be intentionally structured to address the stated goals; (c) progress toward desired goals must be assessed; and (d) an organization must publicize its outcomes (Hurtes & Allen, 2001).

Many educational (school-related) programs are created using the idea of a targeted outcome. For instance, it is a generally accepted principle that physical education (PE) classes play a significant role in fostering positive attitudes toward a healthy lifestyle; however, many schools are phasing out the PE requirement, thus creating the need for more activity-based afterschool programs (Annesi, 2005). Much of the literature has shown that afterschool programming has been effective in decreasing crime, increasing achievement levels and strengthening familial and peer bonds; the same goals of many youth development programs (Annesi, 2005).

A rising issue within elementary schools nationwide is aggressive behaviors within youth, potentially leading towards peer victimization. It is important to note that for the purpose of this study, the more common and widespread occurrences of victimization are addressed, and not the isolated incidents of the highly publicized school tragedies such as shootings and other lethal hostilities. For this study, bullying is defined as hostile behavior that is intentional and directed towards another individual, usually
involving an imbalance of power or strength; incidents are usually repetitive (Cummings, 1999). Some researchers have identified different types of bullying: direct bullying, which involves threats, teasing and taunts; verbal bullying, involving similar actions and including name calling, spreading rumors and excluding individuals; physical bullying, which includes destruction of property, hitting and physical altercations; and sexual harassment, which demeans a person based on their gender or sexual orientation (Beaty & Alexeyev, 2008).

The focus of this study is to foster positive youth development through Benefits Based Programming for an afterschool activity, based off the theoretical framework of resiliency, to decrease bullying at an elementary school. In the fall of 2009, the 5th and 6th graders of an elementary school in Cortland, New York, were introduced to the League 56 Academy. This program was created by the SUNY Cortland students of REC 280: Programming in Recreation, Parks and Leisure Services and REC: 380 Leadership in Recreation, Parks and Leisure Services in order to promote resiliency in the students at the elementary school. The elementary students were randomly split into groups corresponding to approximately three group leaders. The elementary students’ participation in the afterschool program, League 56 Academy, was voluntary. League 56 Academy met twice each week, for eight weeks, and during each week, one of the seven resiliency constructs of Wolin and Wolin’s (1993) model is targeted. During the last week, groups participate in overall resiliency activities. The SUNY Cortland students created weekly activity plans that include activities which they designed to reflect the resiliency trait of that week. The SUNY Cortland students visited the elementary school twice each week, (Tuesdays and Thursdays) afterschool, and introduced and facilitated
their activities to the group. The goal of the program is to foster resiliency in the 5th and 6th grade students at the elementary school with the expectation that instances of aggressive behaviors will decrease within this specific age group.

A similar program was introduced in eastern Virginia in 2009 to 6th graders at a local middle school and was implemented with success (Johnston, 2009). Johnston utilized the RASP in order to measure resiliency outcomes, and logged attendance because of the drop-in nature of this afterschool program.

Statement of Problem

Although there is much literature focusing on afterschool programs, positive youth development and resiliency, aggressive behavior and academic success, there is a gap in the literature that brings theory and practice together and focuses on the interplay between these components. The purpose of this study was to measure the effects of a benefits-based afterschool program in 5th and 6th grade students who participated in the League 56 Academy. Specifically, the focus of the study was to measure students’ own, perceived level of resiliency. Additionally, this study measured the instances of aggressive behavior before, during and after the program was introduced and examined the study participants’ academic success.
Hypotheses

H_1: There will be a decreased number of aggressive behaviors as measured by reported number of referrals before, during and after the program.

H_2: Compared to the pre-test scores on the RASP, the experimental group will show significantly increased levels of resiliency in post-test scores.

H_3: Fifth and sixth grade students who are able to utilize the academic support offered by the SUNY Cortland students will have an increase in academic performance.

H_4: The parent version of the RASP is a valid and reliable measure of resiliency.

Assumptions

It is assumed that participants are able to process the traits of resiliency and possess at least a 5th grade reading level. Also, it is presumed that both the students and parents will answer the surveys to the best of their abilities and in an honest manner. It is also assumed that the students and faculty of SUNY Cortland have correctly programmed and facilitated activities for the students of the elementary school that accurately promote the resiliency trait, specific to each week’s theme.

Delimitations

The scope of this study is delimited to a single resiliency model. The program, though introduced to a similarly aged group of students in Virginia, will be adapted to not
only promote the resiliency traits, but also decrease the instances of aggressive behaviors among the population. The measurement of overall resilience is delimited to the Resiliency and Attitudes Skills Profile (RASP) instrument developed by Hurtes (1999). In addition, the instances of aggressive behaviors are restricted to the reported incidents only occurring during school hours.

**Limitations**

This study may be limited because only one developed program will be introduced and examined at a single location. This study design limits the external validity and the generalizability to multiple populations. Additionally, because of the nature of a quasi-experimental design (participants will choose whether or not they receive the treatment), there is no randomization and no “control group” designated; only a comparison group exists.

The 5th and 6th graders are self-reporting on the RASP; their actions are not being documented or strictly observed, therefore there is a chance for participants to misinterpret their answers. Also, during the course of the eight week program, there were two weeks that only had one session: the second week targeting humor and the last week, which promotes overall resiliency. This is an area of concern because these traits may not have been adequately reinforced; therefore the participants may not understand the concepts of humor and overall resiliency as well as other traits.
Definitions of Terms

(1) *Resiliency* – ability to bounce back, to withstand hardship and repair oneself;

(Wolin & Wolin, 1993) there are seven resilience constructs that are identified:

(a) *Insight* – ability to understand verbal, body, and situational cues and modify
behavior accordingly. Three identifiable subcategories of insight are
understanding, knowing and sensing.

(b) *Independence* – ability to separate oneself from risk factors or negative
consequences; ability to focus on reflection; ability to avoid making decisions
based off peer pressure; three identifiable subcategories of independence are
straying, disengaging and separating.

(c) *Relationships* – ability to form and maintain healthy relationships; ability to
understand how to interact with different individuals and groups; three
identifiable subcategories of relationships are connecting, recruiting and
attaching.

(d) *Initiative* – ability to take charge; ability to be self-determined; ability to
overcome challenges and meet obstacles head-on; ability to lead; three
identifiable subcategories of initiative are exploring, working and generating.

(e) *Creativity* – ability to generate healthy options and/or alternatives which will
help to cope with hardships; three identifiable subcategories of creativity are
playing, shaping and composing.
(f) **Humor** – ability to play and stay light-hearted; ability to focus on and recognize positives; ability to not focus on harsh realities; three identifiable subcategories of humor are playing, shaping and laughing.

(g) **Morality** – ability to recognize one's own values; ability to recognize outcomes; ability to see long-term; ability to make decisions that support a healthy life; three identifiable subcategories of morality are judging, valuing and serving.

(2) **Positive Youth Development** – deemphasizes pathology and builds interventions on the strengths of the individuals; it focuses particularly on values, strengths and the potential within the child (Cheon, 2008)

(3) **Bullying** – hostile behavior that is intentional and directed towards another individual, usually involving an imbalance of power or strength; actions are usually repetitive (Cummings, 1999)

(4) **Benefits-Based Programming** – launched in the mid 1990s by the National Recreation and Parks Association, an approach in which recreation professionals engineer theory-based experiences that are directed at specific, targeted outcomes (Hurtes, Allen, Stevens & Lee, 2000)

(5) **Risk Factors** – circumstances [e.g., single parent family and/or lower income areas (Ellis et al., 2001)] that may lead to undesirable, unhealthy behaviors, increased levels of stress and inconsistent parenting (Allen et al., 1998)

(6) **Protective Factors** – consist of individual or environmental characteristics that promote resiliency (Allen et al., 1998)
(7) *League 56 Academy* – an afterschool program specifically designed for 5th and 6th graders that is intentionally programmed to promote resiliency education, increase academic performance and decrease occurrences of aggressive behaviors
Chapter 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The purpose of this study was to explore the perceived effects of a resiliency-based, afterschool program. This study paid specific attention to levels of resiliency, instances of aggressive behaviors and achievement in academic performance. The key sections on this chapter include the following: (a) positive youth development; (b) the benefits of afterschool programming; (c) aggressive behavior; (d) resiliency; (e) benefits-based programming; and (f) summary.

Positive Youth Development

In both social science research and pop culture, there has been a strong focus primarily on what is “wrong” with people rather than what is “right” with people (Hurtes & Allen, 2001). Traditionally, there has been little attention paid to the strengths-based positive youth development perspective in preventing the onset of troubles with adolescents. The strengths-based component de-emphasizes pathology and builds interventions on the strengths of the individuals (Cheon, 2008). It has focused particularly on values, strengths and the potential within the child as well as being active in the school and community and self-determination (Cheon).
In response to the negative, dysfunctional beliefs about youth development, the subdiscipline of positive psychology defines positive psychology in the following manner: “The scientific study of human strength, resilience, and optimal human functioning,” (Kelley, 2003, p. 49). Rather than focusing on treating youthful dysfunction, positive psychologists facilitate well-being and resiliency in youth and promote pro-social behavior (Kelley, 2003). Kelley suggested that pro-social behavior can be encouraged by teaching young people to understand that it is their birthright to exercise healthy mental functioning and maximize psychological well-being. Commonly, it is assumed that juvenile offenders are in some way, defective; lacking an essential quality (i.e., impulse control, self-esteem, cognitive functions, assertiveness, and social skills). Kelley wrote that at-risk youth would therefore benefit if they were supplied with ways to prevent or control their dysfunctional tendencies by being inundated with programming that addressed these characteristics from the outside-in.

Park (2008) clarified that positive psychologists do not deny or ignore the problems that young people face; however, they strive to supplement the general psychology practices by offering positive life engagements, including subjective experiences, individual traits, relationships, groups and institutions. Good character, some would argue, is central to psychological and social well-being (Park, 2008). The term character refers to the makeup of an individual’s persona that is morally valued by society and is generally associated with positive results regarding school, altruism, and acceptance of diversity (Scales, Benson, Leffert & Blyth, 2000).

In addition to teaching youth about positive approaches to life decisions, the instructors and program facilitators need to have a similar positive attitude. If the
facilitators do not believe that the interventions they are using will work, the programs will fail because the negative attitude they emanate will have a direct impact on the success of the program (Shek & Wai, 2008). Programs that incorporate positive prevention principles into their design are significantly more likely to be effective in achieving goals with at-risk youth (Cheon, 2008).

**Strategies and Programs**

It may be beneficial for young people involved to be a central part of the process when creating and implementing programs (Ellis et al., 2001). Empowering individuals and giving them a sense of ownership in a program will engage them and they will respect the teachings of a program.

One approach to finding effective strategies and programs is to adopt the “best practices” model. Best practice models are based on research and evaluation and identify empirically validated interventions for a specific population and or problem. Cheon (2008) pointed out that widespread community programs tend to be more effective than less broad programming because any problems that may occur within a community are not typically associated with any particular sub-group. Thus, any community efforts given to address an issue may address an underlying cause for the problem (Cheon).

There are multiple strategies that professionals use in order to target positive youth development. One such strategy is the Health Realization (HR) principle (Kelley, 2003). The HR model was applied in crime-ridden cities throughout Florida, California, Minnesota, Hawaii and New York. The community program initially targeted youth
truancy and academic performance. Shortly after the program was initiated, it was expanded to serve a greater community base and infiltrated schools, receiving support for afterschool recreation and tutoring courses. Parents reported that their children were more cooperative and increased their involvement in school activity. Schools reported a decrease in suspensions, referrals, truancy rates, almost a 100% success rate of students passing grade levels, and the police reported no calls for drug trafficking or typical youth criminal activities for nearly one full year (Kelley, 2003).

The Values in Action (VIA) program is an in-school strengths-based design focusing on character strengths that contribute to overall optimal human development (Park, 2008). Students were given a survey to assess their top personal strengths from a list of twenty-four choices. Park concluded that students were most commonly strongest in gratitude, humor and love and lesser in strengths in respect to prudence, forgiveness, spirituality and self-regulation. After learning their primary strengths, students were then given the tools to cultivate their strengths and use what they have learned in their daily routine so as to help them lead a productive and fulfilling life (Park).

The P.A.T.H.S. Program, introduced in Hong Kong had a positive effect on decreasing the risk of alcohol, tobacco, drug abuse and violence in at-risk youth (Shek & Wai, 2008). Much of the focus of the program was geared towards training the facilitators to run the intervention properly. The steps to follow were to (a) present the theory to the children, (b) have them demonstrate the skill they are being taught, (c) then practice the newly learned skill, (d) give feedback to the youth using constructive criticism, and then (e) coach and encourage the children to utilize their knowledge in everyday life (Shek &
Shek and Wai noted that using this model in almost any setting can help reinforce the skills children are learning, thus creating more effective programming.

**Achievement in Academic Performance**

The Health Realization (HR) principle, mentioned above, was applied in a remedial reading setting in Miami to 20 randomly selected students (Stewart, 1985 as cited in Kelley, 2003). The program lasted six weeks and the students were offered five, 40 minute lessons each week. The experimental group instructor, who was HR trained, spent class time building rapport by telling stories, jokes and focusing on “teachable moments” with her students. After the six-week period was over, the students were reevaluated (pre-test and post-test method) and the experimental group’s test scores had improved significantly more than the control group’s scores in the areas of reading level and vocabulary. It was concluded that students experienced accelerated learning rates when both instructors and students are in a constructive and tranquil state (Kelley).

**Benefits of Afterschool Programming**

Many educational (school-related) programs are created using the idea of a targeted outcome. For instance, it is a generally accepted principle that physical education (PE) classes play a predominant role in fostering positive attitudes toward a healthy lifestyle; however, many schools are phasing out the PE requirement (Annesi, 2005). Thus, there is a need for more activity-based afterschool programs (Annesi, 2005). When
children are not active throughout the day, they tend to have their energy stored up and need a release by the time the school day comes to a close.

Much of the research indicates that between the time children arrive home from school and the time parents arrive home from work, there is an increased level of delinquent behavior due to a lack in supervision for adolescents (Gottfredson, Cross & Soule, 2007). In New York alone approximately 931,686 children (27%) take care of themselves afterschool and only 15% (of K-12 students) are able to participate in afterschool programs; furthermore, of those who cannot participate, 36% would, if a program were available to them (Afterschool Alliance, 2004).

When defining the most important functions of an afterschool program, opportunities for enrichment (i.e.: [a] safety, [b] adult supervision, [c] a relaxed environment- academic or cultural, [d] prevention of behavior problems, and [d] facilitation of recreational activities) are high in priority (Hofferth, Brayfield, Diech & Holocomb as cited in Riggs & Greenberg, 2004). In a 2001 survey, 94% of registered voters nationwide, would favor an afterschool program that, “uses public school buildings during afterschool hours five days a week to provide children with fun, enriching learning opportunities that extend beyond school’s traditional academic style, that challenge them and give them more individualized attention,” (Afterschool Alliance, 2001 p. 2). Generally, students who participated in a high-quality afterschool program tended to have more positive work habits than those students who were unsupervised during afterschool time (Reisner, et al., 2007).

Borden, et al., 2005 made an astute observation concerning a child’s motivation for participating in out-of-school activities; are the outcomes and benefits the same for
intrinsically and extrinsically motivated students? Borden, et al., identified four major categories regarding intrinsic and extrinsic reasons regarding why youths feel they should participate in out-of-school programs: (a) afterschool programs help children stay off the streets, (b) youths feel they have the ability to learn new things in afterschool programs, (c) youths can participate to avoid boredom, and (d) youths enjoy activities that are fun. Students specifically mentioned that they liked the feeling of proving to people that they can be successful, that they had fun, and that they were given a chance to escape the confines of their home; in both a physical and philosophical sense (Borden, et al.).

Borden and colleagues also identified four major constraints infringing upon youth’s ability to participate in an activity (a) lack of time, (b) other interests, (c) adverse impressions of the youth center and lastly, (d) parental restrictions that prevented them from participating.

Five key recommendations were devised for designing youth programs in order to increase participation levels (Borden, et al., 2005): (a) define the participants that will be engaging in the program, (b) create programs that offer children the ability to develop essential life skills, (c) allow room for the parents to be involved, (d) incorporate best practices into the model, and (e) continuously evaluate the program. These steps are akin to NRPA’s Benefits-Based Programming (BBP) (Allen & Cooper, 2003) however BBP additionally emphasizes the importance of advocating the results of research and programs.

Gottfredson, et al. (2007) claimed that there are three specific program characteristics that afterschool programs should convey: (a) an emphasis on character development and/or social skills, (b) a well-thought out, prepared and planned program,
and (c) the use of small, contained groups. Adhering to these guidelines will ultimately result in reduced youth problem behavior (Gottfredson, et al.).

**Specified Programming Goals**

In contrast to unstructured child-care programs, youth development based afterschool programs strive to implement multiple domains of functioning that will help children build skills in multiple areas (Riggs & Greenberg, 2004). According to Riggs and Greenberg (2004) these programs generally include content (in one or more areas) that fosters academic success (through tutoring or homework assistance), the arts, body conditioning or socio-emotional capabilities. Many afterschool program developers and facilitators use theory to construct their courses in order to best suit their goals.

Community-Involved Positive Development (CIPD) is a proposed strength-based policy to incorporate youth into the community (Cheon, 2008). Cheon’s first step includes mandating schools to provide students with CIPD activities. Two of the four required components take place after school where the community and school worked collaboratively to provide activities immediately after the school day is over. The second required portion of the CIPD program is based entirely on the community, where activities and programming are provided to fill the gap between the time students exit school and parents enter the home after work (Cheon, 2008).

Linville and Hubner (2005) analyzed the relationships between extracurricular activities and youth violence. Their results were derived from a prior, larger study on resiliency and risk with corresponding protective factors. Of the 235 eighth through
twelfth graders that participated in the survey, 74% said that they had engaged in extra-curricular activities, more than once in the past year (Linville & Hubner, 2005). Additionally, 28% reported having carried a weapon to school in the last 30 days, and 34% had engaged in a physical altercation within the last year. Though much of the literature indicates otherwise, there was a positive correlation between children who participate in out-of-school activities and students who were part of a physical altercation. There can be multiple reasons for this outcome; however, the researchers expressed that because it was never specified what type of activity in which they are engaged, (e.g., gangs as opposed to Girl Scouts) it is difficult to draw conclusions about whether their activities will promote or deter from violent actions (Linville & Hubner, 2005).

Gottfredson, et al., (2007) examined the effectiveness of 35 afterschool programs that specifically addressed the prevention of delinquency and victimization. Delinquent behavior in this evaluation method was measured on 13 items, responding either “yes” or “no” to questions pertaining to their engagement in acts such as theft, vandalism, assault, gang involvement, carrying weapons, breaking & entering and robbery within the last year. Victimization was measured on a seven item scale that assessed whether the child had been on the receiving end of the aforementioned delinquent behavior, children also responded to these questions in a “yes” or “no” format. The results indicated that the more time that students spent with their peers, out of direct, adult supervision, the higher the association with an increase of victimization. Thus the pure presence of adults had a positive effect on the students’ behavior in the time spent immediately after school; a generally unsupervised block of time (Gottfredson, et al.).
Aggressive Behavior

Graham and Bellmore (2007) noted that some occurrences of bullying may stem from an instance where an aggressive child misinterprets the actions of another child, thus becoming outwardly hostile towards that child. Some researchers have identified different types of bullying: direct bullying, which involves threats, teasing and taunts; verbal bullying, involving similar actions and including name calling, spreading rumors and excluding individuals; physical bullying, which includes destruction of property, hitting and physical altercations; and sexual harassment, which demeans a person based on their gender or sexual orientation (Beaty & Alexeyev, 2008).

How is Bullying Measured?

Aggressive behavior can be defined in a number of ways. Bullying, specifically, is defined as hostile behavior that is intentional and directed towards another individual, usually involving an imbalance of power or strength; and this behavior is typically repetitive (Cummings, 1999). Although bullying can be simply defined, measuring the effects of one person’s actions on another person is a difficult matter.

Mynard and Joseph (2000) studied school aged children (ages 11-16) and created a 45 question survey in which students were able to self-report victimization. Questions were based on verbal, physical, and social victimization and attacks on property.

Example items from the survey included the following:
a. Hurt me physically in some way (displaying the physical victimization attribute),

b. Made fun of me because of my appearance (displaying the verbal victimization attribute),

c. Tried to make my friends turn against me (displaying the social manipulation attribute), and

d. Deliberately damaged some property of mine (displaying the attacks on property attribute).

Mynard and Joseph’s (2000) found that, of the 812 respondents, 43% had reported that they had been bullied in some manner (Mynard & Joseph). Peer victimization is a prominent explanation for stress in a student’s life that can lead to both mental and physical health issues (Graham & Bellmore, 2007). The related issue of peer victimization is discussed in the following section.

Effects of Bullying on the Victim

“Students who are chronic victims of school bullying often are rejected by their peers and they feel depressed, anxious, and lonely,” (Graham, & Bellmore, 2007, p. 139). These psychological stressors can manifest themselves into physical symptoms. Nishina, Juvonen, and Witkow (2005) conducted a study to verify this very point. Nishina et al. believed that psychosocial maladjustment and physical ailments both have a negative effect on school functioning, and peer victimization can lead to both of these causes. Furthermore, if one was to eliminate peer victimization, it would lead to an increase in
school functioning. Peer victimization, physical symptoms, depressive symptoms, social anxiety, loneliness at school, self worth, grade point average and absences (excused and unexcused) were measured separately using the questionnaire. The results indicated that peer harassment and sensitivity to its psychological effects can be a direct and an indirect stressor on school functioning (Nishina, et al., 2005).

It was suggested that once a victim is established as such, that status will remain with them for at least the remainder of the school year, however studies have also shown that contrarily, students will lose their victim status from the beginning to the end of sixth grade (Graham & Bellmore, 2007). Graham and Bellmore noted that school transitions (e.g., elementary to middle school) may also have an effect on this issue due to situational dynamics.

**Prevention Methods**

A school-wide prevention program is the most effective intervention approach to bullying because it has the ability to target students, parents, teachers, staff, and administrators, thereby creating an inclusive environment for everyone that should be involved with bullying matters (Graham & Bellmore, 2007). Because students should have some autonomy regarding the activities in which they participate, Graham and Bellmore (2007) suggested that students create classroom regulations regarding victimization, making them more sensitive to their own actions and also more aware of the behavior of their peers. Another effective means of prevention suggested by Graham and Bellmore (2007) would simply be to teach students how to accurately interpret
others’ actions and words; and, if they are still unclear, it is important to ask peers about their intentions. Afterschool programs (Collins, 2009; Johnston, 2009) place an emphasis on resiliency to reduce the prevalence of bullying and aggressive behaviors.

**Resiliency**

Similar to positive youth development approaches, Benard (2004) contends that in order to create a resilient individual, one must concentrate on the quality of the strengths in an individual; this is said to increase social competence, problem solving skills, increase autonomy approaches, and give individuals a sense of purpose. Additionally, it was pointed out that parents play a significant role in increasing a child’s resiliency (Benard, 2004).

Resiliency is defined as the ability to bounce back, to withstand hardship and repair one’s self (Wolin & Wolin, 1993). The concept of resiliency is more than just being able to respond in difficult situations; it is the realization of cognitive capabilities, self-regulating behaviors and building of social support networks (Brennan, 2008). Brennan suggests that there are two types of resiliency that go hand in hand: individual and community. Brennan believed that through partnerships between youth and adults, young people can establish proper coping skills and adults can learn new and innovative ways to approach situations. By providing the means for these partnerships to occur, the facilitator encourages both types of resiliency.

Though some researchers suggest that resiliency is innate, it is imperative for some children to be exposed to “protective factors” that help combat “risk factors” thus
assisting them in fostering their own resiliency (Allen et al., 1998; Benard, 2004). Risk Factors are issues that may lead to undesirable, unhealthy behaviors, increased levels of stress and inconsistent parenting, (e.g., single parent family and/or lower income areas (Benard; Ellis et al., 2001). Protective Factors consist of individual or environmental characteristics that promote resiliency. In addition, recreation and leisure professionals promote youth development by designing their programs to build protective factors that are based off the concepts of resiliency (Ellis, et al.).

Fallon (2007) indicated that maximum student performance can be achieved when teachers instill resilience into their students by creating a positive, fair, reflective atmosphere, thus developing scholarly self-actualization and efficacy. One of the most important factors in this approach is building a strong rapport between the students and their teachers (Fallon).

Promoting resiliency in youth (through group autonomy and listening skills) can instill other traits as well; community stewardship and servant leadership are two that are highlighted by Grothaus (2004). The resiliency model created by Wolin & Wolin (1993) utilized constructs that are closely related to the traits stressed by Grothaus.
Seven Resiliency Traits

According to Wolin and Wolin (1993) adults who had a damaging past have a negative perspective at which they perceive each of the seven resilience traits; examples are outlined below:

Insight, the ability to understand verbal, body, and situational cues and modify behavior accordingly; however, this can be misconstrued as being self-absorbed.

Independence is the ability to separate one's self from risk factors or negative consequences, the ability to focus on reflection or avoid making decisions based off peer pressure; although a person may feel an innate fear of intimacy.

Relationship is the ability to form and maintain healthy relationships, or to understand how to interact with different individuals and groups; although it also can be viewed as an unhealthy dependency on others.

Initiative is the ability to take charge; ability to be self-determined; ability to overcome challenges and meet obstacles head-on; ability to lead; and may be known as an overachiever.

Creativity is the ability to generate healthy options and/or alternatives which will help to cope with hardships; or can simply be viewed as a useless daydream.

Humor is the ability to play and stay light-hearted; ability to focus on and recognize positives; ability to not focus on harsh realities; however it can be understood as a habitual jokester.


*Morality* (Values Orientation) is the ability to recognize one's own values or outcomes and one has the ability to see long-term and to make decisions that support a healthy life; although this can also be seen as a guilty conscience or taking on too much responsibility. After applying the seven traits of resiliency in youth programming, it seemed more appropriate to identify “Morality” as “Values Orientation;” so as to make all the terms “kid-friendly,” (Hurtes, 1999).

Because of past experiences, people who have been insulted or verbally abused by their family members and psychologically of physically abused throughout their lives do not have the awareness of these resiliency traits; they have to be taught how to appropriately apply each of these constructs to their everyday lives (Wolin & Wolin, 1993).

**Measures of Resiliency**

The Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile (RASP) was developed following Nunnally’s (1964, 1970) approach, reiterated and collapsed by Churchill (1979) and Kline (1986) (Hurtes, & Allen, 2001). These approaches assessed the nature of each aspect of a theory and produced questions specifically relating to each aspect. The following steps were suggested:

1. Create a domain (boundary) for item content. This should pertain to a particular theory or the results of a literature review.

2. Find a significant amount of relevant items. These should be based off of a thorough review of literature, focus groups and expert panels.
(3) Select the sample, collect your data and use a confirmatory factor analysis to
purify the measure.

(4) Select a second sample, collect the data again and determine reliability.
Internal consistency, measured by coefficient alpha is usually the way reliability is
established.

(5) Establish validity through the collection of new data. Construct validity can
be accomplished by using the confirmatory factor analysis.

(6) The final step is to establish norms. In order to do this, a robust sample size is
needed. (The RASP was not executed to a population of this magnitude.)

Within the RASP, after all reliability and validity tests were executed, it contained
40 items (Hurtes, 1999). Though the RASP specifically measures the seven constructs
separately, the assessment shows higher levels of internal consistency (reliability
measuring at 0.91 using Cronbach’s Alpha) for the survey as a whole (Hurtes & Allen,
2001).

**Resiliency Based Programming**

Responsive Advocacy for Life and Learning in Youth (RALLY) is a program that
was created by Harvard University. Harvard University, Norfolk Public Schools and Old
Dominion University worked together to initiate an in-class and afterschool prevention
program where academic performance, character education and resiliency were the
measureable outcomes (Johnston, 2009). The intervention consisted of collaboration
between teachers, students and prevention practitioners (provide students with a support
system-mentorship) to help encourage all students, not just at-risk youth, to join the program in order to benefit from rendered services. There are five requirements for the RALLY program: (a) a host school in which you have the support of the administration, student support providers, and participating teachers, (b) a coordinator who is on-site full time, (c) a mental health partner, (d) practitioners with ample time and training to serve students, and (e) community partners who can provide out-of-school opportunities for students (RALLY Prevention Programs, 2006).

The afterschool activities were programmed and implemented by Old Dominion University’s Department of ESPER (Exercise Science, Sport, Physical Education and Recreation). In order to instill resiliency in students, Wolin and Wolin’s (1993) theory was implemented, utilizing the seven resiliency traits. In order to measure the effectiveness of the program, the RASP (Hurtes, 1999), the CREE (Collective Responsibility for Excellence and Ethics) (Davidson, & Khmelkov, 2006) and the RALLY Satisfaction Survey (developed by RALLY researchers, RALLY Prevention Programs, 2006).

Johnston’s (2009) program used the concepts behind RALLY and altered it to suit the needs of sixth grade students at Blair Middle School in Norfolk, VA. The students of Old Dominion University’s Department of Recreation and Tourism Studies created and implemented resiliency-building activities starting at 2:45 p.m. lasting until 4:45 p.m. Additionally, for 20 minutes, the middle school students were given time to work on academic materials with help from the college students to encourage positive academic performance; this was done while the students were eating a snack. Second, the students
participated in a large group activity of high energy, and then split into smaller groups to concentrate on the resiliency trait-focused activity (Johnston, 2009).

In order to assess the effectiveness of the program, Johnston used the Resiliency Attitude and Skills Profile (Hurtes, 1999) in a pretest, posttest model. Johnston’s results indicated that more research needed to be completed, over various populations in order to fully assess the effectiveness of the resiliency piece of the program. Also, in order to look at the effectiveness of the academic assistance, it was suggested to attain grades beforehand and afterwards of the students who participated (Johnston, 2009).

Benefits-Based Programming

The therapeutic recreation process is a method of development and implementation of services for individuals with disabilities. Therapeutic recreation professionals use a process of effective development, implementation and evaluation; because the steps must be followed to generate valuable and publishable outcomes, it leads to more effective youth programs (Ellis et al., 2001). In order to broaden the scope of these practices, the National Recreation and Parks Association implemented the benefits-based programming model which publicizes similar applications.

The goal of the benefits based movement is to alter the perception of recreation as an optional leisure activity, to a vital, human service, with preventive, developmental, and rehabilitative aspects (Allen, et al., 1998). As indicated, this movement focused on four specific types of benefits including economic, environmental, community and individual. These benefits correspond highly with the risk and protective factors inherent
in the resiliency literature. In order to achieve the intended beneficial outcomes, three components to this movement emerged: Benefits-Based Management, Benefits-Based Awareness and Benefits-Based Programming.

The Benefits Based Programming (BBP) model includes four steps: (1) theory-based, outcome oriented, program goals should be identified and meaningful to the agency, the participants, and other stakeholders, (2) program components should be intentionally structured to address the stated goals, (3) progress toward desired goals must be assessed and (4) an organization must publicize its outcomes (Allen & Cooper, 2003).

Within the first step, program coordinators should refer to their organization’s mission, vision, goals and values. This will help to ensure that the program goals and objectives coincide with the users’ and stakeholders’ expectations of what program outcomes should be. Stakeholders can be identified as participants, parents of participants, local schools, governments, etc. A decrease in aggressive behavior (Collins, 2009; Johnston, 2009), grade point average (Nishina, et al., 2005) and criminal activity (Graham & Bellmore, 2007; Reisner, et al., 2007) may be goal-oriented outcomes.

The second step of the BBP encourages the program developer to gather data on successful programs that have been implemented and create a plan to develop and execute their own program. The programmer must discover the theory on which successful programs are based. He or she must then be able to find supporting literature that can be used to support the changes to the program that they will be making in order to suit the needs of the specific population. Within Johnston’s (2009) and Collins’ (2009)
programs, they each utilized a “Daily Activity Plan” in order to achieve intentional programming.

Third, the program should be evaluated. This can be done via any type of program evaluation tool including, but not limited to, questionnaires of satisfaction, surveys of skill retention that are either hand-written or electronic, focus groups, open-ended questions, etc. Often times, skill retention surveys are given before (formative) and after (summative) the implementation of a program in order to track the change in the population over time; thus tracking solely the results of the program. Johnston and Collins utilized the Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile (RASP, Hurtes, 1999) in order to measure perception levels of resiliency.

The last step in the BBP identifies the importance of sharing successful ideas with interested parties. Sharing of resources can be achieved in a variety of ways, program advertisement, newspaper and journal articles, conferences, workshops, etc. Use of the BBP model leads to a cyclical chain of events; once a successful program is publicized, another organization is given the opportunity to utilize the scheme, mold it to align with their own goals and objectives and implement and evaluate accordingly.

Summary

The previous sections concentrated on programs with respect to goals, procedures and outcomes. All topics were addressed to sufficiently outline the objectives of the afterschool program to be implemented for this study. As outlined previously, some research indicates that afterschool programming, resiliency and some benefits-based
programming models lead to academic success and a decrease in bullying in youth (Afterschool Alliance, 2004; Allen & Cooper, 2003; Hurtes, 1999). The focus of this study is to foster positive youth development through benefits based programming for a series of resiliency theory-driven afterschool activities that will decrease aggressive behaviors at an elementary school. The RASP© will be an intricate part of this study, as it may measure the effectiveness of a benefits-based, resiliency-focused, afterschool program.
Chapter 3
METHODS

The purpose of this study was to explore the perceived effects of a resiliency-based, afterschool program. This study paid specific attention to resiliency education, instances of aggressive behaviors and achievement in academic performance. This study sought to determine whether or not a drop-in afterschool program could alter a 5th or 6th graders’ perception of resiliency, change their behaviors and their study habits.

The study utilized multiple methodologies in order to address the research questions at hand. Both quantitative methods, including the RASP scores and instances of aggressive behaviors, and qualitative methods of inquiry were used. The major sections of this chapter include the following: (a) study design; (b) selection of sample; (c) instrumentation; (d) experimental treatment; (e) data collection; and (f) data analysis.

Study Design

This study utilized a quasi-experimental design, specifically the nonequivalent control group method, to study the effects of a resiliency-based program on 5th and 6th graders. This design enabled the investigator to track instances of aggressive behavior within the 5th and 6th grades, their academic performance, and their resiliency education.
Selection of Sample

The principal of an elementary school in Central New York (CNY) approached the faculty at SUNY Cortland asking to initiate change due to a problem with high occurrences of bullying during recess. The problem was occurring primarily between the 5th and 6th grade students. The Recreation, Parks and Leisure Studies Department of SUNY Cortland was able to adapt the previously instituted afterschool program from eastern Virginia to suit the needs of the elementary school. The afterschool program (Johnston, 2009) developed for 6th graders at an elementary school in eastern Virginia, was geared to promote resiliency in at-risk, inner city youth. The program was offered to all 5th and 6th graders at the elementary school in CNY and each student was given the option of whether they would like to participate or not. Within the 5th and 6th grades, there were approximately 120 students, total. Based off verbal feedback from the children during a pilot study in spring 2009, it was estimated that approximately half of the students would choose to join the League 56 Academy (afterschool program); the non-participatory half served as the comparison group. The convenience sample of participants was thus chosen for the implementation of the program.

Instrumentation

Because the seven resiliency traits of Wolin and Wolin’s (1993) theory are the foundation of the League 56 Academy, it was beneficial to measure the outcomes of the program. The Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile, (RASP; Appendix A) offers a series
of 40 “I – statements” with multiple inquiries about each of the seven resiliency traits (four items measuring creativity, four measuring humor, eight measuring independence, five measuring initiative, seven measuring insight, eight measuring relationships and four measuring values orientation). It is measured on a 6-point, likert-type scale (with 1 equaling “Strongly Disagree” and 6 equaling “Strongly Agree”) (Hurtes, 1999).

The parental version of the RASP (Appendix B) also contains forty statements; however they begin with, “My child…” rather than, “I…” For the purpose of this study, the parental version of the RASP was evaluated to determine the psychometric properties of the scale.

Although the parental portion of the RASP has not been measured for reliability and validity, the children’s version of the RASP has an internal consistency of .91 (Hurtes & Allen, 2001). Although the RASP specifically measures the seven constructs separately, the assessment shows higher levels of internal consistency for the test as a whole (Hurtes & Allen, 2001). In addition, as reported by Hurtes and Allen, the RASP is significantly correlated with the Mental Health Index; positively correlated with the Psychological Well-Being scale ($r = .47$) and negatively correlated with Psychological Distress scale ($r = -0.22$) (which is measured on a convergent validity scale of negative one to one).

Aggressive behavior or bullying was measured using the number of behavioral referrals or “pink slips”. The teachers and the aides reported the behavioral referrals to the principal during school hours through. Thus, the definition of “bullying” was left up to the supervising administrators within the school.
After the implementation of the program, the 5th and 6th grade classroom teachers were asked to answer three open-ended questions via e-mail. This was an attempt to gain qualitative feedback about their impressions of the program and their perceptions regarding the academic performance of the students who benefited from academic assistance.

**Experimental Treatment**

The 5th and 6th graders of the elementary school were referred to as “League 56” in order to build a sense of community within the school. Because the program was specifically designed for these 5th and 6th graders, it was decided that it would be called “League 56 Academy.”

A pilot program, akin to the League 56 Academy afterschool program, was instituted in the spring of 2009; however, the activities were led only by the SUNY Cortland students of the REC 380: Leadership class. Also, the group activities took place during the traditional recess time (after lunch) which had been recently converted to “recreation time.” Students had the option to participate in the League 56 Academy or to play on their own. This pilot program was the foundation for the League 56 Academy that was to be implemented in the fall of 2009.

In the fall of 2009, the children of the CNY elementary school were introduced to the League 56 Academy. League 56 Academy lasted eight weeks and during each week, one of the seven resiliency traits was targeted through intentional programming. During the last session a summary of resiliency was the focus. Following the predetermined
calendar (Appendix C), the SUNY Cortland students visited the elementary school twice each week (Tuesdays and Thursdays), afterschool, and introduced and facilitated their predetermined activities to the group.

League 56 Academy was programmed and facilitated by the SUNY Cortland students of the REC 280: Programming class and the REC380: Leadership class in order to promote resiliency in the students. The curriculum of the Programming class was designed to teach the students how to structure their allotted program time and for them to learn the proper way to accurately program in order to reach program goals. In the Leadership class, students were taught the theory of leadership and how to use their personal strengths in order to effectively lead groups (particular focus was placed on the League 56 Academy program, but leadership skills are meant to be transferable outside of the program). The Cortland students were divided into groups of three. Lab time was used in order to complete their “Weekly Activity Plan” (WAP) and practice program facilitation. The WAP consisted of the resiliency trait that they were focused on for that week, a measureable objective to target that trait, and a minimum of six activities, outlined in step-by-step instructions for implementation (Appendix D).

Each group of student leaders was assigned to program activities for one of the seven resiliency traits. After the WAPs were submitted twice (the first time for feedback, and the second for a final copy) they were distributed to all other groups for implementation during League 56 Academy. The lab time was also used in order to practice the activities with classmates in mock scenarios and gain familiarity and comfort facilitating the activities.
The program followed the same schedule (Appendix E) each session. From 2:30 p.m. until 3:05 p.m. the elementary students worked on their homework assignments with the assistance of the SUNY Cortland students. The SUNY students provided academic assistance in a different subject matter as per the request of the homeroom teacher. At 3:05 p.m., the students had the opportunity to have a snack, which was provided to them through the USDA grant for afterschool programs. Elementary students then checked in with their group leaders and participated in a large, high-energy activity designed to get them moving and ready for the afternoon. Next, the elementary students were split into seven randomly assigned small groups for the remainder of the program where they participated in an intentionally programmed, resiliency-focused activity. Following the activities, students engaged in a debriefing session utilizing open-ended questions, tangible objects, and writing materials in order to help them process their experiences.

**Data Collection**

Letters explaining the program, a copy of the survey, and parental permission for children to participate in human subject research were sent to the parents (Appendix F). This survey was the Resiliency and Attitudes Skills Profile (RASP) instrument developed by Hurtes (1999). Institutional Review Board (IRB) approved this study in March of 2009 (Appendix G).

During the first week of the League 56 Academy program, all the 5th and 6th grade students were asked to complete the RASP. The survey administrator, who was the students’ respective teacher, asked the students to complete the questionnaire honestly.
and to the best of their ability. It was explained to the students that their participation was entirely voluntary and if they chose to not participate that they could simply return the sheet to the envelope after the survey had begun. Those who completed the survey placed their sheets in the same envelope.

In addition to the pre-test described above, a post-test was administered to the students one week after the completion of the program. Questions in this survey were the same as those in the pre-test and were distributed and collected in the same manner. The envelopes were then sealed and returned to the faculty researchers at SUNY Cortland.

Along with this test, the parents of the 5th and 6th graders were also administered a similar RASP survey. Like the child version, the parent survey was also administered before and after the completion of the League 56 Academy. The package that was sent home included a brochure, permission slip, afterschool pick-up and medical form and the parent RASP. The primary home caregivers were asked to send their completed RASP to school with their children, who would then give it to the homeroom teachers. The teachers then delivered the RASP surveys to the faculty researchers at SUNY Cortland.

**Data Analysis**

The scores on the RASP were evaluated using SPSS Version 17.0. The dependent variable evaluated was the students’ level of resiliency, whereas the independent variable was his or her their participation and/or involvement in League 56 Academy. In order to analyze the scores for each variable, the participants in the study were divided into seven separate groups and the mean scores were cross-compared using independent t-tests.
Descriptive statistics show the overall mean score of resilience for each group and the $t$-tests show whether a significant difference occurred between each of the groups (Table 1).

Table 1

*Comparison Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Test</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Participants</td>
<td>Pre-Test</td>
<td>Post-Test</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aggressive behavior (bullying) was measured by simple, descriptive statistics; academic performance was measured qualitatively. Number of referrals was recorded for the 5th and 6th graders at six weeks prior to the implementation of the program, eight weeks during the program, and five weeks following the program. Rather than studying the referrals assigned to the participants or non-participants, a more accurate assessment was to consider the overall numbers for the 5th and 6th graders because of interactions that may occur between participants and non-participants. Teachers responded to three open-ended questions regarding students’ academic performance. The students of SUNY Cortland provided this academic assistance. Teachers’ responses to the questions were analyzed regarding elementary students’ by way of thematic trends of academic performance.
Chapter 4
RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to explore the perceived effects of a resiliency-based, afterschool program. This study specifically focused on levels of resiliency, instances of aggressive behaviors, and achievement in academic performance. This chapter illustrates the results of the implementation of a resiliency model during an afterschool program at a local elementary school. The results chapter is divided into the following sections: (a) descriptive statistics and response rate; (b) factor and reliability analysis of RASP traits; (c) mean scores of participants and non-participants; (d) factor and reliability analysis of parental RASP traits; (e) descriptive analysis of aggressive behaviors; and (f) academic performance evaluation.

Descriptive Statistics and Response Rate

The League 56 Academy program was available and accessible to all 69 fifth and 60 sixth graders at the elementary school. Of the 129 potential participants, 79 consented to participate in the study, resulting in a 61% response rate. Average attendance ranged from zero to 13 in each of the seven small groups and had a mean attendance of 32 students overall, at each session (see Figure 1).
Prior to exploring any relationships in the data, confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) with Varimax Rotation were performed to determine if the variables within the RASP constructs (i.e., the constructs representing each of the hypothesized resiliency traits) were valid and reliable. The sampling adequacy was evaluated by running the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity on each of the constructs. Each construct that displayed values of KMO of more than 0.60 and a significant Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity value (p<0.05) was accepted as meeting the

Figure 1. Number of attendees at League 56 Academy portrayed by group association.
minimum requirements for sampling adequacy in order to perform validity and reliability analyses (Tabacknick & Fidell, 1996). Once validity of the items was assessed, they were subjected to a reliability analysis (Cronbach’s alpha >0.60). On this basis, some items were removed from the constructs during the CFA (validity check), while others were removed during the reliability analysis to ensure a stronger (more reliable) scaled variable (construct). Items which exhibited factor loadings greater than 0.60 for each of the constructs were retained.

Table 2 indicates there were 40 items which were used to measure seven dimensions/subscales (i.e., insight, creativity, relationships, initiative, humor, independence, and values). Because the RASP was conceptualized as a multidimensional measure of resiliency (Hurtes, 1999; Hurtes & Allen, 2001), the approach taken for this analysis involved two validity tests. The first test was to confirm the internal validity of the subscales (dimensions) of the RASP, and the second check was to test the external validity by noting that the items loading high on the subscale they were supposed to load on did not load higher on other scales when all the “confirmed” subscales were entered into a final exploratory factor analysis. Theoretically, if the validity of each of the items measuring the subscales holds true (internal validity), then when put in with the other subscales, those same items should not load higher on other scales (external validity). To do so would violate the tenets of validity (Gómez, personal communication, April 15, 2010).

Once the validity had been assessed, each subscale (and overall scale) was then subjected to a reliability analysis. If the subscale was found to be reliable, then a new “composite variable” was created. If the subscale was not reliable (each item within the
subscale increased the subscale’s alpha coefficient) items loading lower were removed and the remaining items were then re-tested for validity via factor analysis. If all factors held, the reliability was then reassessed. Assuming all subscales passed the validity and reliability checks, the composite variables were then subjected to an overall factor analysis of the RASP construct, with the subscales (composite variables) used as items for the RASP construct. In the following analyses, the subscales will be referred to as “traits.” The reported factor loadings and alpha reliability are found in Table 2. The components are each discussed with respect to the validity and reliability assessment of the creativity, insight, relationships, humor, independence, initiative, and values traits.

Table 2

*RASP – Items after Validity & Reliability Checks*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items for the Creativity Trait ($\alpha = .588$)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. I can imagine the consequences of my actions.</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. When I’m faced with a tough situation, I come up with new ways to handle it.</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>1.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I can come up with different ways to let out my feelings.</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>1.454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I can entertain myself.</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items for the Insight Trait ($\alpha = .603$)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. I learn from my mistakes.</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>1.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I notice small changes in facial expressions.</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I know when I’m good at something.</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>1.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I can change my behavior to match the situation.</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>1.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. When something goes wrong, I can tell if it was my fault.</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I can sense when someone is not telling the truth.</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I can tell what mood someone is in just by looking at him/her.</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>1.384</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### RASP – Items after Validity & Reliability Checks (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items for the Humor Trait (α = .696)</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11. My sense of humor makes it easier to deal with tough situations.</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I look for the &quot;lighter side&quot; of tough situations.</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>1.421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Laughter helps me deal with stress.</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>1.697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. When I’m in a bad mood, I can cheer myself up.</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.617</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items for the Independence Trait (α = .661)</th>
<th>Removed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. I can deal with whatever comes in the future.</td>
<td>Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I say “no” to things that I don’t want to do.</td>
<td>Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. It’s OK if I don’t see things the way other people do.</td>
<td>Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. It’s OK if some people do not like me.</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I am comfortable making my own decisions.</td>
<td>5.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I control my own life.</td>
<td>Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I avoid situations where I could get into trouble.</td>
<td>Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I share my ideas and opinions even if they are different from other people’s.</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items for the Relationship Trait (α = .833)</th>
<th>Removed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. My friends know they can count on me.</td>
<td>5.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My family is there for me when I need them.</td>
<td>5.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I avoid people who could get me into trouble.</td>
<td>Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I choose my friends carefully.</td>
<td>5.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I’m good at keeping friendships going.</td>
<td>5.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I have friends who will back me up.</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I can be myself around my friends.</td>
<td>5.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. I make friends easily.</td>
<td>Removed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items for the Initiative Trait (α = .678)</th>
<th>Removed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. When my work is criticized, I try harder the next time.</td>
<td>4.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Once I set a goal for myself, I don’t let anything stop me from reaching it.</td>
<td>4.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I can change my surroundings.</td>
<td>Removed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I try to figure out things that I don’t understand.</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. When something bad happens to me, I don’t give up.</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items for the Values Orientation Trait (α = .702)</th>
<th>Removed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. I’m prepared to deal with the consequences of my actions.</td>
<td>4.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Lying is unacceptable.</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. I try to help others.</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I stand up for what I believe is right.</td>
<td>5.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Creativity trait. In the questionnaire, creativity was measured using four items. Initially, a confirmatory factor analysis was performed. Three of the items had factor loadings sufficient to consider them as underlying measures of creativity, however item 39 (“I can entertain myself.”) exhibited a factor loading of 0.031 and was therefore excluded from the reliability analysis of the RASP construct. The three remaining items measuring creativity are listed in Table 2 and had factor loadings of 0.801, 0.746 and 0.619 respectively. A factor loading represents the correlation of the item with the underlying construct, in this case creativity. Thus, a very strong relationship was identified between the items and the underlying support construct they are measuring.

A reliability analysis of the items resulted in a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.588, which was interpreted as a low level of internal consistency. However, consequent deletion of any item would not improve the scale reliability; thus the three items measuring resiliency’s creativity trait were retained. Based on sample scores, items 6, 22 and 23 were provided evidence of validity and reliability.

Insight trait. The initial confirmatory factor analysis of the seven items intended to measure the insight trait of RASP resulted in a KMO of 0.701 and a significant result of Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity (p = 0.0001). However, the factor loadings component matrix revealed two dimensions of the insight trait. Further analysis showed that Items 15 and 21 (“When something goes wrong, I can tell if it was my fault.” and “I can sense when someone is not telling the truth.”) were loading approximately equal on both dimensions. This constitutes a case of invalidity; therefore the items were removed
during the reliability analysis. A test of reliability resulted in a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.603 and therefore suggested a minimally acceptable level of reliability.

**Humor trait.** The initial factor analysis of the four items intended to measure the humor trait of the RASP resulted in a KMO of 0.724 and a significant result of Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity \( p = 0.0001 \). All items had factor loadings sufficient to consider them as measuring humor; therefore, none were excluded from the reliability analysis of the RASP construct.

A reliability analysis of the items resulted in a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.696, which was interpreted as a moderate level of internal consistency. Consequent deletion of any item would not improve the scale reliability; thus the items measuring resiliency’s humor trait were retained. The subscale was found to be valid and reliable.

**Independence trait.** The first confirmatory factor analysis of the eight items included in independence resulted in a KMO of 0.779 and a significant level of Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity \( p = 0.0001 \), confirming good sampling adequacy and valid factor measures. The factor loadings component matrix, however, demonstrated that there were two dimensions of independence. Three of the items (2, 26, and 34 or “I can deal with whatever comes in the future,” “I control my own life,” and “I avoid situations where I could get into trouble,” respectively) had factor loadings below the critical value of 0.60 (0.429, 0.301, and 0.323, respectively) and were removed from the analysis.

Reliability analysis was performed on the remaining five items. Cronbach’s alpha was 0.72 and 0.611, respectively. Deletion of item 9 (“I say “no” to things that I don’t want to do.”) improved the scale reliability; thus, the four items remaining measuring resiliency’s independent trait were analyzed for internal validity.
The second factor analysis, consisting of items 16, 19, 20 and 38, and resulted in a KMO of 0.707. However Item 16 (“It’s OK if I don’t see things the way other people do.”) measured at .568, below the minimum accepted value and was consequently removed for the reliability analysis.

The final reliability analysis resulted in a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.661, an acceptable level for reliability, and deletion of items would not increase this value. Therefore the remaining three items measuring independence were valid and reliable for this subscale.

**Relationship trait.** The initial confirmatory factor analysis of the relationship items resulted in a KMO value of 0.757 and a significant Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity ($p = 0.0001$). The exploration of the factor loadings component matrix revealed two dimensions. Similar to the previous analysis, one item (40, “I make friends easily.”) was dropped due to the factor loading (0.587). Also, similar to the previous analysis, the second dimension did not make substantive sense, so it was not included in the analysis. Due to the deletion, seven items were utilized in the reliability test.

Cronbach’s alpha for the reliability analysis was a 0.818, which was interpreted as a high level of internal consistency. The deletion of Item 18 (“I avoid people who could get me into trouble.”) increased the scale reliability; thus item 18 measuring resiliency’s relationship trait was removed.

The second factor analysis included items 12, 14, 24, 31, 32, and 35. This resulted in a KMO of 0.814 and all factor loadings for the items were above the acceptable level.
The final reliability test resulted in a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.833 and consequent deletion of any items would not improve this value. Reliability and validity for the six items measuring relationship were acceptable.

**Initiative trait.** The initial factor analysis of the initiative items resulted in a KMO value of 0.780 and a significant Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity (\(p = 0.0001\)). The exploration of the factor loadings component matrix revealed a unidimensional construct. One item, however (13, “I can change my surroundings.”), measured 0.582 and was removed before the reliability test.

The Cronbach’s alpha for the reliability analysis on initiative was a 0.678, which was interpreted as an adequate level of internal consistency. Deletion of any items would not improve the value; thus the four items remained.

**Values orientation trait.** The initial factor analysis of the four items intended to measure the values orientation trait of the RASP resulted in a KMO of 0.744 and a significant result of Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity (\(p = 0.0001\)). All items had factor loadings sufficient to consider them as measuring values orientation and therefore were retained for the reliability analysis.

A reliability analysis of the items resulted in a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.702, which was interpreted as a moderate level of internal consistency. Consequent deletion of any item would not improve the scale reliability; thus the four items measuring resiliency’s values orientation trait were retained. Subscale items were found to be valid and the scale reliable.

**Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile (RASP).** As a final step in the confirmatory factor analysis, the seven subscales were converted to items (composite
measures) measuring the RASP. Factor analysis and reliability analysis were performed on the seven subscale items of the RASP in order to measure external validity (e.g., items from the insight, creativity, humor, independence, relationship, initiative, and values orientation subscales). The initial factor analysis resulted in a KMO value of 0.821 and a significant result ($p = 0.0001$) of the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity, which confirmed that all components represented a valid measure of the RASP construct.

A principle components factor analysis was run with Varimax rotation. The hypothesis was that there would be seven factors (traits) identified after the rotation process. However, it was found that 8 factors were identified. Furthermore, factor loadings were assessed in terms of parsimony (i.e., they load only on the hypothesized factor, otherwise they would be discarded), and that they still met the criterion of greater than 0.60 in order to be retained. Not every hypothesized trait “held” in the analysis. Some traits lost items due to the cross loading of items on other traits, and only a marginal number of the traits were empirically sound. Table 3 shows the means and standard deviations for each subscale.

Table 3

RASP Subscale Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Items for the Creativity Trait</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items for the Insight Trait</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items for the Humor Trait</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items for the Independence Trait</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items for the Relationship Trait</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items for the Initiative Trait</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items for the Values Orientation Trait</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mean Scores of Participants and Non-Participants

Of the 79 students selected to participate in the study, 32 of the pre and post test scores were able to be matched based upon the coding system (last four digits of home phone number). Participation in the program was measured by attending eight sessions, one more than half of the meetings offered. Thirteen of the study participants were labeled as “participants” in League 56 Academy and six of the study participants did not attend the afterschool program, labeled “non-participants”. The remaining 13 matched sets of RASPs were unable to be identified as participants or non-participants and were consequently removed from the dataset. Scores within groups were assessed using paired samples t-tests to compare participant pretest scores with participant posttest scores and non-participants’ pretest scores with non-participant posttest scores. Additionally, gain scores between groups were assessed using independent samples t-tests. Because the RASP had already been evaluated for validity and reliability, it is important to look at mean scores for both the 40 item scale and the proposed 29-item scale.

40 Item scale results. When looking at whether there are differences in RASP scores between participants and non-participants of the afterschool program, there was a significant difference between participants’ pretest ($M = 4.349$, $SD = 0.85$) and posttest scores ($M = 4.518$, $SD = 0.90$), with $t(12) = -0.745$, $p < .05$. The effect size of the League 56 Academy manipulation was $r^2_{pb} = 0.044$. Furthermore, when looking at differences between pretest ($M = 4.146$, $SD = 0.506$) and posttest ($M = 4.265$, $SD = 0.547$) scores for non-participants, there was no significant difference ($p > .05$) found. When taking the
gain scores (means of pretest minus posttest for each group), the difference in independent samples t-test scores was not significant.

Table 4

RASP – 40 Item Scale Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.854</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.897</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.043</td>
<td>-0.745</td>
<td>0.045*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Participant</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>0.506</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.041</td>
<td>-0.504</td>
<td>0.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain Scores</td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>0.606</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*significant at (p < 0.05)

29 Item scale results. When looking at whether there are differences in RASP scores between participants and non-participants of the afterschool program based on the 29 item scale, there was not a significant difference between participants’ pretest (M = 4.279, SD = 0.910) and posttest scores (M = 4.497, SD = 0.933) (p = 0.051). Furthermore, when looking at differences between pretest (M = 4.161, SD = 0.458) and posttest (M = 4.280, SD = 0.573), with t(12) = -0.695, p < .05. The effect size of the League 56 Academy manipulation was $\rho^2 = 0.039$. When looking at scores for non-participants, there was no significant difference (p = 0.0443) found. When taking the gain scores (means of pretest minus posttest for each group), the difference in independent t-test scores was not significant. It is important to highlight that the mean difference was identical in both gain scores.
Table 5

*RASP – 29 Item Scale Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>0.910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-0.695</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non- Participant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>0.573</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>-0.115</td>
<td>-0.503</td>
<td>0.443</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at (p < 0.05)

**Factor and Reliability Analyses of Parental RASP Traits**

The parental version of the RASP was evaluated using the same criterion for accepting and rejecting potential scale items. Thirty-eight parents returned the completed RASP. Table 6 indicates the items which were evaluated.
Table 6
*Parental RASP – Items after Validity & Reliability Checks*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>$M$</th>
<th>$SD$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items for the Creativity Trait ($\alpha = .870$)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My child can imagine the consequences of my actions.</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.353</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. My child comes up with new ways to handle difficult situations.</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>1.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. My child can come up with different ways to let out his or her feelings.</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. My child can entertain his or her self.</td>
<td><em>Removed</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items for the Insight Trait ($\alpha = .819$)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My child learns from their mistakes.</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. My child notices small changes in facial expressions.</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>1.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. My child knows when they are good at something.</td>
<td><em>Removed</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My child can change their behavior to match the situation.</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. When something goes wrong, my child can tell if it was his or her fault.</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. My child can sense when someone is not telling the truth.</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. My child can tell what mood someone is in just by looking at him/her.</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items for the Humor Trait ($\alpha = .824$)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My child’s sense of humor makes it easier to deal with tough situations.</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. My child looks for the &quot;lighter side&quot; of tough situations.</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>1.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Laughter helps my child deal with stress.</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. When my child is in a bad mood, I can he or she can cheer them self up.</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>1.913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items for the Independence Trait ($\alpha = .803$)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My child can deal with whatever comes in the future.</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. My child says “no” to things that he/she doesn’t want to do.</td>
<td><em>Removed</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My child knows it’s OK if they don’t see things the way other people do.</td>
<td><em>Removed</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. My child knows it’s OK if some people do not like them.</td>
<td><em>Removed</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My child is comfortable making their own decisions.</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. My child controls his/her own life.</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>1.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. My child avoids situations where they could get into trouble.</td>
<td><em>Removed</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. My child shares their ideas and opinions even if they are different from other people’s.</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.273</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Parental RASP – Items after Validity & Reliability Checks (cont.)

### Items for the Relationship Trait \((\alpha = .917)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12. My child’s friends know they can count on him/her.</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My child knows their family is there for him/her when they need them.</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My child avoids people who could get them into trouble.</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. My child chooses their friends carefully.</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. My child is good at keeping friendships going.</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. My child has friends who will back him/her up.</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. My child can be his/her self around my friends.</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>1.209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. My child can make friends easily.</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.457</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Items for the Initiative Trait \((\alpha = .845)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. When my child’s work is criticized, they try harder the next time.</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>1.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Once my child sets a goal for themselves, they don’t let anything stop them from reaching it.</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. My child can change his/her surroundings.</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>1.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. My child tries to figure out things that they don’t understand.</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>1.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. When something bad happens to my child, they don’t give up.</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.437</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Items for the Values Orientation Trait \((\alpha = .700)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. My child is prepared to deal with the consequences of their actions.</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. My child thinks that lying is unacceptable.</td>
<td>Removed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. My child tries to help others.</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>0.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. My child stand up for what they believe is right.</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>0.959</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Creativity trait.** In the questionnaire, creativity was measured using four items. Initially, a confirmatory factor analysis was performed. Three of the items had factor loadings sufficient to consider them as measuring creativity, however Item 39 (i.e., “My child can entertain his or her self.”) exhibited a factor loading of 0.451 and was therefore excluded from the reliability analysis of the RASP construct. The three remaining items measuring creativity are listed in Table 2 and had factor loadings of 0.879, 0.845 and
0.896 respectively. A very strong relationship is identified between the items and the underlying support construct they are measuring.

A reliability analysis of the items resulted in a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.864, which was interpreted as a high level of reliability that the items consistently measured creativity. Consequent deletion of any item would not improve the scale reliability, thus the three items measuring resiliency’s creativity trait were retained. Based on sample scores, items 6, 22 and 23 were provided evidence of validity and reliability.

**Insight trait.** The initial factor analysis of the seven items intended to measure the insight trait of RASP resulted in a KMO of 0.824 and a significant result of Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity ($p = 0.0001$). Item 7 (“My child knows when they are good at something.”) had a factor loading lower than the acceptable level (0.557) and was therefore removed before the reliability test.

A test of reliability resulted in a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.816 and therefore suggested an adequate level of reliability. Consequent deletion of any items would not increase the alpha, thus the remaining items were kept, adequately measuring the insight trait for reliability and validity.

**Humor trait.** The initial factor analysis of the four items intended to measure the humor trait of the RASP resulted in a KMO of 0.762 and a significant result of Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity ($p = 0.0001$). All items had factor loadings sufficient to consider them as measuring humor therefore none were excluded from the reliability analysis of the RASP construct.

A reliability analysis of the items resulted in a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.824, which was interpreted as a moderate level of reliability that the items consistently measured
humor. Consequent deletion of any item would not improve the scale reliability, thus the items measuring resiliency’s humor trait were retained. The subscale was found to be valid and reliable.

**Independence trait.** The first factor analysis of the eight items included in independence resulted in a KMO of 0.721 and a significant level of Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity ($p = 0.0001$), confirming good sampling adequacy and valid factor measures. The factor loadings component matrix, however, demonstrated that there were two dimensions of independence. Three of the items (9, 19, and 34 or “My child says ‘no’ to things that he/she doesn’t want to do,” “My child knows it’s OK if some people do not like them,” and “My child avoids situations where they could get into trouble,” respectively) had factor loadings below the critical value of 0.60 (0.405, 0.583, and 0.078 respectively) and were removed from the analysis.

Reliability analysis was performed on the subscale. Cronbach’s alpha was 0.798. Deletion of item 16 (“My child knows it’s OK if they don’t see things the way other people do.”) improved the scale reliability, thus the four items remaining measuring resiliency’s independent trait were again analyzed for validity.

The second factor analysis, consisting of items 2, 20, 26 and 38 resulted in a KMO of 0.755 and all items were above the accepted level of 0.60.

The final reliability analysis resulted in a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.803, a high level for reliability and deletion of items would not increase this value. Therefore the remaining three items measuring independence are valid and reliable for this subscale.

**Relationship trait.** The initial factor analysis of the relationship items resulted in a KMO value of 0.812 and a significant Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity ($p = 0.0001$). The
exploration of the factor loadings component matrix revealed two dimensions. However no items were dropped before the reliability analysis due to high factor loadings.

Cronbach’s alpha for the reliability analysis was a 0.887, which was interpreted as a high level of reliability that the items measure relationships. Consequent deletion of Item 14 (“My child knows their family is there for him/her when they need them.”) would improve the scale reliability, thus Item 14 was removed for the following factor analysis.

The second factor analysis included Items 12, 18, 24, 31, 32, 35 and 40. This resulted in a KMO of 0.812 and all factor loadings for the items were above the acceptable level; however Items 18 and 24 loaded on a second factor.

The second reliability test resulted in a Cronbach’s Alpha of 0.900 and consequent deletion of Item 18 (“My child avoids people who could get them into trouble.”) would improve this value. Thus this item was removed for the following factor analysis.

The factor analysis resulted in a KMO of 0.818 and factor loadings were above the acceptable level, therefore these six items were subjected to another test of reliability.

The third reliability test resulted in a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.904 and deletion of Item 24 (“My child chooses their friends carefully.”) would increase the scale reliability and it was therefore removed for the following factor analysis.

The factor analysis resulted in KMO of 0.859 and factor loadings were above the acceptable level, therefore these six items were subjected to another test of reliability.
The fourth reliability test resulted in a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.917 and deletion of Item 12 (“My child’s friends know they can count on him/her.”) would increase the scale reliability and it was therefore removed for the following factor analysis.

The factor analysis resulted in KMO of 0.813 and factor loadings were above the acceptable level, therefore these six items were subjected to another test of reliability.

The last reliability test resulted in a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.917 and deletion of any items would not increase the scale reliability and therefore the remaining four items, (31, 32, 35 and 40) are a valid and reliable measure of the relationship trait.

**Initiative trait.** The initial factor analysis of the initiative items resulted in a KMO value of 0.796 and a significant Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity ($p = 0.0001$). The exploration of the factor loadings component matrix revealed a unidimensional structure and all items held with values above 0.60.

The Cronbach’s alpha for the reliability analysis on initiative was a 0.845, which was interpreted as an adequate level of reliability that the items measure the initiative trait. Deletion of any items would not improve the value, thus the four items remained.

**Values orientation trait.** The initial factor analysis of the four items intended to measure the values orientation trait of the RASP resulted in a KMO of 0.622 and a significant result of Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity ($p = 0.0001$). All items had factor loadings sufficient to consider them as measuring values orientation, however the items loaded on two separate components, therefore all four items remained for the reliability analysis.

A reliability analysis of the items resulted in a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.700, which was interpreted as a moderate level of reliability that the items consistently measured
values orientation. Deletion of Item 17, (“My child thinks that lying is unacceptable.”) would improve the scale reliability, thus the item was removed measuring values orientation before being subjected to another factor analysis.

With the second confirmatory factor analysis, a KMO of .626 was represented and all three items loaded on an acceptable level, therefore the remaining three items were kept for the reliability test.

A reliability analysis of the items resulted in a Cronbach’s alpha of 0.723.

Deletion of Item 8, (“My child is prepared to deal with the consequences of their actions.”) would improve the scale reliability, thus the item was removed measuring resiliency’s values orientation before being subjected to another factor analysis.

With the Factor Analysis, a KMO of .500 was which is below the acceptable level and though deletion of Item 8 would increase the reliability, it would decrease the validity below the minimum level of acceptance, therefore it was decided to keep Item 8 and the resulting Cronbach’s Alpha is 0.723.

**Parental version of the Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile (RASP).** As a final step in the factor analysis, the seven subscales were converted to items (composite measures) measuring the RASP. Factor analysis and reliability analysis were performed on the seven subscale items of the RASP (e.g., items from the insight, creativity, humor, independence, relationship, initiative, and values orientation subscales). The initial factor analysis resulted in a KMO value of 0.524 and a significant result ($p = 0.0001$) of the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity, which falls below a valid measure of the RASP construct.

A principle components factor analysis was run with Varimax rotation. The hypothesis was that there would be seven factors (traits) identified after the rotation
process. However, it was found that six factors were identified. Furthermore, factor loadings were assessed in terms of parsimony (i.e., they load only on the hypothesized factor, otherwise they would be discarded), and that they still meet the criterion of greater than 0.60 in order to be retained. Not every hypothesized trait “held” in the analysis. Some traits lost items due to the cross loading of items on other traits, only the minority of the traits were empirically sound (most of which were of the relationships trait). Table 7 shows the means and standard deviations for each subscale.

Table 7

Parental RASP Subscale Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Items for the Creativity Trait</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items for the Insight Trait</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items for the Humor Trait</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items for the Independence Trait</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items for the Relationship Trait</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items for the Initiative Trait</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Items for the Values Orientation Trait</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Descriptive Analysis of Aggressive Behaviors

According to results from Rosero (2010), the principal at an elementary school in Cortland, NY, there were zero behavioral referrals (“pink slips”) for the duration of the fall semester for 5th graders. Before the program was instituted, (month of September 2009, 17 school days) there were zero aggressive behaviors reported for 6th grade students. During the extent of the 8-week program (October through November 2009, 36 school days) there were five behavioral referrals (all males) submitted to the faculty. For
the month of December, (17 days) there were five referrals (one female, and four males).

Table 6 indicates that the frequency of aggressive behaviors rose 62% after the program had ended.

Table 8

*Instances of Aggressive Behaviors as reported by the Principal*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>School Days</th>
<th>Number of Aggressive Behaviors</th>
<th>Percentage of Aggressive Behaviors*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Before</td>
<td>September</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During</td>
<td>October &amp; November</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After</td>
<td>December</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Measured by: School Days/Number of Aggressive Behaviors

**Academic Performance Evaluation**

Because numerical averages of students’ grades were unavailable to the researchers, the 5th and 6th grade teachers were e-mailed a qualitative inquiry after the implementation of League 56 Academy. The survey consisted of only three questions, “Do you think any of your students benefited from the academic assistance that was provided to them in the Fall League 56 Academy program?” “If so, to what extent?” “Keeping anonymity, can you please provide an example?” Due to a limitation of respondents, a restricted amount of information exists for this research component.

When asked, “Do you think any of your students benefited from the academic assistance that was provided to them in the Fall League 56 Academy program?” A sixth grade teacher responded, “Definitely.”
When asked, “Do you think any of your students benefited from the academic assistance that was provided to them in the Fall League 56 Academy program?” “If so, to what extent?” A sixth grade teacher’s response was, “Many sixth-graders looked forward to working with the SUNY students. Even students who were not struggling with the content enjoyed working with the SUNY [Cortland] students because they made personal connections with them. Students who struggle with homework completion had the opportunity to get it done in study hall, and felt great about it. They were earning recess the following day, and learning.”
Chapter 5

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to explore the perceived effects of a resiliency-based, afterschool program. This study focused on levels of resiliency, instances of aggressive behaviors and achievement in academic performance.

This chapter illustrates the summary of the implementation of a resiliency model during an afterschool program at a local elementary school. The conclusions in this chapter are introduced in the following manner: (a) summary of procedures; (b) summary of findings; (c) conclusions; (d) discussion and implications; and (e) recommendations.

Summary of Procedures

This study was a quasi-experimental design that was used to study the effects of a resiliency-based afterschool program. In accordance with the four-step, Benefits-Based Programming (BBP) model (Allen, et. al, 1998), stakeholders, including participants, parents, school board, school administrators and teachers, were all taken into consideration when creating the outcome oriented program goals. The sample was hand-selected (consisting of 5th and 6th graders at a local elementary school in Central New
York, in order to address an issue with a prominent number of aggressive behaviors within that population.

Next, theories and previous, successful courses were studied in order to create a successful program that this population would benefit from (i.e., positive youth development [Cheon, 2008], RALLY afterschool program [Johnston, 2009], resiliency literature [Wolin & Wolin, 1993], benefits of afterschool programming [Witt, 2005], etc.) The afterschool program, League 56 Academy, was identified as the experimental treatment and the elementary students had the choice of whether or not they attended (drop-in style). The goals of the program were three-fold: to instill resiliency in participants, decrease occurrences of aggressive behaviors and increase academic performance within the 5th and 6th grades.

Third, multiple measures were taken in order to assess progress towards desired goals. In order to assess progress in the area of resiliency, RASP pretests and post-tests were administered to both participants and non-participants, and were coded using the last four digits of their home phone number. Results from this data collection were assessed using SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) version 17.0. Reliability, validity and significance tests were all run with this data. Additionally, to assess aggressive behaviors, the faculty researchers were given information from the elementary school principal regarding the numbers of aggressive behaviors that occurred before, during and after the program implementation. In order to evaluate whether or not the academic assistance piece was beneficial to the elementary students, teachers were asked to answer three open-ended questions via e-mail. A fourth measure was also taken in order to assess the program in the future; this was the addition of the parental version of
the RASP. In this study, it was evaluated for psychometric properties, thus enabling its use in future studies.

Continuing with the last step of the BBP model, the program accomplishments have been publicized. An article in the local paper was published in order to inform the local public about the practices. Furthermore the program coordinators have spoken at multiple conferences and community events about the undertakings, outcomes and benefits of League 56 Academy.

**Limitations**

While an overall focus and use of resiliency seems to be a potential antidote to meet the needs of youth, it is important to note that it takes ample time and effort to combine a number of organizations, individuals, and teaching concepts to accurately tailor a program that provides benefits a particular population can use in order to enhance their general well-being. It is imperative to note that this is the first year in which a program such as this being instituted in conjunction with a single elementary school (targeted at 5th and 6th grade students), a University, and a resiliency based component that guides the entire program. There are limited effects (positive or negative), as of yet, being seen in League 56 Academy due to limited data. Overall, the methods and analyses of this study were limited due to the new and early stages of development of a program like League 56 Academy and the data collection process.

Data collection and coding was extremely problematic for this study. One of the primary concerns involved the matching of the “last four digits” of the elementary
student’s phone number. This was difficult because phone numbers changed in the course of a year, students forgot their number from pre to post test, some had multiple phone numbers (e.g., one for mother, one for father, or cellular versus home phone), and some students (e.g., siblings) may have had the same last four numbers (making it difficult to distinguish one set from the other). This was also made difficult due to illegible handwriting and a change of a telephone number during the year for some of the participants.

There was also a lack of response from the elementary school teachers when encouraged to answer questions about their students’ academic performance. Though the teachers were prompted twice within a three-week period, only one teacher was inclined to respond.

**Summary of Findings**

The identified RASP dimensions in the present study (i.e., creativity, insight, independence, relationships, initiative, relationship, humor and values orientation) besides demonstrating statistical validity and reliability, also confirm previous research on resiliency. The results of the present study support previous research on the dimensions of resiliency. As Wolin and Wolin (1993) initially suggested, the seven resiliency traits all measured the overall resiliency attribute, as operationalized by the RASP (Hurtes & Allen, 2001). Unlike, Johnston’s (2009) study, which found support for combining the “insight” and “creativity” traits into one trait, evidence in this study and in Collins’ (2009) suggested that the these two resiliency traits should remain separated.
The RASP was confirmed to incorporate the dimensions of creativity, insight, independence, relationships, initiative, humor, and values orientation; therefore the present study can be regarded as a confirmation of previous research. More research is needed, however, to continue to test all the items, as there were some discrepancies between this study, Collins’, and Johnson’s exploration of the resiliency traits.

With respect to the RASP as a measure of resiliency, most of the items used to measure resiliency held up to the various iterations of reliability and validity analyses. However, because in some cases, stark differences were found between this study’s findings, in relation to Collins’ (2009) and Johnston’s (2009) studies, replication of the RASP on the same and other populations should continue.

In relation to the components of the RASP construct, the resiliency trait that presented the highest Cronbach’s Alpha was Relationships (0.833) noting it was the most consistent measure; again supporting findings from Collins (2009). Additionally, the relationship trait also had the highest mean. The next highest means and alphas that were assessed were those of the values orientation construct. This finding does not support the findings of previous studies, as it was found that initiative tended to have the second highest means and alphas. The lowest Cronbach’s Alpha was that of Creativity (0.588). This finding does not support the findings of previous studies as prior studies indicate that humor was the lowest alpha. These findings showcase why some resiliency traits need to be emphasized more within the afterschool program to ensure the constructs are understood. The proposed idea of an in-school component may help this concern.
**Research Hypothesis 1**

It was hypothesized that there would be a decreased number of aggressive behaviors as measured by reported number of referrals before, during and after the program. This hypothesis was accepted. Over the course of eight weeks (during the program), there were only five incidents of aggressive behaviors. After the program ended, there were five more, over a four-week period. This indicates that there was the same number of aggressive behaviors, over twice the amount of time, after League 56 Academy ended. The program had a positive impact on aggressive behavior as evidenced by the 62% decrease of referrals during the program.

**Research Hypothesis 2**

Compared to the pre-test scores on the RASP, experimental group would show significantly increased levels of resiliency in post-test scores. Accept the hypothesis. Given the results of the dependent t-test, (of the 40 item RASP) it was indicated that participants had a significant increase in scores. The 29 item RASP, given a larger sample size, could be more user-friendly instrument; this was concluded based on the p value (.051) measuring level of significance.
**Research Hypothesis 3**

Students who were able to utilize the academic support offered by the college students would have an increase in academic performance. Fail to reject the null hypothesis. With the responses from the homeroom teacher of the fifth and sixth grade students, it is acceptable to claim that the academic assistance is beneficial to the students.

**Research Hypothesis 4**

The parent version of the RASP is a valid and reliable measure of resiliency. Accept the hypothesis. After testing the psychometric properties of the parental version of the RASP, it is acceptable to suggest that the RASP should be decreased to 29 items and administered to the parents again.

**Conclusions**

Similar to previous findings, this study found a significant difference between participating in recreational activities and achieving more benefits of resiliency (e.g., Collins, 2009). With the use of a paired samples $t$-test to analyze the 19 participants who completed the pre and post (40 item RASP) test, the data revealed that there was a significant difference between pretest and posttest scores. However, (it is speculated that)
due to a limited sample size (19), there was no significant difference found from pretest to post-test using the 29 item RASP.

**Discussion and Implications**

The use of recreational activities for fifth and sixth grade students seemed to correlate well with past studies regarding the use of recreation in an afterschool program. The students were excited to participate in the activities and a number of individual behaviors increased in positivity as they became comfortable with program leaders (SUNY Cortland’s Recreation, Parks and Leisure Studies’ students) as suggested they would by Witt (2005). Also, the activities were a great way for the youngsters to relieve energy, as they had been in school for over six hours, sitting in classes, with minimal breaks during school hours, and League 56 Academy was the fun and excitement that they needed and wanted, where they could participate in activities with their peers. Additionally, as mentioned before, League 56 Academy served an average of 32 students per afterschool session, students who were not being served prior to the initiation of this program; it gave them academic assistance, a healthy snack and provided them with an opportunity to develop positive outlooks on life.

The concepts and explanations above have provided an in-depth framework of how League 56 Academy encourages a positive, benefits-based approach to program planning and implementation. It is the intent that program leaders interacting in the program will help improve the overall quality of life of individuals participating while increasing resiliency skills that have been tailored within the curriculum, to help the fifth
and sixth grade students achieve, understand and appreciate the resiliency traits that League 56 Academy teaches. All these things can be achieved with the successful completion of the following areas: continuing to implement positive youth development, keeping the strong mentorship between the undergraduate and elementary students, improving programming structure and implementation, and continuing to build a strong relationship with the school district to ensure the stability and success of League 56 Academy.

**Recommendations**

This study can be useful for continued studies related to resiliency, structured afterschool time, and the use of the Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile. Although this study showed little significance throughout its analysis, it could be further explored and measured to determine new ways to achieve success in a program like the one in this study. Unfortunately, with a new program like League 56 Academy there are a number of unforeseen environmental and programming circumstances that may occur.

Knowing the positive effects that the relationship and values orientation traits have had on the participants are critical in the next steps of programming for the future. As a recreation programmer it is important to continue to acknowledge and encourage the use of these traits as they have been fully understood by participants. Initially, it is important to critically assess all activities that were developed for both the relationship and values orientation traits, compare them with others in order to discover why these constructs were more easily attained. It is necessary to make similar changes in other
weekly activity plans for the remaining five traits in order to test whether the
development, facilitation or organization may have had an effect on the participants’
perception of the trait.

It is also recommended to encourage an in-school portion so students may be
introduced to the concepts that they will be encountering after school. In relation to those
participants who did not score well within certain traits, it would advised to assess
whether an individual consistently scored poorly or if it was solely within a specific
traits. It is also recommended that the teachers stress the trait of the week during school
(e.g., language arts). In addition, in order to increase response rates for qualitative
feedback regarding students’ academic performance, it is suggested that the researcher
conduct an interview or focus group with the teachers, post program.

Within the study, some factors should be reevaluated (each resiliency item) and
others should be considered to determine if this program played a role in other aspects
within the sixth grade students’ lives. Those aspects could be a rise or fall in attendance,
truancy rates, delinquency rates, detention rates, school spirit, friends, etc. Additionally, it
appears that students grasped the concept of relationships; therefore it would be
beneficial to follow-up with reports from students, parents or teachers regarding this
matter. For example, students may consider whether or not they felt more at ease with
their peers due to their attendance within the program, versus how they felt prior to
participating League 56 Academy. As a 29 item scale the RASP was still a valid and
reliable instrument; therefore given the age, and accordingly, probable attention span of
the population, it is recommended to alter the scale, removing the 11 items that did not
hold.
If the study were to be conducted again, there are a number of factors that should be examined and changed. Those factors include the use of the “last four digits” of the participants’ phone numbers and to have a program coordinator proctor the survey to ensure the directions are read. It would be recommended to assign numbers to students who complete the survey, thus keeping anonymity for the participants, while giving the researcher the opportunity to easily match pretest to post test.

Additionally, it would be beneficial to use the parental version of the RASP to coincide with the child version. Comparison of these scores may confirm to validate the child’s perception of their resiliency skills. Moreover, it is suggested that the parental version of the RASP be reduced to a 29 item scale as well, as many of the items did not hold throughout the reliability and validity tests. Before reducing the scale, more research needs to be conducted with a larger sample size to authenticate the results.

If this afterschool program was developed to target multiple schools, results from similar settings may also be evaluated to confirm findings. The expansion of the program to the remaining four elementary schools in the school district may suit this recommendation well. League 56 Academy combined the concepts of positive youth development, intentionally designed programming, and resiliency in order to create an afterschool program to combat many multiple risk factors that youths encounter throughout their lives.
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Appendices
Appendix A

Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile

(RASP©)
Gender: Male or Female  Age: _________  Grade: 5th OR 6th

Last four digits of your home phone # ________________

The following items relate to your opinions of yourself and your personal characteristics. Please read each statement and indicate, by circling a number, the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement. **There are no right or wrong answers, so please be as honest as possible!**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. When my work is criticized, I try harder the next time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I can deal with whatever comes in the future.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Once I set a goal for myself, I don't let anything stop me from reaching it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I learn from my mistakes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I notice small changes in facial expressions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I can imagine the consequences of my actions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I know when I'm good at something.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I'm prepared to deal with the consequences of my actions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I say “no” to things that I don't want to do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I can change my behavior to match the situation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. My sense of humor makes it easier to deal with tough situations.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My friends know they can count on me.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I can change my surroundings.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My family is there for me when I need them.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. When something goes wrong, I can tell if it was my fault.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. It’s OK if I don’t see things the way other people do.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Lying is unacceptable.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I avoid people who could get me into trouble.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. It’s OK if some people do not like me.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I am comfortable making my own decisions.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21.</strong> I can sense when someone is not telling the truth.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>22.</strong> When I'm faced with a tough situation, I come up with new ways to handle it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>23.</strong> I can come up with different ways to let out my feelings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>24.</strong> I choose my friends carefully.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25.</strong> I look for the &quot;lighter side&quot; of tough situations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>26.</strong> I control my own life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>27.</strong> I can tell what mood someone is in just by looking at him/her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>28.</strong> I try to help others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>29.</strong> I stand up for what I believe is right.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>30.</strong> I try to figure out things that I don't understand.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td></td>
<td>STRONGLY AGREE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. I’m good at keeping friendships going.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. I have friends who will back me up.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Laughter helps me deal with stress.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I avoid situations where I could get into trouble.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. I can be myself around my friends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. When I’m in a bad mood, I can cheer myself up.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. When something bad happens to me, I don’t give up.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I share my ideas and opinions even if they are different from other people’s.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. I can entertain myself.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. I make friends easily.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THANK YOU FOR PARTICIPATING!
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CREATIVITY: 6, 22, 23, and 39

HUMOR: 11, 25, 33, and 36

INDEPENDENCE: 2, 9, 16, 19, 20, 26, 34, and 38

INITIATIVE: 1, 3, 13, 30, and 37

INSIGHT: 4, 5, 7, 10, 15, 21, and 27

RELATIONSHIPS: 12, 14, 18, 24, 31, 32, 35, and 40

VALUES ORIENTATION: 8, 17, 28, and 29

There are no reverse coded items.
Appendix B

Parent Version of the Resiliency Attitudes and Skills Profile

(Parental RASP©)
The following items relate to your opinions of your child and his/her personal characteristics. Please read each statement and indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each one. **There are no right or wrong answers, so please be as honest as possible!**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MY CHILD...</th>
<th>STRONGLY DISAGREE</th>
<th>STRONGLY AGREE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. tries harder the next time after his/her work is criticized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. can deal with whatever comes in the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. doesn’t let anything stop him/her from reaching a goal once he/she sets it for himself/herself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. learns from his/her mistakes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. notices small changes in facial expressions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. can imagine the consequences of his/her actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. knows when he/she is good at something</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. is prepared to deal with the consequences of his/her actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. says “no” to things that he/she doesn’t want to do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. can change his/her behavior to match the situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. uses his/her sense of humor to make it easier to deal with tough situations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. has friends who know they can count on him/her</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. can change his/her surroundings</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. has family who is there when he/she needs them</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. can tell if it was his/her fault when something goes wrong</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. knows it’s OK if he/she doesn’t see things the way other people do</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. knows lying is unacceptable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. avoids people who could get him/her into trouble</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. knows it’s OK if some people don’t like him/her</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. is comfortable making his/her own decisions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. can sense when someone is not telling the truth.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. comes up with new ways to handle difficult situations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. can come up with different ways to let out his/her feelings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. chooses his/her friends carefully.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. looks for the &quot;lighter side&quot; of tough situations.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. controls his/her own life.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. can tell what mood someone is in just by looking at him/her.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. tries to help others.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. stands up for what he/she believes is right.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. tries to figure out things that he/she doesn’t understand.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>STRONGLY DISAGREE</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>is good at keeping friendships going.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>has friends who will back him/her up.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>uses laughter to help him/her deal with stress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>avoids situations where he/she could get into trouble.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>can be himself/herself around his/her friends.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>can cheer himself/herself up when in a bad mood.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>doesn’t give up when something bad happens to him/her.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>shares his/her ideas and opinions even when they are different from other people’s.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>can entertain himself/herself.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>makes friends easily.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Calendar of Targeted Constructs
League 56 Academy Calendar Fall 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 5</td>
<td>October 6</td>
<td>October 7</td>
<td>October 8</td>
<td>October 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td>Initiative</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 12</td>
<td>October 13</td>
<td>October 14</td>
<td>October 15</td>
<td>October 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td>October 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher Work Day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 19</td>
<td>October 20</td>
<td>October 21</td>
<td>October 22</td>
<td>October 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 26</td>
<td>October 27</td>
<td>October 28</td>
<td>October 29</td>
<td>October 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 2</td>
<td>November 3</td>
<td>November 4</td>
<td>November 5</td>
<td>November 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Values Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Values Orientation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 9</td>
<td>November 10</td>
<td>November 11</td>
<td>November 12</td>
<td>November 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td></td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 16</td>
<td>November 17</td>
<td>November 18</td>
<td>November 19</td>
<td>November 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Insight</td>
<td></td>
<td>Insight</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November 23</td>
<td>November 24</td>
<td>November 25</td>
<td>November 26</td>
<td>November 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Overall Resiliency</td>
<td></td>
<td>OFF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thanksgiving Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix D

Weekly Activity Plans

Weeks 1 through 8
REC 280/380 Weekly Activity Plan (WAP)

Programmers/Leaders:  

Date: 9-18-09  Week number: 1  Group number: 3

Names of Activities for the week (page # and Bag Color if used from Training Wheels®):

**Group Juggle**: Need random tossable objects, about 4 or 5 per group, could be obtained from any bag (p. 43 & 142); **Pass the Can**: Need 4 or 5 random objects, these can be the same objects used for Group Juggle and can also be obtained from any bag; **Feeling Card Debrief**: Feeling cards, Red Bag; **Rubber Chicken Debrief**: 1 rubber chicken per group, Yellow Bag; **Bull Ring**: bull ring, ball, stand frisbees, Green Bag; **Bull Ring Variation**: hula hoops, bench ball, webbing, Red Bag, Maze: tarp, maze cards, bull horn, Red Bag; **Maze Variations**: tarp, webbing, Red Bag, lily pads, Green Bag.

Resiliency Traits: Relationships

Weekly Measurable Objective:
The Barry students will show the resiliency trait relationships through learning every group member's name by the end of the week.

**Tuesday**

All Resources Needed (e.g., tarp, cones, ropes, etc.). The same resources may not be used for both Tuesday and Thursday's plans: 4 or 5 tossable objects per group; 10 random objects per group; a rubber chicken per group for possible debrief technique

Activity Name and Steps (1, 2, 3, etc.) for each of the following:

1. Name game/Icebreaker/Deinhibitor (e.g., Elbow Tag, Group Juggle, etc.)
   **Group Juggle** (4 or 5 tossable objects):
   1. Have all participants form a circle.
   2. Have everyone introduce themselves.
   3. Share the following directions with participants:
      - one person starts with object, says “my name is ______” then tosses it to someone else in circle saying “here you go ______”
      - that person catches the object and replies “Thank you ______”
      - they then toss the object to a different person saying “here you go ______” who then replies “thank you ______”
   4. Continue this until everyone has received the object, and the object has been returned to you.
   5. Tour around the circle again keeping the pattern.
   Variations:
   1. Having the students remember the pattern and try it again for a faster time
   2. Repeat without names once (this is our way of making the game faster and then ask group “keeping the same order how can we make this faster?”)
   3. Do the original pattern backwards.
   4. Continue to add objects to the process. See if can do this without dropping any.

2a. Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Gutter-ball, Human Knot, etc.)

People to People:
1. Each student is going to partner up. If there is an even number leaders participate to make it an odd number of students then the student without a partner is going to be the one who gives the commands.
2. The caller is going to give directions (for example: elbow to chin).
3. The partners will decide who is going to use which body part to connect to the partners other body part.
4. In the midst of giving commands the caller has the option to say “Velcro” which simply means that the partners must stay connected when they have to attempt to attach different body parts on the next call.
5. After about three tries they can say people to people and the partners must split up and find a new partner and the person without a partner is the new caller.
Safety precaution: In an attempt to keep the participants from getting hurt or feeling uncomfortable they can use bumpers. Bumpers are basically used if someone were to call something that might be uncomfortable such as forehead to forehead. The way you use a bumper is that you connect both of your hands to each other which creates space between the body parts that are uncomfortable.

2b. Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)
Pass the can (4 or 5 tossable objects):
1. Have participants sit in a circle with their legs straight out in front of them. Participants should be relatively close to each other.
2. Place objects on different participants feet. You can put two objects on people sitting next to each other or spread them out, depending on how difficult you want to make the activity.
3. Participants must pass the objects around the circle only using their lower bodies.
4. You determine the direction the objects will go around the circle. Objects going in the same direction is easier than having objects go in multiple directions. Again, it depends on how difficult you want to make the activity.
5. The group can brainstorm if they want to pass the objects all at once or one at a time, if necessary. If they have difficulty and haven’t talked about how they’re going to do it, you may want to step in and suggest that they brainstorm.
6. If an object falls on the ground it returns to who started with it, and must start being passed again.
7. Once objects have successfully gone once around the circle and returned to their original places, the activity is completed.

2c. Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)
Maze (tarp, maze cards, bull horn):
1. Lay down tarp on a flat surface.
2. Pick a pattern from one of the cards, or make up your own!
3. Tell participants that they must make it through the maze by following a certain pattern on the tarp.
4. Only one person is allowed on the tarp at a time.
5. Make the sound from the bull horn if they step on the wrong square.

Optional:
1. Cannot leave anything on the tarp (no trails of leaves, etc.)
2. Once a person makes it successfully through the maze, she or he may no longer talk.

Variations:
1. Create your own maze by putting squares (approximately 14) on a tarp with tape.
2. Create your own maze by laying webbing or rope down crisscross so that you have at least 14 squares on the ground.
3. Use lily pad squares to make squares for the maze.

2d. [Back-up] Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)
Trust Walk (Zipper):
1. Make sure you have an area that’s flat, with space to run
2. Pick one person to be the “runner.”
3. Have remaining participants get a partner.
4. Have participants make two lines, facing the runner, with each person standing next to their partner with enough space for a person to walk/run between the partners.
5. Have people in the left line put their right arm out to the side into the middle of the two lines.
6. Have people in the right line put their left arm out to the side into the middle of the two lines.
7. The runner tells the lines to “zipper up.” The lines are “zippered up” when they are straight.
8. The runner then asks the lines, “Lines ready?” The lines are ready when both the lines are straight, and everyone has their arms out and is paying attention.
9. When the lines are ready, everyone in the lines yells, “Ready!”
10. The runner then says, “Running/jogging/walking” etc.
11. The lines reply, “Run/jog/walk on.”
12. The runner then runs/jogs/walks through the middle of the lines.
13. The people in the lines bring their arms up and out of the way just before the runner gets to them.

*The runner can either run/sprint, jog, or walk. Just make sure they clarify before they go through the lines.

3. Three Reflective Learning Techniques (see Training Wheels Field Guide)
   
   **Pass the chicken:** Sit in a circle and pass the chicken throughout the group. When you have the chicken you get to tell your most fun moment of the afternoon and something you learned.
   
   **Reflective Questioning:** Start out by asking who knows the definition of relationship and play off of that. Ask them what if felt like to be doing different aspects of the activities. Example: How did it feel when you had your eyes closed and had to be directed by someone? Relate how trust, communication, cooperation build relationships and have them suggest how things can be applied in the classroom and out of it.
   
   **Grab Bag** (put some of the objects from the activities in a bag): Everyone takes a random object from a bag and relates it to the activities, day, and how we’ve learned the theme of relationships.

---

**Thursday**

All Resources Needed (e.g., tarp, cones, ropes, etc.). The same resources may not be used for both Tuesday and Thursday’s plan: About 8 Lilly pads, per group, feeling cards

**Activity Name and Steps (1, 2, 3, etc.) for each of the following:**

1. **Name game/Icebreaker/Deinhibitizer** (e.g., Elbow Tag, Group Juggle, etc.)
   **Switch if:**
   1. Have all participants stand back to back with a partner. 1 participant shouldn’t have a partner.
   2. The individual without a partner says “switch if” _______” ex. “switch if you’ve been skiing, if you’ve seen a shooting star, etc.”
   3. Any participant who has done/experienced what was stated needs to run and find a new partner. The person in the middle also finds a partner.
   4. The participant who is left without a partner then calls out the next “switch if” statement.
   5. Continue this process until it is time for the next game.

2a. **Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based]** (e.g., Gutter-ball, Human Knot, etc.)
   **Hog Call:**
   1. Have the students pick a partner that they don’t know well. Have them come up with a two word phrase. Such as pop-corn, hot-dog, macaroni-cheese, etc. Tell them they will use this phrase to call each other, so one person is going to be macaroni and the other cheese.
   2. Have them stand opposite their partner, forming two lines.
   3. Tell the students to put their hands on the shoulders of the person to their left (if kids have a problem use body barriers such as linking elbows), close their eyes and keep them closed. There line will be led away from the other line. After a leader yells hog call start calling your partners’ “name”.
   4. Once you find your partner ask a few questions and name.
   5. Sit in a circle and introduce your partner.

2b. **Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based]** (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)
   **Bottoms up:**
   1. Have the kids find a partner.
   2. They both sit on floor facing each other.
   3. Have them connect both feet (bottom of shoe sole to sole), with palms are on the ground.
   4. The object it to both try to lift bottoms off floor at the same time, by pushing feet together, and pushing off the floor with their hands.

2c. **Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based]** (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)
   **Bull Ring (need a bull ring, tennis ball, 2 Frisbees):**
   1. Tell the group to stand in a circle.
   2. Give one string to each person. If more strings than people, participants can have more than one string. If more people than strings, participants without strings can act as “guides,” with a main “leader” who plots the course and the others watch out for obstacles.
   3. Tell the group they may only hold the strings on the bull ring within the last three inches of the end, and that they may not wrap the strings around their fingers.
4. Place ball on upside down Frisbee.
5. Participants must put the tennis ball on the ring and transport the tennis ball to another place. Participants must use the “ball ring” and may not touch the ball with any part of their body.
6. If the ball falls off the ball ring, it must go back to the original Frisbee.

Variations:
You can make your own “balling” by attaching webbing (enough strands for every participant) to a hula hoop and having the group use that to pick up a larger ball.

2d. [Back-up] Trust/Communication/Problem Solving (Resiliency-based) (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)
Willow in the Wind:
1. Tell the group to stand in a circle shoulder to shoulder.
2. Ask for a volunteer to go into the middle
3. Instruct the middle person to cross their arms over their chest, put their feet together and close their eyes.
4. Everybody else is the spotters. Spotters have to form their spotting stance, arms out in front of them and one foot in front of the other ready to brace the person in the middle being pushed towards them.
5. The person in the middle must keep their feet in place, and keep their back rigid and straight, rather than bending at the waist when they lean back.
6. Ask if spotters ready? Spotters respond ready to spot, tell the kids if they are not ready to spot make sure they say no. This is a trust activity. Trust is being built by the middle person and the spotters. After all the spotters respond the middle person says ready to roll.
7. The person in the middle is rolled to and fro from one spotter’s hands to another. Spotters gently push the middle person away to another spotter to catch.
8. Repeat process until everyone, or everyone who wants to be in the middle has gone.

3. Three Reflective Learning Techniques (see Training Wheels Field Guide)
Rose & Thorn: Everyone says a rose—positive thing—and a thorn—something we could improve upon—about the day.
One Word: Have the kids sum up their experience for the day in one word (you don’t have to push the one word, if they want they can do it in a few words).
Feeling Cards: Everyone takes a feeling card that represents how they’re feeling and explains it.

Comments/Concerns/Notes:
REC 280/380 Weekly Activity Plan (WAP)

Programmers/Leaders:

Date: 10/06/09  Week number: 2  Group number: 2

Names of Activities for the week (page # and Bag Color if used from Training Wheels®):
Zoo game, Tank attack, Thumper, TP shuffle (p. 177 Red bag), Famous Amnesia

Resiliency Trait/s:
Humor and Over all

Weekly Measureable Objective:
The Barry Students will show humor by laughing, giggling and being silly together. This silliness will carry on for more than half of the time that we spend with them. This task will be performed with a positive attitude and friendly participation.

Tuesday

All Resources Needed (e.g., tarp, cones, ropes, etc.). The same resources may not be used for both Tuesday and Thursday’s plan):
Tank Attack—Bandanna’s and soft, throw able objects (balls)
TP shuffle—tarp
Famous Amnesia—Index card with characters names on them
Debrief: Index cards with smile face on one side and frown face on other side

Activity Name and Steps (1, 2, 3etc.) for each of the following:

1. Name game/Icebreaker/Deinhibitizer (e.g., Elbow Tag, Group Juggle, etc.)

   **Zoo Game**
   1. Start in a large circle.
   2. Choose one person to be in the middle as the ‘zoo keeper.’ The zoo keeper will be the one who shouts out directions to the other participants.
   3. There are three basic animals to start off with
      A) Elephant—individuals on both sides stretch out their arms to make the ears of the elephant while the person in the middle crosses their arms to make the trunk of the elephant. The person in the middle must also make an elephant noise.
      B) Rabbit—individuals on both sides hurry to the middle person and stomp their feet repeatedly. The person in the middle brings their hands to their mouth to form the teeth of the rabbit.
      C) Giraffe—individuals on either side crouch down by the middle person’s feet and become the feet of the giraffe. The person in the middle gets up on their humpy toes and pretends to eat leaves from a tree above.
   4. The ‘zoo keeper’ starts off the game by pointing directly at a person in the circle and shouts out which animal to imitate.
   5. The people on either side of the individual pointed at have to assist by creating the animal called out.
6. From the time the ‘zoo keeper’ shouts out the animal, the participants get a count of 10 to complete the chosen animal.
7. If the participants are unable to perform the action in the time limit, the person who was pointed at then becomes the new ‘zoo keeper’

2a. Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Gutter-ball, Human Knot, etc.)

**Tank Attack**

1. Have the participants pair up with a partner.
2. One of the individuals from each group is a “tank” and will be blindfolded. The other is the “guider.”
3. Prior to beginning, the facilitators scatter the two-somes throughout a designated area.
4. After the “tanks” have placed the blindfolds over their eyes, the facilitators place soft objects on the ground in various spots within the designated area. (soft objects include, paper balls, dodge balls, etc)
5. The person who is blindfolded (the tank) has to listen to their partners instructions on leading them through the course.
   A) The tank is not allowed to talk back to their partner while the game is being played.
   B) The tank must walk heel-toe while rolling their arms in front of their body.
6. Prior to beginning, the facilitators scatter the two-somes throughout the given area.
7. The individual who isn’t blindfolded (the “guider”) must lead their partner to the scattered objects.
8. The tank must then pick up the object and while listening to their partner’s instructions, aim at another tank and throw the object underhand.
9. If the partnership succeeds in hitting another “Tank” (hitting the guide doesn’t count), they get a point. The other tank combo does not lose any points.
10. This game can have a set amount of time to play and the partnership who has the most points at the end, are the “winners.”

**Ideas:**
1. If the group does not seem to stay in the designated area, a boundary could be set up. With the boundary could come a penalty. Like if a member steps over the boundary, that partnership loses one of their points.
2. Depending on how much time is given for the game, the facilitators could pause it halfway through. The partners could switch duties, tank can now become the guide and vice versa. The game would resume with the facilitators scattering the participants and also rearranging the objects.

2b. Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)

**TP Shuffle**

1. Ask the group to all stand on the tarp.
2. Decide a certain order you would like the group to line up (ex: tallest to shortest, oldest to youngest, shirt color, alphabetical order)
3. Have the group line up in the order you decided without stepping off the tarp (Participants can use each other to help balance, but no body part can step off the tarp)
   A) A penalty for stepping off the tarp is that the individual has to go back to their original spot and cannot talk the rest of the rest of the challenge.
4. After the task is completed, if you would like to, you can have the children do it again lining up in a different order.

**Alternatives:**
Instead of using the tarp, a group could use a painted field line, or a border line if we are in the gym. Pretty much anything straight will work.
Ideas:
To make it slightly more challenging, introduce a restriction that there are only two phrases which are allowed to be said. “Walk the Plank” and “Get back Aboard.” “Walk the Plank” entitles that the individual to whom it is said, must move to the left of the individual who said it. “Get Back Aboard” implies that the individual to whom it was said, must move to the right of the individual who said it.

Looking at the group:

“Walk the Plank”

“Get Back Aboard”

2c. Trust/Communication Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)

Famous Amnesia
1. Give each student a pre-prepared index card with a famous character’s name on it. (sponge bob, Hannah Montana, etc)
2. Have the facilitators tape the different characters on each participant’s back without them seeing who they are.
3. Be sure to explain that the group cannot literally tell each other who they are.
4. The students must then find out who they ‘are’ by asking their peers yes or no questions about their famous character.
5. Have all the students finish figuring out who they are based on the question they ask.

(Remember don’t tell them and try not to give them hints, they must think for themselves)

2d. [Back-up] Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)

Thumper
1. All the participants get into a large circle.
2. A role call is announced by one facilitator.
   Role call:
   A) One by one you go clockwise around the circle with each person displaying their own BRIEF/appropriate dance move.
   B) Go around 2 or 3 times to make sure everyone knows each other’s move.
3. Choose a facilitator to lead off the game with a chant.
4. The game starts with everyone hitting their hands on their knees and a brief chant:
   Facilitator: “WHAT'S THE NAME OF THE GAME?”
   Group yells: “THUMPER”
   Facilitator: “AND WHY DO WE PLAY IT?”
   Group yells: “TO HAVE FUN!!”
5. The facilitator’s chant then does his or her move followed by another individual’s dance move, triggering the other person to their move and then someone else’s.
6. If a person is not able to perform correctly, they start the game over beginning with the chant, their move, and someone else's.

7. A sort of elimination can be administered after everyone gets the hang of the game.
   
   Ex. If an individual messes up, they must do 5 jumping jacks.

Ideas:
Instead of doing jumping jacks, the participant could do a lap around the circle.

3. Three Reflective Learning Techniques (see Training Wheels Field Guide)
Each child will be given an index card as they sit in a circle. The cards will have a smiley face on one side, and a frown face on the other! The facilitators will introduce each game that was played one by one:
   1. The kids will either show a smiley face or a frown face.
   2. Then, going clockwise around the circle, the kids will explain WHY they chose the given face.
   3. Facilitators should also have one of the cards to input their ideas.

Questions that could be asked about each game:
   1. How well do you believe the group worked together?
   2. What were the funniest parts of the game?
   3. What changes could have been made to make the games more humorous?

This allows everyone to participate and have their voice heard.

Comments/Concerns/Notes:
**REC 280/380 Weekly Activity Plan (WAP)**

Programmers/Leaders:  

Date: 02/29/09  
Week number: 3  
Group number: 1

**Names of Activities for the week (page # and Bag Color if used from Training Wheels®):**  
Circle/Motion Name Game, Changing It Up, Protect the Hen House, Itchy Minnie Hoi, Lily Pads, Word game, Object Toss, Virtual Postcard, Wrap-Up, Hoop Pass, Building Blocks, Indian Chief, Dr. Octopus, Name Recognition, Well Oiled Machine, Alphabet Soup

**Resilience Trait(s):** Insight

**Weekly Measurable Objective:** Upon completion of this week’s activities, 80% of the league's 56 academy students will attempt to help their peers when they see that help is needed.

---

**Tuesday**

**All Resources Needed (e.g., tarp, cones, ropes, etc.). The same resources may not be used for both Tuesday and Thursday’s plan:**  
4 balls to toss, rubber chicken, 6 bases, paper and pens for everyone

**Activity Name and Steps (1, 2, 3, etc.) for each of the following:**

1. **Circle Motion/Pass Game [Ice Breaker]**  
   1. Get participants to circle up with one facilitator on the outside  
   2. Explain that each person must think up a motion for themselves  
   3. Demonstrate that one person makes a motion, says their name, and then the following person has to replicate the preceding motion as well as say the person’s name. It becomes more challenging for each succeeding participant.  
   4. If the individual cannot complete it, they go to the center of the circle and wait for someone else to make a mistake and then they take their spot in the circle.  
   5. Icebreaker activity to reinforce names.

2a. **Protect the Hen House**  
   1. Form a circle around a rubber chicken  
   2. Choose a farmer to stand in the middle and protect the hen  
   3. The “wolves” standing around the circle must try to take the chicken (3 at a time) out of the circle without being tagged on their hands or arms  
   4. Tagged players must wait 15 seconds before rejoining pursuit. (May count out loud, jumping jacks, etc.)  
   5. Whoever successfully takes the chicken becomes the new farmer  
   6. Time limits or extra chickens may be used for variation.

2b. **Changing It Up**  
   1. Split group up into two teams  
   2. Then line up the two teams across from each other, each person on the team stands shoulder to shoulder  
   3. One team goes first and studies the other team for 30 seconds  
   4. They then turn around having backs to the other team  
   5. The other team then changes something about themselves. (Taking out an earring, putting their hair up, taking off a jacket, moving spots, etc.)  
   6. After 10 seconds the team that was turned around turns back to face the team that changed. They then have to guess what the team changed  
   7. Can use points every time the team guesses a change correctly  
   8. Keep going until time starts to run out.

2c. **Itchy, Minnie, Hoi**  
   1. Participants divide into 2 teams. They then form 2 lines next to each other facing the front  
   2. The playing area is similar to a small baseball diamond. The first players from each team have to dance along the baseline in opposite directions until they reach each other.
3. Upon reaching each other, they should “HOI” and proceed to Rock, Paper, Scissors, but instead they and
their teams shout, “Itchy, Mimi, Hoi!”
4. On “Hoi” they put out rock, paper, or scissors
5. The non-winner goes to the back of the winner’s line. The winner continues to dance around the bases in
the same direction they started in. While the next person from the opposite team dances towards them.
6. Upon reaching them, the person repeats the process of rock, paper, scissors
7. Once a person crosses “home plate” their team scores a point. Games will be played up until 10 points or
until time runs out. Also, once a person crosses the plate, a new dance must be made up. Try not to repeat
any and mix it up!

2d. [Back-Up] Lilly Pads
1. Mark off a space on the floor that will be radioactive lava
2. Explain that the whole group must cross this lava using only the pads provided.
3. If anyone falls in, then the group must start over.
4. Variations include timing, and always having someone touching a pad or it gets taken away.

3. Three Reflective Learning Techniques (see Training Wheels Field Guide)
   Word Game
   - Participants are given a sheet of paper and a pencil and are asked to write as many words out of the
     longer word. Leader can relate the word to a theme or place for added fun. (Maybe Insight)
   Object Toss
   - Get some type of object (Rubber chicken, ball, etc.). Have each student and advisor say one thing
     that they got out of the games played when tossed the toy.
   Virtual Postcard
   1. Hand out an index card and a marker to each student
   2. Tell them to draw a picture about one of the activities for the day
   3. Once everyone is finished drawing, have each student show their picture and describe to the class
      what it means.
   4. After each student’s explanation, try to add to their description and get them to think more about
      their meanings.

Thursday

All Resources Needed (e.g., tarp, cones, ropes, etc.). The same resources may not be used for both Tuesday and
Thursday’s plans:
    Building blocks and a hoop

Activity Name and Steps (1, 2, 3, etc.) for each of the following:

1. Wap-Um [Ice Breaker]
   1. All participants sit in a circle with their feet extended to the middle.
   2. One person stands in the middle of the outstretched legs and feet.
   3. The object of this activity is to NOT be in the middle.
   4. The person in the middle...
      a. Calls out a person’s name.
      b. The person called then has to call someone else’s name as quick as possible BEFORE...
      c. The person in the middle tries to tap their feet.
      d. If they are tapped before a name is called, the two people switch places and there is a new person
         in the middle.

2a. Hoop Pass
   1. Have the group form a circle and join hands.
   2. Insert the hula hoop between two people so it rests on their conjoined hands.
   3. Instruct the group that the hoop must pass through the entire group, starting & ending at the same spot.
   4. Use the stop watch to time the group.
   5. After the first time, ask the group if they think they can do better.
   6. Do it about 3 more times, and see if they can decrease their time each time.
   7. Debrief about how they can decrease their time even more.
      Variation: Have the group set a goal before they begin.

2b. Building Blocks
   1. Need to obtain building blocks from the bag. Separate group into 2 equal teams.
   2. Facilitators build a secret castle out of the building blocks on one side of a sheet or in a secret place that the
others cannot see.
3. One team goes on the side with the castle and the other team has blocks that are not built. The team that has the castle built must communicate with the others so that the other team builds a replica of the other castle.
4. VARIATION. Make it so the team that is communication cannot speak.
5. Switch teams so that others can use their communication skills.
6. Reinforce the importance of clear instructions. Make sure each student gets a chance to both describe, and build.

2c. Indian Chief
1. Have everyone sit in a circle Indian style. Select one person to be a guesser and have him turn his back to the group. Select one person to be the Indian Chief (without the guesser knowing).
2. Have the Indian Chief start clapping, slapping knees, snapping, rubbing hands together, etc.
3. The group does what the Indian Chief does. The guesser is called back and has to stand in the center of the circle and guess who the Indian Chief is.
4. The Indian Chief continues to change motions so the guesser has a chance.
5. After the guesser guesses correctly, the Indian Chief becomes the guesser and the guesser picks a new Indian Chief.

2d. [Back-up] Dr. Octopus
1. Choose one student to be it also called the “octopus.”
2. Next choose another student to be the “doctor.”
3. Then have the rest of the students, including the doctor line up on one side of the gym. Set boundaries as necessary.
4. Explain to the students that they must try to reach the other side of the gym without being tagged by the octopus.
5. If they are tagged, they must sit down until the doctor tags them to rejoin the game.
6. The game ends when the octopus has tagged everyone, including the doctor.
7. Variations that can be added are naming two octopuses if one is having trouble.
8. If the game is getting out of control, have students walk toe to heel to slow them down.

3. Three Reflective Learning Techniques (see Training Wheels Field Guide)

Name Recognition
1. Participants are asked to use the letters in their name to answer a question or give feedback to a situation.
2. You can limit them to just their first, middle, or last names or let them use any letters from their full name.
EX: “How was the energy in that last activity?”
    Sue: “Surprisingly upbeat”

Well Oiled Machine
1. Tell students that they will all be working together to make a well oiled machine.
2. Have one student begin making a noise that you may hear coming from an engine.
3. Next, one by one have the rest of the students make their own individual noise and join onto the “machine.” They can join on by interlocking their arms or legs with anyone else who is already a part of the machine.

Alphabet Soup
1. Participants sit in a circle. One player begins by saying, “Today I learned about (something that begins with A) acceptance.
2. The next player says, “Today I learned about Acceptance and Building.”
3. The third player says, “Today I learned about Acceptance, Building, and Communication.”
4. The game continues until the group goes through the entire alphabet, or until each person has had a turn. If a player is unable to remember the items that went before his her turn, that person may pass.
REC 280/380 Weekly Activity Plan (WAP)

Programmers/Leaders: 

Date: 10-01-09  Week number: 4  Group number: 4

| Names of Activities for the week (page # and Bag Color if used from Training Wheels®): |
| 1. Three Minute Challenge | 1. Commonalities (pg. 54) Yellow Bag |
| 2. Human Knot (pg. 152) Green Bag | 2. Helium Pole (pg. 172) Green Bag |
| 4. Hoop Pass/Believe it or Knot (pg. 244) Yellow Bag | 4. Steal the Bandana (pg. 102) Green Bag |
| 5. Smug’s Jewels (pg. 95) Yellow Bag | 5. Toxic Waste (pg. 220) Yellow Bag |

Resiliency Traits: Creativity

Weekly Measurable Objective: Ability to generate healthy options and/or alternatives which will help to cope with hardships through creativity.

Tuesday

All Resources Needed (e.g., tarp, cones, ropes, etc.). The same resources may not be used for both Tuesday and Thursday’s plan:

- Three Minute Challenge instruction sheet
- One Ball
- Ball Stand
- Blindfolds/Handkerchiefs
- Pens/Pencils
- Cones/Bases
- Six pieces of 15ft. webbing
- Two Hacksy Sacs
- Bull Ring

Activity Name and Steps (1, 2, 3, etc.) for each of the following:

1. Name game/Icebreaker/Deinhibitor (e.g., Elbow Tag, Group Juggle, etc.)
   
   Three Minute Challenge
   1. Follow instructions on the sheet of paper

2a. Trust/Communication Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Gutter-ball, Human Knot, etc.)
   Human Knot (Pg 152)
   1. Each participant gets a bandana and they hold it in their right hand
   2. Bunch together and have each participant reach across the circle and grab another participant’s bandana
   3. The object is for the participants to make a circle without letting go of the bandana that they are holding on to

2b. Trust/Communication Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)
   Bull Ring (Pg 184)
   1. Put ring with strings attached on the floor with the strings extended (Looking like a bicycle wheel)
   2. Place the ball in the middle of the ring
   3. Pick up the ball with the Bull Ring using only the tips of the strings
   4. Move Bull Ring to objective (Ball Stand) through obstacles without dropping the ball
   5. You may put blindfolds on every other participant to make it more challenging (only participants w/out blindfolds are allowed to speak)

2c. Trust/Communication Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)
   Hoop Pass/Believe it or Knot (Pg 244)
   1. Have the participants form a circle and join hands (bandanas)
   2. Insert webbing between two participants so it rests on their conjoined hands (bandanas)
   3. Tell the participants that the webbing must pass through the entire group, starting and ending at the same spot
   4. You may use a stop watch to time the activity after their first time ask them if they think they can do better (see if the participants can beat their previous time)
To incorporate Belief it or Knot use the following directions:
1. Start by passing the knot (the pointer) to the right around the group using the hoop pass technique.
2. Someone (picked by facilitator) says stop and the person nearest the knot needs to disclose some fact about themselves such as “I have a twin sister”.
3. It is now the responsibility of the rest of the participants to decide if the information is TRUE or FALSE.
4. Group members are allowed to ask a total of three questions pertaining to the information at hand.
5. After some discussion the group makes a decision if the information is true of tales, then the truth is revealed.
6. The participant who just revealed the truth sets the webbing in motion (Right or Left) and they say “stop”.
7. Repeat Process.

2d. [Back-up] Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.) Smog’s Jewels (Pg 95)
1. Lay the webbing circle flat on the ground and put the hacky sack/jewels in the middle of the circle and ask for a volunteer to be the Smog.
2. The object for the Smog is to protect his jewels from being stolen.
3. The object for all the other participants is to steal Smog’s jewels, the Smog guards their circle but may not step inside the circle and neither can any of the participants.
4. The Smog may tag anyone trying to steal their jewels, once someone is tagged they are out until the next Smog is chosen.
5. The round is over if the Smog’s jewels are successfully stolen or if the smog tags everyone.

3. Three Reflective Learning Techniques (see Training Wheels Field Guide)
1. Give them props at the end and tell them to pick one and explain why the picked it and how they felt out the activity.
2. Ask them to write what they didn’t like about the activity’s.
3. Do you feel your group was successful? Why or why not?

Thursday

| All Resources Needed (e.g., tarp, cones, ropes, etc.). The same resources may not be used for both Tuesday and Thursday’s plan): |
| Tent Poles | Bandanas | 2 balls | 50 ft boundary rope | Six pieces of 15 ft webbing |
| Bungee Cords | Two bandanas | Two Hacky Sacs | One bucket |

Activity Name and Steps (1, 2, 3 etc.) for each of the following:

1. Name game/ Icebreaker/Deinhibitor (e.g., Elbow Tag, Group Juggle, etc.)
   Communalities (Pg 54)
   1. Place two circles on the floor (consisting of two 15 ft lengths of webbing)
   2. Partner Up
   3. Share three unique items participants have in common (same birthday, likes the same book) Dig Deep
   4. After identifying these items, they raise their hands shouting “they are finished”.
   5. They join a group that has their hands up as well to form a group of four.
   6. The group of four identifies two things they all have in common (try to use different communalities)
   7. After identifying these items, they raise their hands shouting “they are finished”.
   8. They join a group that has their hands up as well to form a group of eight, now they have to stand inside a circle
   9. The group of eight has to find one common interest, have the groups share what they have in common.

2a. Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Gutter-ball, Human Knot, etc.)
   Helium Pole (Pg 173)
   1. Line up the children in 2 lines facing each other with their index fingers extended from the hip.
   2. Explain to them that you are going to lay the tent pole on their extended index finger. And that the only thing that can touch the tent pole is their index finger.
   3. Explain that the object of the activity is to lower the tent pole to the ground.
   4. You might have to demonstrate the proper way to have the pole on your index finger or some kids may cheat.
2b. Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)

Blob Tag
1. First you create boundaries that they must stay in, if they go out they become part of the blob.
2. One person starts out as the blob everyone else is to run but stay in the boundaries.
3. Once you get tagged by the blob you are connected and you link arms and try to catch the others.
4. Only the outside hands on each side can tag someone.
5. When you reach 4 people matosis happens and the blob splits into 2. Each time a group reaches 4 they can split.
6. After everyone is caught the game is over.

2c. Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)

Steal the Bandana (Pg. 102)
1. Split the Group in Half and have the 2 groups form lines facing each other 20-40 ft.
2. Have Each team number off.
3. Stand in the middle holding the bandana and call a number.
4. The number called runs out to the center and tries to get the bandana and run to safety of their own side.
5. If the other teams player tags the person with the bandana then no one wins the point.

2d. [Back-up] Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)

Toxic Waste (Pg. 220)
1. Create a circle with the 50 ft webbing.
2. Place the toxic waste can upside down in the center of the circle.
3. Place 2 balls on top of the bucket.
4. Take a piece of webbing and make a circle with it. Place the circle about 30 feet from the large group.
5. Leave all the other props on the outside of the circle.
6. Instruct the group that they must build a toxic waste removal device and move the toxic waste to a safe place (the webbing circle).
7. You can give them as many restrictions as you want such as: Balls must remain on top of the bucket at all times, boundary ropes may not be moved, only props can be used to transport waste.

3. Three Reflective Learning Techniques (see Training Wheels Field Guide)
1. Ask what they liked about the activity.
2. Pass Out a Piece of Paper and have them write one word about how they felt.
3. What would you do differently if you had it all to do again? Why?

Comments/Concerns/Notes:
REC 280/380 Weekly Activity Plan (WAP)

Programmers/Leaders: [Blank]

Date: 9/20/2009  Week number: 5  Group number: 7

Names of Activities for the week (page # and Bag Color if used from Training Wheels®):

Stand Up pg 50  Captain is Coming pg 92
Bats and Moths  Animal Farm pg 39
Trust Run  Peak-A-Who pg 33
Rope Run  Turn over a new leaf pg 173
Have I Ever p 83  Card Punch

Resiliency Trait(s): Initiative

Weekly Measureable Objective: The 5th and 6th graders at Barry Elementary School will demonstrate initiative by leading or co-leading an activity and/or the debriefing process by the end of the week.

Tuesday

All Resources Needed (e.g., tarp, cones, ropes, etc.). The same resources may not be used for both Tuesday and Thursday’s plan: One blindfold, one large rope, amount of play squares for each person in group. Rubber Chicken, Whistle (optional), enough bandanas for each participant. 6th graders at Barry Elementary School will demonstrate initiative by leading or co-leading an activity and/or the debriefing process by the end of the week.

Activity Name and Steps (1, 2, 3, etc.) for each of the following:

1. Name game/Icebreaker/Deinhibitzer (e.g., Elbow Tag, Group Juggle, etc.)
   STAND UP
   1. Everyone should find a partner and form pairs.
   2. Then, you and your partner are to sit on the floor and sit back to back.
   3. Make sure you and your partner’s shoe laces are tied for safety purposes.
   4. Lock arms with your partner.
   5. At the count of three, each pair is going to try to stand up while keeping arms locked the entire time.

2a. Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Gutter-ball, Human Knot, etc.)
   BATS AND MOTHS
   Materials: one blindfold
   1. Have the participants get into one large circle.
   2. Assign one person to be a bat and one person to be a moth.
   3. Explain to the participants that bats use echolocation to detect their prey.
   4. Blindfold the bat and explain that when the bat claps his/her hands, the moth must respond by clapping back.
   5. The point of the game is for the bat to tag the moth.
   6. The other participants are the border, or the trees, and they are not to confuse the bat by clapping.
   7. Some safety to consider includes the blindfolded person. Make sure they always have their hands out in front of them.

2b. Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)
   Chuck the Chicken
   1. Split the class, or group up into equal numbers.
   2. The first group that gets the chicken must designate one person to throw the chicken as far away from the opposing group as possible.
3. Once they throw the chicken, their group must form a tight circle while the person who threw the chicken runs around them.
4. Each time they complete a circle, their team receives a point. When the chicken is thrown, the other team must run together as a group over to the chicken (or can designate one person to receive chicken and bring back to group).
5. Once the group has the chicken, they must form a line and pass the chicken to each other by through the legs and over the shoulder (passing technique changes from person to person).
6. Once the chicken is passed to the end of the line, the last person throws the chicken.
7. The cycle starts again as their group forms a circle and the person throwing becomes a runner.
8. The game is played until a certain amount of points are achieved (Ex. 20 pts).

Modifications - If game is being played in a crowded area, one person can be designated to get the chicken.
- If there is enough room, design a workout for the students to obtain points instead of one person running around the team that is huddled. Establish that as the group does 5 jumping jacks consecutively that they will be rewarded 1 point.

2c. Trust/Communication Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)
ROPE RUN
Materials: one large rope
1. Position two facilitators on each end of the rope. Have them slowly swing the rope in a large circle.
2. Explain to the participants that they need to use their judgment to decide when the right time to run through the path of the rope.
3. The point of the game is for each participant to not get hit with the rope and successfully have each team member pass through.
4. Line up the participants and have them pass through one at a time.
5. Some safety to consider would be the speed of the rope. It must be slow enough to not hurt the participant if they are hit.

2d. [Back-up] Trust/Communication Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)
HAVE I EVER
Materials: enough play squares for each person in the group
1. Have the group stand in a circle, each person on their own individual square.
2. Have one square placed in the middle of the circle for the person who is “it.”
3. The middle person says their name and something about themselves that is cool and appropriate (Have you ever... had a dog?)
4. Then whoever in the group who has done the question before (if they had a dog) has to leave their square and try to find another, leaving someone new in the center.
5. Repeat until everyone has had a turn or if it’s time for a new game.
Variations: Instead of having a center spot which could make people feel uncomfortable; have a “hot spot.” This red square will be the designated question square along the outside of the circle instead of having people stand in the middle of the circle.
Safety: No body checking. Have people use a “fast walking pace” instead of running.

3. Three Reflective Learning Techniques (see Training Wheels Field Guide)
1. What did you like about the activity?
2. Pass out paper and have each person write one word describing the activities and then explain out loud.
3. How did you demonstrate initiative today (i.e., which activities did you immediately like playing?)
Thursday

All Resources Needed (e.g., tarp, cones, ropes, etc.). The same resources may not be used for both Tuesday and Thursday’s plan: one large tarp/sheet and 20 numerical playing cards

Activity Name and Steps (1, 2, 3, etc.) for each of the following:

1. Name game Icebreaker/Deinhibitor (e.g., Elbow Tag, Group Juggle, etc.)
   
   CAPTAIN IS COMING
   Directions: This game is a great icebreaker and energizer for any group preferably larger than 10. The facilitator plays the role of the captain and is the person who calls out the orders. This is similar to Simon says. The following orders are several actions the group does depending on what the captain calls out.
   
   “To the Shore” - Everyone must run to the left
   “To the Ship” - Everyone must run to the right
   “The Captain is Coming” – Everyone stands at attention and salutes the Captain.
   “Swab the Deck” – Everyone acts like they are quickly mopping the floor.
   “Lighthouse” - Everyone gets into pairs. They stand facing each other, then run in a circle with their elbows up and touching while saying “boop, boop, boop.”
   “Man Overboard” - Everyone gets into groups of 2. 2 people hold hands to form a circle around a 3rd person who stands looking for a man overboard.
   “Row Ashore” - Everyone gets into groups of four. They line up in a single file line facing the same direction and act like they are rowing a boat together.
   “Grub time” - Everyone gets into groups of 5. Standing in a huddle, they act as if spooning food into their mouths while saying “grub, grub, grub….”

People that cannot get into groups in time do the wrong action are told to “walk the plank” They go to the side and have to sing pirate songs. Ex. A pirate’s life for me.

2a. Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Gutter-ball, Human Knot, etc.)
   
   ANIMAL FARM
   1. You will receive a piece of paper with the name of an animal on it.
   2. Read the name of the animal, keep it to yourself, and then close your eyes.
   3. When the leader says “go” everyone should start making the noise of the animal they got.
   4. While making your noise and keeping your eyes shut, you are to find other people who are making the same noise as you. (These people have the same animal as you)
   5. So, all the horses, cows, etc. should be in their own separate group. Each group will represent one animal in the end.
   6. Some safety precautions are: keep hands in front of you while running, make sure laces are tied, and pick up objects on the floor before hand so no one trips.

   * this game is not just limited to farm animal sounds. Musical instruments etc. can be substituted.

2b. Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)

   PEAK-A-WHO
   Materials: one large sheet or tarp
   1. Divide the group into two equal teams.
   2. Have the facilitators hold the tarp vertically and position each team on either side of the tarp.
   3. Explain that the teams must nominate one person on each side to come up to the tarp.
   4. When the facilitators drop the tarp, the person that says the other person’s name first wins.
   5. The “loser” must leave their side and join the “winners’ team.
   6. The point of the game is to end up with all of the participants on one side.
   7. Explain to the group that they are not allowed to help the person that is up at the tarp unless instructed by the facilitator.

2c. Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)

   TURN OVER A NEW LEAF
   Materials: tarp
   1. Spread out tarp onto the ground
   2. Have all group members stand on the tarp.
   3. Instruct the group to turn the tarp completely over without touching the ground around the tarp.
   4. They must accomplish this task without stacking people (everyone must have at least one foot on the ground at all times, don’t allow people to carry others)
Variations: see how many times the group can fold the tarp in half without touching the ground

2d. ([Back-up] Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.))
CARD PUNCH
Materials: 20 numerical playing cards
1. Divide the people into two groups and set them up behind a starting line.
2. Spread out two sets of numerical playing cards 1-20 (or another group of consecutive numbers), each in their own roped off circle on the floor. These circles will be about ten feet away from the starting point.
3. When the instructor says “Go”, the people must run to their teams roped off circle and stand around it, not placing any body part in the circle.
4. The cards must be touched in numerical order by whoever is near it. At first run though and briefly touch the card. Later on it would be good to have them keep touching the card until the game is completed
5. The students must show initiative by touching the correct numbers.
6. Only one person can have a body part in the circle at a time.
7. Once a team has correctly touched all the numbers in order, they must return back behind the starting line.
8. Time starts and stops with everyone behind the starting line.
Variations: Have them touch numbers in different orders (from 20 to 1, only even numbers, go up to 20 and then back down to 1)

3. Three Reflective Learning Techniques (see Training Wheels Field Guide)
1. How does initiative help you in life?
2. How do these games help you have more initiative?
3. Have the student sit in a circle with a small ball or object. Have the person with the object say one thing that they liked about this activity and pass the object to another classmate.
REC 280/380 Weekly Activity Plan (WAP)

Programmers/Leaders: 

Date: 9/14/2009  Week number: 6  Group number: 5

Names of Activities for the week (page # and Bag Color if used from Training Wheels®): Yarn Ball Toss (pg. 36 Activity Gourmet), Toilet Paper Game (pg. 29 Activity Gourmet), Human Handcuffs (green bag, pg. 153 Field Guide), Serial Winker (pg. 42 Activity Gourmet), Trust Walk (pg. 239 Field Guide), Roses & Thorns, Body Parts (Red bag, pg. 280 Field Guide), Thumb Consensus (pg. 244 Field Guide), Boppity, Bop, Bop, Bop (pg. 21 Field Guide), Odd or even (pg. 37 Activity Gourmet), Minefield (pg. 182 Field Guide), The Human Knot (pg. 41 Activity Gourmet), Look Up (pg. 96 Best New Games), Dry Erase Board (Yellow bag, pg. 290 Field Guide), Tool Box (Yellow, pg. 294 Field Guide), Deck of Cards (Yellow bag, pg. 282 Field Guide).

Resiliency Trait(s): Values Orientation

Weekly Measurable Objective: The 5th and 6th graders at Barry Elementary will share their values by playing games that express what is important to them.

Tuesday

All Resources Needed (e.g., tarp, cones, ropes, etc.). The same resources may not be used for both Tuesday and Thursday’s plan: Ball of yarn, roll of toilet paper, rope handcuffs, 5-6 bandanas

Activity Name and Steps (1, 2, 3 etc.) for each of the following:
1. Name game/Icebreaker/Deinhibitizer (e.g., Elbow Tag, Group Juggle, etc.)
   Yarn Ball Toss: pg. 36 of Activity Gourmet
   1. Participants sit in a circle and everyone tells their name to the group.
   2. One person is given a roll of yarn. One person is told to hold on to the free end.
   3. While holding onto the end the instigator says another player’s name in the circle and throws the ball of yarn to him or her.
   4. The 2nd person holds the extended piece of yarn, calls another player’s name, and throws the yarn ball to that person.
   5. When the game is completed, a design will have been created with the ball of yarn.

2a. Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Gutter-ball, Human Knot, etc.)
   Toilet Paper Game: pg. 29 of Activity Gourmet
   1. The group is asked to sit in a circle.
   2. The leader explains that there is a toilet paper shortage in the school.
   3. The very sacred last roll of toilet paper is passed around the circle, each participant is instructed to take what they think they will need for the next 8-24 hours.
   4. For each square of toilet paper the participant will state something that is important to them, such as their family, pets, friends, etc.

2b. Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)
   Human Handcuffs: pg. 153 of Field Guide
   1. Have the group get into pairs
   2. Have one person put on rope handcuffs and their partner so that they interlock.
   3. They must separate from each other without cutting the rope or untwisting the knots or slipping the knots over their hand and/or taking the loops off.
   4. Answer as many non-solution questions as they ask and emphasize that there is a solution.

   Solution:
   1. Make a bright (pinch) the center of your partners rope, pass the bright under either of your wrist loops, so that the bright portion is closest to your fingers.
2c. **Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)**

**Serial Winker pg. 41. Activity Gourmet**
1. Participants sit in a circle.
2. Each person takes a card or slip of paper.
3. The person who receives the slip of paper marked “Winker” must try to tag each person in the circle by winking at them without getting caught.
4. If a person in the circle is “winked” at, they wait a few seconds and say “I’m Out”.
5. The Winker continues to wink at all players until everyone has been winked at.
6. If a person sees the winker wink at someone else, they say, “I know who the winker is” and states the person’s name.
7. If the person is incorrect in guessing the winker, they are out until the next round.

2d. **[Back-up] Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)**

**Human Overhand Activity**
1. Participants form an even number in a line.
2. Each participant is connected to one another by holding the ends of a bandana.
3. The object is for the group to work together to form a knot in the center length of bandana without anyone letting go of the ropes.

3. **Three Reflective Learning Techniques (see Training Wheels Field Guide)**

**Body Parts, Pg. 280 (red bag) Field Guide**
1. Present each ball and explain the different metaphors (I heard good communication or I saw great teamwork) they could talk about when they receive the ball.
2. As you describe the other balls, toss the one you described already to someone in the group.
3. Once all the balls are cut in the circle go back to the person that you “tossed the ball to.”
4. Let them share with the group what they learned in the activity that goes along with the ball they have.
   - **Eyeball: something new you saw in yourself or someone in the group**
   - **Stomach ball: something that took guts for you to do**
   - **Brain ball: something new you learned about yourself or someone in the group**
   - **Heart ball: a feeling you experienced**
   - **Hand ball: a way the group supported you, someone you would like to give a hand for a job well done**
   - **Ear ball: something you listened to, a good idea you had**
   - **Smiley face ball: something that made you smile**

**Roses & Thorns**
1. Form a circle.
2. Tell the group that they should come up with an apple and an onion for the day or the activity that they just completed.
   - **Apple:** something good that happened, they liked doing or saw etc...
   - **Onion:** something they did not enjoy or disapproved etc…

**Thumb Consensus, pg. 244, Field Guide**
1. Have the group stand in a circle, facing each other.
2. Instruct them to place one hand behind their backs.
3. On the count of three, they will make either a “thumbs up,” “thumbs down,” or “thumb in the middle” sign with their hand.
   - **Thumbs up:** means the group functioned perfectly—listened to everyone’s ideas, no one argued, everyone participated in a positive way.
   - **Thumbs down:** means that the group did not function well as a team at all—there were lots of arguments and inappropriate communication.
   - **Thumbs in the middle:** means that the group did well, but there is room for improvement.
4. Once you explain the “thumbs” scale, count to three, and have everyone present their thumbs and keep them in front of their bodies.
5. Ask the group to go around the circle and discuss one specific example of why they chose the sign they did.
Thursday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>All Resources Needed (e.g., tarp, cones, ropes, etc.). The same resources may not be used for both Tuesday and Thursday's plan:</th>
<th>Random objects for minefield</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Activity Name and Steps (1, 2, 3, etc.) for each of the following:**

1. **Name game/Icebreaker/De/inhibitor (e.g., Elbow Tag, Group Juggle, etc.)**
   - Boppyty, Bop, Bop, Bog, pg. 21, Field Guide
   - 1. The group forms a circle and one person stands in the middle.
   - 2. The person in the middle points to someone in the circle and says “left” or “right”.
   - 3. The person who was pointed at then has to say the name of the person to their left or right before the person in the middle of the circle can say “Boppyty, Bop, Bop, Bog!”
   - 4. If the person finishes saying “Boppyty, Bop, Bop, Bog!” before the other says the person’s name then he/she is it and has to switch places.
   - 5. If the person does not finish saying “Boppyty, Bop, Bop, Bog!” before the other says the person’s name then they are to continue going around the circle until they can out speak someone.

2a. **Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Gutter-ball, Human Knot, etc.)**
   - Odd or Even, pg 37, Activity Gourmet
   - 1. Each person is given an envelope of 20 beans upon entering the room
   - 2. All are instructed to circle around the room
   - 3. Once at a time, each person offers another the opportunity to guess the number of beans now enclosed in the room by asking “Odd or even?”
   - 4. If the person responds correctly, the player gets the beans.
   - 5. If he/she responds incorrectly, they must give away that number of beans to the other players.
   - 6. The person with the most beans at the end of time called wins

2b. **Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)**
   - Minefield, pg 192, Field Guide (random objects)
   - 1. Set boundaries and set up random objects within the designated area
   - 2. Have participants designate a player to be blindfolded
   - 3. The remaining players are to verbally guide a blindfolded player through the minefield, but by holding up their partners legs like a wheel barrow, without them stepping on any of the mines
   - 4. Have players switch roles after the 1st has been led successfully through the field

2c. **Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)**
   - Spot Swap
   - 1. Participants stand in a circle
   - 2. The leader counts them off starting wherever they want, (1, 2, 3, 4) until everyone has a number.
   - 3. One person stands in a circle and says two numbers. The two people that have those numbers must switch spots, while the person in the middle tries to take an empty spot
   - 4. Whomever is left standing is now “it” and must call out two more numbers, the two who have spots must assume the number of their new spot

2d. **[Back-up] Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)**
   - Look Up, pg 96, Best New Games
   - 1. Form 2 circles of players
   - 2. One person is chosen to be the caller, who starts by saying “Look down” and the players look down at their feet
   - 3. When the caller says “look up” everyone looks up directly at someone else in the circle
   - 4. If two people are looking at each other, they both go to the other circle
   - 5. If the caller leaves the circle, a new caller is chosen
3. Three Reflective Learning Techniques (see Training Wheels Field Guide)

Dry Erase Board, pg. 290, Field Guide (yellow bag)
1. Pass the dry erase board around the circle
2. Each participant writes something they learned or did well during the activity
3. Discuss and share what each person wrote and why they wrote what they did

Deck of Cards, pg. 282, Field Guide
1. Have the group sit in a circle
2. Designate meaning to each suit in the deck of cards
   - Hearts: Something from the heart
   - Clubs: Describe things that grow (new ideas, etc.)
   - Spades: Describe new ideas the group had
   - Diamonds: Gems of wisdom you had during the activity
3. Deal up to 8 cards to each player
4. Each player then shares their responses based on the guidelines and according to the activity

Tool Box, pg. 294, Field Guide
Props: tool cards
1. Spread the cards out before the group
2. Have them pick a tool that best represents an experience/feeling they had.
3. Go around and ask each group member to share why they picked the card they did and why it represents a feeling or experience they had.

Comments/Concerns/Notes:
**REC 280/380 Weekly Activity Plan (WAP)**

Programmers/Leaders: 

Week number: 7  Group number: 6

---

**Names of Activities for the week (page # and Bag Color if used from Training Wheels®):**

- Knee coup (87), card punch (132), blind polygon (225), spider web (228), Fish hunt, sharks and minnows, obstacle courses, Gutterball (178), mine field (182), red light green light 1, 2, 5.

---

**Resiliency Traits:**

- Independence

---

**Weekly Measurable Objective:**

Our objective is for more than half of our students to come out of their comfort zones and be engaged in the activity for the duration of the activity.

---

**Tuesday**

All Resources Needed (e.g., tarp, cones, ropes, etc.). The same resources may not be used for both Tuesday and Thursday's plans. Knee coup: marker cones, card punch: jumbo set of cards. Starting line, blind polygon: 1-50 foot piece of rope, blind folds.

---

**Activity Name and Steps (1, 2, 3, etc.) for each of the following:**

1. Name game/Icebreaker/Deinhibitor

   **Flag Tag:**

   (group 7 will be leading this with the whole group and will explain it)

2a. Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Gutter-ball, Human Knot, etc.)

   **Card Punch:** (jumbo cards: green bag) (use a line in the gym for starting line)

   1. Set up two circles with thirteen cards in each. Hearts in one circle, clubs in the other circle set up randomly. Split groups into two teams.
   2. Have all players start behind a starting line behind the two circles.
   3. On the word go each team must touch the cards in order ace to king.
   4. Only one player can be in the card circle at a time. If more than one player is in the circle at more than one time the time is voided for the entire group. The object is to go for the lowest time.
   5. When the last player crosses the start/finish line the time stops.
   6. Before the game starts the groups can plan their strategy on their own.

2b. Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)

   **Blind Polygon:** (2-50 ft. long ropes – Blue bag)

   1. Tell the group that they are going to be blindfolded. Have them stand in a circle.
   2. Place a rope around the outside of the group.
   3. Tell the group that their goal is to find the rope and shape it into a square.
   4. Everyone must be connected to the rope at all times once it is found. If someone lets go of the rope they must start over.
   5. Tell them to communicate and if you see anyone about to bump into anything direct them away from it.

2c. Trust/Communication Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)

   **Lava crossing** (lily pads)

   1. Have two boundary lines (on the basketball court, cones, fellow facilitators, with chalk)
   2. With the lily pads, the group must make it to the other boundary line without falling off their squares
   3. If one person falls off the whole team needs to start over
4. Each lily pad has to be occupied by a body part. (EX: so one foot cannot move in less the person behind them puts their foot on it first)
5. If a lily pad is left with no one occupying it then it gets taken away and they have to work with fewer materials.

2d. [Back up] Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based]
Fish Hunt: (blindfolds – Blue or Maroon bag, can use too minefield balls from the maroon bag in place of fish)
1. You need 2 blindfolds, and 2 “fish” or other softer objects.
2. Have remaining kids who are not blindfolded stand in a large circle. Have the blindfolded people inside the circle.
3. Have the 2 “fish” thrown in different places in the circle.
4a. blindfolded children are crawling around on hands and knees.
4. Half the circle are the “cheerleaders” for child A and shout at them where to move to get the fish. Other half the circle is the “cheerleaders” for child B and shouts at them where to move for the fish.
5. Once fish are found by blind folded children find “fish” they stand up and then need to find other child to hit them with it.
6. First child to get hit loses.

3. Three Reflective Learning Techniques (see Training Wheels Field Guide)
A. Word Association:
1. Everyone sits in a circle.
2. Write the theme of the week “independence” on the white board.
3. Pass the white board around and have the kids write down the first word that pops into their head.
4. Explain consequences for inappropriate words.
B. Talking stick.
1. Have them sit in a circle.
2. Pass a stick around and have them say their favorite part of the activities.
C. Feeling cards.
1. Have them sit in a circle.
2. Pass around the bag of cards and have them each pick a card.
3. Have them go around and explain how the word on their card relates to something they did today.

Thursday

All Resources Needed (e.g., tarp, cones, ropes, etc.). The same resources may not be used for both Tuesday and Thursday’s plans: Obstacle course: make up own with objects (jump ropes, scooters, etc) gutterball: gutterball kit. Mine field: mine field kit and blind folds.

Activity Name and Steps (1, 2, 3 etc.) for each of the following:

1. Name game Icebreaker/Deinhibitizer (e.g., Elbow Tag, Group Juggle, etc.)
Sharks and Minnows.
1. Have up to 2 children become sharks.
2. Spend the rest of children to a designated line and sharks stand in middle of area.
3. At shouting “Shark Attack” “minnows” children run onto other side of area trying not to get tag by “sharks”
4. If tagged then “minnow” sits down and turns into seaweed. They can move their arms and NOTHING else to try and tag other “minnows” running by.
4a. “Shark Attack” keeps being yelled each time “minnows” runs into designated area and is re grouped.
5. Last two children left standing become “sharks”

2a. Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Gutter-ball, Human Knot, etc.)
Spider Web (modified- yarn and one of the ropes that is in the bags)
1. Two facilitators (one standing and one kneeling, two on either side make a maze with the yarn by holding the yarn in their fingers.
2. The kids then must as a team get the rope through a designated path through the maze
3. The rope must not touch the yarn. If it does then they have to start over.
2b. Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)

**Gutter ball:**
1. Split children into two equal teams.
2. Give each child a wooden piece.
3. Have each team stand in single file line shoulder to shoulder.
4. A marble will be placed at one end of the line and will need to be passed from person to person to the other end.
5. Marble cannot be touched by anyone’s hand and needs to be passed by every person on a team.
6. Whichever team gets the marble from end to end the fastest wins the race.
7. Modifications from previous weeks: have children only use one limb, make the game silent, make one student shut their eyes.

2c. Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)

**Minefield:** (minefield kit in maroon bag)
1. Ask for a volunteer to be blindfolded.
2. Set up the mine field with the bag of random materials from the body bag.
3. Ask for another volunteer who will be the speaker for the game.
4. The “speaker” will not be facing the mine field, but facing the rest of the group, the rest of the group will be facing the mine field.
5. The rest of the group will be silenced and have to communicate to the blindfolded person through the speaker.
6. Tell the group they must lead the blind person verbally through the “minefield”.
7. If the blindfolded person hits something in the minefield then they must start over.
8. If the silenced group accidently speaks the blindfolded person must start over.
9. The object is to lead the blind person to a designated object.
10. Other kids can take turns being blindfolded.
11. Modifications: have the kids, if there are enough kids split them into two groups and have two teams go through the minefield at the same time.

2d. [Back up] Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)

**Red Light Green Light:**
1. Have all the kids line up at one end of the gym.
2. The object is to reach the other side of the gym where you are.
3. You turn around so you are not facing the kids. Proceed to say “Red Light Green Light 1, 2, 3.” While you are saying this the kids are allowed to move walking with heel to toe. When you finish saying the phrase you turn around and they must all freeze. If you see anyone move they must go back to the wall and start over.
4. The winner is the first person to get to the wall where you are standing. The winner then switches with you and you participate with the kids and the winner becomes the Red light green light caller.

3. Three Reflective Learning Techniques (see Training Wheels Field Guide)

**A. Treasure Chest:**
Have the kids pick out an object in the chest and each explain why they picked the object and how it relates to their day.

**B. Body parts:**
Use the Bag of body parts and each kid picks out a part and then tells how they used that body part that day (ex: ear – how well or when they had to listen)

**C. Thumbs up Thumbs down:**
The leader call out the activities or situations throughout the day) and the kids place their thumbs up if they liked it and thumb down if they didn’t. Have the kids explain why.

**Comments/Concerns/Notes:**
We have some of the same games from previous weeks, but we have made modifications to the games as to add a different aspect.
REC 280:380 Weekly Activity Plan (WAP)

Programmers/Leaders: 

Date: November 12, 2009  Week number: 8  Group number: 2

Names of Activities for the week (page # and Bag Color if used from Training Wheels®):  
Fire Tag (p. 103), Spud, Circle Flip (p. 146), Jaguars and The Great Divide (p. 185)

Resiliency Traits:  
Overall Resiliency

Weekly Measurable Objective:  
The Barry students will show understanding of the seven resiliency traits by stating an example of each trait during our debriefing process at the end of the day.

Tuesday

All Resources Needed (e.g., tarp, cones, ropes, etc.). The same resources may not be used for both Tuesday and Thursday's plan:  
Fire Tag- Bandana's, Spud- Soft Ball, Circle Flip- Bandana's, The Great Divide- Tape or rope, or any straight line. May use bandana’s to tie legs together. Limbo Debrief- rope, or rubber chicken, or a long stick

Activity Name and Steps (1, 2, 3, etc.) for each of the following:

1. Name game Icebreaker/Deinhibitor (e.g., Elbow Tag, Group Juggle, etc.)  
   Fire Tag
   1. Give a bandana to a couple different participants and have them tie it onto their arm. (about 3 taggers to every 12 players)
   2. The individuals with the bandanas are now ‘it’ and represent fire.
   3. Before anyone who is ‘it’ can tag anyone they must stop, drop, and roll.
   4. After the ‘it’ person has stopped dropped and rolled, he or she can chase the other players.
   5. If you are tagged, you must take the bandana and tie it to your arm.
   6. You must stop, drop, and roll before you can tag another person.

   Variation:  
   Have the people who get tagged stop, drop, and roll and then join arms with the original person who was it.

2a. Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Gutter-ball, Human Knot, etc.)  
   Spud
   1. The participants start in a circle.
   2. Numbers are assigned to each participant (do NOT repeat numbers)
   3. One person in the middle has a ball
   4. The person with the ball will call out a number (of a fellow player) and then throw the ball high straight up in the air.
   5. As the ball is thrown into the air, everyone except the number called runs away from the ball.
   6. The participant who’s number was called, runs in towards the ball to catch it before it hits the ground.
   7. Once the ball is caught, the catcher yells “FREEZE!” and everyone stops right where they are.
   8. After yelling freeze, the participant holding the ball takes up to 3 steps toward any person who is nearest to them.
   9. After taking those 3 steps, they throw the ball underhand at whomever is nearest.
   10. If they hit the person at whom they were aiming, they get one point.
   11. They then retrieve the ball and everyone gets back into a circle and they start the game again by shouting a number and then throwing the ball up high into the air.

2b. Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)  
   Circle Flip
   1. The participants form a circle with everyone facing in.
   2. Everyone grabs the bandana’s of their neighbor. (instead of holding hands)
   3. The circle of participants is then instructed to find a way to turn inside out so everyone is facing outward.
   4. This must be done WITHOUT letting go of the bandana’s. Also, individuals cannot just merely turn around and have their arms crossed.
2c. Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)

**Jaguar**

1. One person is assigned the role of the Jaguar.
2. The rest form a line, with hands on the shoulders of the person ahead of them. (Kind of like a Congo line)
3. The Jaguar’s job is to try and tag the person at the end of the line.
4. In order to tag, the Jaguar must stand on two hands, and one leg, with the other leg in the air acting as a ‘tail’
5. The job of the line is to twist and turn to keep themselves in-between the Jaguar and the person at the end of the line.
6. Once the person at the end of the line is tagged, they are now the new Jaguar.
7. The previous Jaguar joins the front of the line and the process repeats.

2d. [Back-up] Trust/Communication/Problem Solving [Resiliency-based] (e.g., Lilly Pads, Mind Field, etc.)

**The Great Divide**

*This is kind of like the three legged race with quite a twist.*

1. The participants form a straight line with the sides of their feet touching their neighbor’s feet.
2. A straight line is formed in front of the group a short distance away. (by tape, rope, or a previous line)
3. The group must cross the line without becoming detached from each other
   - (Which is where the bandanas used to tie the legs together might help)
4. Have the participants do this in a large group a couple times and then split them into two smaller groups and turn it into a race.

3. Three Reflective Learning Techniques (see Training Wheels Field Guide)

**Limbo**

**“Can use a rubber chicken, a rope, pretty much anything the participants can limbo under”**

1. All the participants form a line.
2. Each time a person passes under the ‘bar’ they must give an example of the given trait.
3. The Bar is lowered after everyone has passed under the bar (whether successfully or not).
   - 1st Bar (original height)- Relationships
   - 2nd Bar (lowered once)- Humor
   - 3rd Bar (lowered twice)- Insight
   - 4th Bar (lowered 3x)- Creativity
   - 5th Bar (lowered 4x)- Initiative
   - 6th Bar (lowered 5x)- Value
   - 7th Bar (lowered 6x)- Independence
   - After Independence, the participants can just keep going through until time runs out or there is one person left

**-Talking Stick**

1. All the participants get into a circle.
2. An object is passed around the circle which holds ‘special talking powers’ (only the person holding the object may talk).
3. When holding the object, the individuals must say something they are thankful for.

**-Consensus Thumbs**

1. Have all the participants form a circle.
2. Explain what consensus is to the group.
3. Next, demonstrate the three positions of the thumb and what each position means
   - Thumbs Up: I agree
   - Thumbs sideways: I’m unsure
   - Thumbs down: I disagree
4. Have a facilitator ask questions to the group and the participants will demonstrate how they felt with their thumb.
   - If a participant disagrees, gives a thumbs down, have them explain why.

---

Comments/Concerns/Notes:
Appendix E

League 56 Academy Daily Schedule
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2:30 – 3:05</td>
<td>Attendance and Snack</td>
<td>Students will check-in with their group leaders and have the option of bringing their own or being given a healthy snack provided to them by us.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(35 Mins)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:10 – 3:20</td>
<td>Deinhibitor</td>
<td>Students will be organized into a large group and participate in an activity designed to get them moving and ready for the afternoon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(10 Mins)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:25 – 3:55</td>
<td>Construct-Focused Activity</td>
<td>Students will be separated into groups with approximately seven peers and three group leaders. Leaders will facilitate intentionally structured activities in order to promote the resiliency trait of that week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30 Mins)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:55 – 4:00</td>
<td>Debrief</td>
<td>Following the activities, leaders will facilitate small group discussions designed to help students process their experiences. We will use open-ended questions, tangible objects and writing materials to make this process engaging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5 Mins)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00 – 4:??</td>
<td>Pack-up &amp; Pick-up &amp; Sports</td>
<td>Students will pack their belongings and depart the school. Group leaders and/or program coordinators will stay with the children until all the children have left.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

League 56 Academy Parental Permission Packet
September 2009

Dear League 56 Families,

Last year the 5th & 6th graders had an opportunity to participate in the League 56 Academy, which is a new program consisting of recreation activities that target the needs of our youth. These activities included cooperative and teambuilding initiatives, such as working with peers to complete a given task, facilitated by SUNY Cortland students. Last spring, our program was facilitated during recreation time after lunch. This year, our program will be expanded to after-school time with a recreation and academic focus.

One of our goals is to determine the impact of this new and exciting program on your child’s social and academic performance. To determine the effect on social skills, we are asking you and your child to complete a survey designed to measure outcomes of the program. To determine the program’s effect on school performance, we are asking for permission to view your child’s grades prior to and following the program. However, no names will appear in any of the results and all findings will be reported collectively. We have enclosed a “Consent/Permission for Child’s Participation” form for you to sign. Your child has the choice to participate in this new program and activities even if he or she does not complete the surveys.

Please carefully read the attached “Consent/Permission for Child’s Participation” form. It provides important information for you and your child. After reviewing the attached information, please return the signed form (to school) of the “Consent/Permission for Child’s Participation” to your child’s homeroom teacher if you give permission for your child to complete the surveys. An additional copy of this material will be provided for you if desired. Even if you give consent/permission, your child will complete the surveys only if he/she is willing to do so. Either way, your child will still be able to participate in the program activities.

If you have questions about the new recreation program, please refer to the contact information below. For questions about research at SUNY Cortland or questions/concerns about participant rights and welfare, you may contact Nancy J. Ausman, IRB Chair, Associate Provost of Academic Affairs, SUNY Cortland, PO Box 2000, Cortland, NY 13045 (nrb@cortland.edu or 753-2511).

We thank you in advance for taking the time to consider you and your child’s participation in this study.

Sincerely,

Eddie Hill

Amy Shellman

Lydia Rosero

Eddie Hill, Ph.D., Assistant Professor
Recreation, Parks & Leisure Studies Dept.
SUNY Cortland
P.O. Box 2000
Cortland, NY 13045
phone: 607.753.2448
fax: 607.753.5982
eddie.hill@cortland.edu
http://familyweb.cortland.edu/hill
www.cortland.edu/rec

Amy Shellman, Ph.D., Assistant Professor
Recreation, Parks & Leisure Studies Dept.
SUNY Cortland
P.O. Box 2000
Cortland, NY 13045
phone: 607.753.4263
fax: 607.753.5982
amy.shellman@cortland.edu
www.cortland.edu/rec

Rosero
Principal
Barry Elementary
Cortland, NY 13045
607-758-4150
lrosero@cortlandschools.org
State University of New York College at Cortland
Department of Recreation, Parks and Leisure Studies

Informed Consent to Participate in Research

Beginning this fall, your school and researchers at SUNY Cortland will evaluate a new recreation program called League 56 Academy, which is a series of activities for 5th and 6th graders at Barry Elementary. This program is designed to improve social skills and school performance. During the recreation component, techniques such as cooperative recreational activities will be used to promote fitness. These activities include cooperative and teambuilding initiatives, such as working with peers to complete a given task (e.g., working as a team to get your group across an area given only certain resources), facilitated by SUNY Cortland students.

Drs. Hill and Shellman will be gathering information about the program to see if the design of the program is working to help students as planned. The goal of the research is to measure the impact of the League 56 Academy.

To measure the success of the program, we ask that you and your child each complete a survey. The surveys will take approximately 15 minutes to complete each time. If you choose to participate, your child’s survey will be administered during school and a survey will be sent home for you, the guardian, to complete. This information will help us see if children liked the program and if it improved resilience, problem solving ability, and social skills. Names will not be used on the surveys, instead, we will use a code (i.e., last four digits of home phone number) to match the answers from the pre-test to the post-test. If you decide to participate in this study, we will also request your child’s grade point average (from their teachers) before and after the program, to determine the effect of the program on academic achievement.

We do not anticipate that there will be any risks associated with this study, beyond what your child would normally encounter during a typical school day.

Your participation, as well as your child’s, is completely voluntary. You or your child can refuse to be in the research. Deciding not to participate involves no penalty or loss of benefits your family or your child may be receiving from the school or any other agency. You or your child can quit the study at any time. Leaving the League 56 program evaluation involves no penalty or loss of benefits your family or your child may be receiving.

Parents and students that participate will have access to a summary of results regarding League 56. An Executive Summary Report will be available in the main office at Barry by the end of this school year. Participants will be assigned a code number so that you or your child’s name will not be attached to responses. All data and participant information will be kept in a locked and secure location.

If you have questions about the new recreation program, you may contact Principal Rosero at 755-4150. For questions about the evaluation of the recreation program, you may contact Drs. Eddie Hill at 753-2448 or amy.shellman@cornell.edu or Amy Shellman at 753-4263 or amy.shellman@cornell.edu. For questions about research at SUNY Cortland or questions concerning participant rights and welfare, you may contact Nancy J. Aumann, IRB Chair, Associate Provost of Academic Affairs, SUNY Cortland, PO Box 2000, Cortland, NY 13045 (irb@cornell.edu or 753-2511).

Please complete the attached form and return it to the homeroom teacher by Monday, September 21, 2009.

(You may keep this page for your records.)
State University of New York College at Cortland
Department of Recreation, Parks and Leisure Studies

Informed Consent to Participate in Research

I __________________________ (Participant's Printed Name) have read the description of the project for which this consent is requested and the researcher has answered any questions I have at this time. I understand my rights and I hereby consent to participate in this study. I have received a copy of this form for my future reference.

☐ I am planning to have my child join the League 56 Academy program after school.

OR

☐ I am NOT planning to have my child join the League 56 Academy Program after school.

Your child’s name (please print): ________________________________________________

Your name (please print): ______________________________________________________

Relationship to child (please check one):
  Parent: ______
  Legal Guardian: ______

Your Signature: ________________________________________________________________________

Date: _______________________________________________________________________________
League 56 Students

Our names are Professor Hill and Professor Shellman from SUNY Cortland.

This school year, you will have the chance to join in on some fun new activities after school. These activities are part of the League 56 Academy, a new program at Barry Elementary School. We are doing a research study to find out if kids think this program is helping them. We would like you to participate in our research by completing a survey.

You get to decide if you want to be part of the research. No one but people on the research team will see your answers. Answering these questions will take about 15 minutes. When completing the surveys, do not put your name on them. If you decide to fill out the surveys, we will not tell anyone else what you said or did in the survey. Even if your parents or teachers ask, we will not tell them about what you wrote in the surveys.

You may ask questions about the surveys and the program at any time.

Signing below means that you have read this form or have had it read to you, and that you are willing to be in this study.

Students Signature

Student’s printed name

Date
Appendix G

Institutional Review Board Approval
MEMORANDUM

To: Eddie Hill and Amy Shellman

From: Leslie Eaton, Associate Professor of Psychology
       Institutional Review Board Administrator

Date: 03-25-09

RE: Institutional Review Board Approval

In accordance with SUNY Cortland’s procedures for human research participant protections, the protocol referenced below has been approved for a period of one year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title of the study:</th>
<th>Engaging 5th and 6th graders through resiliency-based recreation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level of review:</td>
<td>Expedited</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocol number:</td>
<td>809010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project start date:</td>
<td>Upon IRB approval*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approval expiration date*:</td>
<td>03-24-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Notes: see page 2

For information about continuation policies and procedures, visit http://www.cortland.edu/irb/Applications/Continuations.html

The federal Office for Research Protections (OHRP) emphasizes that investigators play a crucial role in protecting the rights and welfare of human subjects and are responsible for carrying out sound ethical research consistent with research plans approved by an IRB. Along with meeting the specific requirements of a particular research study, investigators are responsible for ongoing requirements in the conduct of approved research that include, in summary:

- obtaining and documenting informed consent from the participants and/or from a legally authorized representative prior to the individual’s participation in the research, unless these requirements have been waived by the IRB;
- obtaining prior approval from the IRB for any modifications of (or additions to) the previously approved research; this includes modifications to advertisements and other recruitment materials, changes to the informed consent or child assent, the study design and procedures, addition of research staff or student assistants, etc. (except those alterations necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to subjects, which are then to be reported by email to irb@cortland.edu within three days);
- providing to the IRB prompt reports of any unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others;
- applying for continuation requests, consistent with SUNY Cortland Policies and Procedures and federal guidelines, prior to the expiration of this approval; and,
- maintaining records as required by the HHS regulations and NYS State law, for at least three years after completion of the study.

Given the topics and methods of research conducted at SUNY Cortland, investigators frequently possess multiple and possibly conflicting role responsibilities. A principle investigator’s primary duty is to ensure the protection of research participants during recruitment, participation, and after the study has concluded. In the event that questions or concerns arise about multiple roles or the conduct of research at SUNY Cortland, contact the IRB by email irb@cortland.edu or by telephone at (607) 753-2079. You may also contact a member of the IRB who possesses expertise in your discipline or methodology, visit http://www.cortland.edu/irb/members.html to obtain a current list of IRB members.

Sincerely,

Leslie Eaton
Notes

Intervention began 01-09, a program offered as a service-learning course (not under the purview of the IRB). Full review protocol was reclassified as expedited. A second reviewer and the Full Board will examine the protocol to ensure that the federal regulations are satisfied. Feedback (if any) will be distributed to both investigators.

Please include the protocol expiration date to the bottom of your consent form.