Afterschool staff have been identified as a critical piece in the positive outcomes youth receive through participation in afterschool programs (Apsler, 2009; Daud & Carruthers, 2008; Riggs & Greenberg, 2004). These programs may benefit youth with disabilities but little is known about what influences staff to include youth with disabilities in afterschool programs. This dissertation describes two studies aimed at understanding what factors influence afterschool staff to include youth with disabilities in afterschool programs, and if training afterschool staff based on these factors would be an effective way to encourage inclusion behaviors.

The first study surveyed 91 afterschool program staff using a measure designed to capture staff beliefs toward including youth with disabilities in physical activity. The results of this study indicated that 53% of staff members’ intention to include youth with disabilities can be explained by attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control, while 8% of behavior is explained by staff’s intention. Expectations of those
closest to staff was the strongest predictor of staffs intention. The strength of the relationship from subjective norms to intention indicated that the expectations of others are an important factor in the inclusion of children with disabilities in physical activity during afterschool programs. Afterschool programs should be clear in presenting their inclusion philosophy to staff working in their afterschool programs.

The second study aimed to determine if a 3 hour staff training had a positive effect on staff’s inclusion intention, inclusion behavior and inclusion knowledge. Eighty two participated from x afterschool sites. All participants were assigned to either training or control groups by stratified random assignment. Participants in the training group received a three hour training on expectations of inclusion by key stakeholders (organizations, parents, youth with disabilities, peers) and strategies to include youth with disabilities in physical activity among other topics. Results indicate that staff participating in the training significantly increased their knowledge (F (1, 78) = 21.43, p<.05) compared to the control group. No differences were observed between groups for inclusion intention or inclusion behavior. This study demonstrates that in-service trainings are a useful resource for increasing afterschool staff’s inclusion knowledge.

Overall, this dissertation identifies key factors that contribute to staff inclusion intention and behavior, and how a three hour in-service training is effective in increasing staff knowledge. Study one indicates that attitudes of staff and the expectations of those around them play a role in their inclusion of youth with disabilities in physical activity and should be included in trainings. Study two demonstrates that a three hour in-service training focusing on attitudes and expectations can increase afterschool staff’s
knowledge. An increase in knowledge may help staff to provide appropriate supports and modifications to youth with disabilities participating in physical activity during afterschool programs.
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Chapter 1: General Introduction
General Introduction

Approximately 8.5 million youth in the United States attend afterschool programs. Research indicates that quality afterschool programs benefit youth in a variety of ways including academics, social emotional competence, health, peer acceptance, physical activity, and character development (Apsler, 2009; Mahoney, Lord, & Carryl, 2005; Trost, Rosenkranz, & Dzewaltowski, 2008; Watts, Witt, & King, 2008). These programs could be of particular importance for youth with disabilities. Youth with disabilities experience a number of challenges when compared to their typically developing peers. Youth with disabilities may have higher rates of overweight and obesity (Rimmer, Rowland, & Yamaki, 2007), lower levels of physical activity (Foley, Bryan, & McCubbin, 2008), lack of knowledge and awareness about health behavior (Rimmer et al, 2007) and lower levels of social participation due to labeling, lack of adaptations, and attitudes about individuals with disabilities. Riggs and Greenberg, (2004) suggested that youth with disability can benefit from quality afterschool programs. A recent report by the Afterschool Alliance (2012) indicates that up to 16% of youth attending afterschool programs have some sort of disability. This is slightly higher than the 13.1% of total students enrolled in publics schools (U.S Department of Education, 2012)

Physical activity is the second most reported offering to youth who attend afterschool programs, and these opportunities are especially important for youth with disabilities (Afterschool Alliance, 2012) Youth with disabilities have a 38% higher prevalence of overweight and obesity, they also face the increased risk for secondary conditions associated with overweight and obesity (CDC, 2013). Secondary conditions
are preventable physical, mental, social or social conditions that result either directly or indirectly form an individual’s primary disability (WHO, 2013) The secondary conditions that youth with disabilities may face can include, type I diabetes, sleep apnea, joint pain, decubitus ulcers, depression, and social isolation (CDC, 2013). The current lack of physical activity by youth with disabilities and the adverse health outcomes that are associated with this inactivity are concerning.

The challenge then is to increase the physical activity of these youth, however, there are numerous barriers that youth with disabilities face when trying to participate in physical activity. These barriers for youth with disabilities include; (a) less time in or being excluded from physical education, (b) class sizes too large to fit the child’s needs, (c) individuals gross motor function or feelings about being able to be successful, (d) lack of access to facilities or community programs, (e) lack of social support, (f) lack of knowledge among staff, (g) lack of staff training to help facilitate PA (Rimmer & Braddock, 2002; Temple & Walkey, 2007; Rimmer, et al., 2007; Block & Obrusnikova, 2007; Maher, Williams, Olds, Lane, & Adelaide, 2007). The physical activity opportunities available at afterschool programs may help to limit some of these barriers and promote a physically active lifestyle for youth with disabilities.

Staff contribute significantly to the quality of afterschool programs. The ability of afterschool programs to include youth with disabilities in physical activity may largely depend on the quality of staff. Studies show that staff play a key role in the effectiveness of afterschool programs and the outcomes youth receive from the program (Apsler, 2009; Daud & Carruthers, 2008; Riggs & Greenberg, 2004). Staff who are trained, attentive,
engaged with youth, and positive role models, have a positive influence on the outcomes of youth attending their programs (Daud & Carruthers 2008). The impact staff have on the environment, youth, and the program as a whole contribute to the benefits of afterschool programs (Riggs & Greenberg, 2004). Although the importance of staff has been emphasized, little is known about after school program staff behavior and intention to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during their programs.

Considering the significance of the staffs’ role in including children with disabilities in afterschool program, it is important to understand factors that influence staffs’ inclusion of youth with disabilities in physical activity and to train staff based on these factors. A theory based in-service training may provide ways to help afterschool program staff understand youth with disabilities and provide opportunities for staff to learn skills that can assist them in including youth with disabilities in physical activity during afterschool programs. Therefore, the purposes of this dissertation were; a) to examine factors influencing afterschool staffs inclusion of youth with disabilities in physical activity, and b) examining the effectiveness of a three hour in-service training on afterschool staffs knowledge, intention and behavior of including youth with disabilities in physical activity during afterschool programs. The following specific research questions and hypothesis was examined.

Study 1:
Question 1: What factors influenced afterschool staffs inclusion of youth with disabilities in physical activity during their afterschool program.

Study 2:
Question 1: What were the effects of three hour in-service training on staffs’ knowledge about working with youth with disabilities?

Hypothesis 1: The training would increase afterschool program staffs’ knowledge about working with youth with disabilities in their afterschool program.

Question 2: What were the effects of three hour in-service training on the behavior and intention of staff to including youth with disabilities in physical activity during their afterschool program?

Hypothesis 2: The three hour training would increase the behavior of afterschool program staff to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during their afterschool program.

Hypothesis 3: The three hour training would increase the intention of afterschool program staff to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during their afterschool program.

Assumptions

These studies operated under the following assumptions:

Study 1:

1. Afterschool program staff were answering questions honestly and without fear of repercussion.

Study 2:

1. Afterschool program staff were answering questions honestly and without fear of repercussions.

2. The measure being used is appropriate for use with this population.
3. Afterschool program staff assigned to training and control groups did not discuss the training content with each other during the study time period.

4. Afterschool organizations value inclusion and support staff including youth with disabilities in physical activity.

**Delimitations**

These studies were delimited to the following:

**Study 1:**

1. Afterschool staff working in youth development afterschool programs that contain programming that focuses on promoting positive development in one or more domains of functioning (Riggs & Greenberg, 2004).

2. Afterschool organizations in Northern California and Oregon

**Study 2:**

1. Afterschool staff working in youth development afterschool programs that contain programming that focuses on promoting positive development in one or more domains of functioning (Riggs & Greenberg, 2004).

2. Afterschool organizations in Oregon

**Limitations**

**Study 1:**

1. There is a limited ability to generalize this studies results to the general population of afterschool staff

2. Small sample size
Study 2:

1. There is potential for a cohort effect.

**Operational Definitions**

1. Afterschool program: For the purpose of this study the term afterschool program was referred to what Riggs and Greenberg (2004) describe as a youth development afterschool program that “explicitly attempts to promote positive development of one or more domains of functioning” (pg. 181).

2. Staff: the term staff will refer to someone who is at least 18 years of age, is a part time or full time employee of an afterschool program that provides direct service to youth in their program.

3. Inclusion: Philosophy of acceptance of diversity that focuses on individual differences and works toward promoting self-directed behavior, and interactions with peers. Programming is characterized by adaptation of teaching skills, and techniques to accommodate individual differences.

4. Youth with disabilities: Any youth that has a documented disability or a disability that has been identified by the parent/guardian. These disabilities may include but are not limited to learning disabilities, developmental disabilities and/or physical disabilities.

5. Knowledge: Understanding of a topic
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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to identify factors influencing staff inclusion of youth with disabilities in physical activity during afterschool programs. One hundred and twenty participants completed the Inclusion in Afterschool Programs Staff Survey (IAPSS). The results of a path analysis indicated that 53% of staff members’ intention to include youth with disabilities can be explained by attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control, while 8% of behavior is explained by staffs’ intention. Subjective norm was the strongest predictor for the participants’ intention to include children with disabilities in programs. The strength of the relationship from subjective norms to intention indicates that the expectations of others are an important factor in the inclusion of children with disabilities in afterschool programs. Programs wanting to promote the inclusion of youth with disabilities should be clear in presenting the program philosophy and/or their partnering organizations philosophy towards inclusion.

Key words: Theory of Planned Behavior, inclusion, out of school time, intention, physical activity, afterschool programs, staff attitudes
Factors Influencing Staff Inclusion of Youth with Disabilities in Afterschool Programs

Over 15 million youth attend afterschool programs nationwide (Afterschool Alliance, 2012). These programs benefit youth in a variety of ways including academics, social emotional competence, health, peer acceptance, physical activity, and character development (Apsler, 2009; Mahoney, Lord, & Carryl, 2005; Trost, Rosenkranz, & Dzewaltowski, 2008; Watts, Witt, & King, 2008). Different types of afterschool programs may offer participants different opportunities to be physically active. School-age child care programs can be unstructured and have a variety of free choice activities ranging from recreation, arts and crafts, homework time, and just "hanging out." These programs can offer participants opportunity to be physically active but activity is likely to be self-initiated and unstructured (Riggs & Greenberg, 2004). A youth development afterschool program generally contains programming that focuses on promoting positive development in one or more domains of functioning. These afterschool programs offer structured and unstructured programs that can provide participants opportunities to engage in physical activity that they enjoy as well as try new activities that are led by staff (Daud & Carruthers, 2008; Riggs & Greenberg, 2004).

Afterschool programs could be of particular importance to youth with disabilities who often have fewer opportunities to participate in physical activity in the community and have substantially lower levels of physical activity during afterschool compared to their typically developing peers (Foley et al., 2008; Rimmer, Rowland, & Yamaki, 2007). Afterschool programs may provide youth with disabilities a variety of recreation opportunities, in turn increasing their potential to participate in more physical activity.
The benefits that youth with disabilities experience in afterschool programs could be largely influenced by the staff that supervise and implement the programs. Daud and Carruthers (2008) revealed that staff influences four major outcomes youth from vulnerable populations experience by attending afterschool programs including (a) exposure to a nurturing and enjoyable environment, (b) learning positive behaviors and values, (c) development of a sense of competence by trying and learning new things, and (d) development of a positive plan for the future. Staff members who are engaged with youth, are a positive role model on how to interact and treat others, and help youth build positive relationships with peers all have a positive influence on the outcomes of youth attending their programs (Daud & Carruthers, 2008). Staff members also play an important role in the afterschool program climate. Staff members who are trained, warm, attentive, and responsive have a positive influence on the outcomes of programs (Riggs & Greenberg, 2004).

Successful inclusion of youth with disabilities in afterschool programs will require staff members who (a) believe in the concept of inclusion, (b) have an attitude of acceptance of differences, (c) are trained, and (d) model appropriate behavior towards the inclusion of youth with disabilities (Anderson & Kress, 2003; Miller, Schleien, & Bowens, 2010; Miller, Schleien, & Lausier, 2009) Research has identified that staff members have generally positive attitudes towards inclusion and they believe that youth with disabilities benefit for inclusion (Scholl, Smith, & Davidson). However, there is limited evidence on what specific factors influence afterschool program staff’s beliefs and perceptions about inclusion in physical activity. Knowledge of these factors will
allow for collaboration in the development of staff trainings specific to afterschool programs that could increase the amount of physical activity youth with disabilities participate in. Previous studies (e.g., Jeong & Block, 2011; Kozub & Lienert, 2003; Kudlacek, 2008) have explored factors influencing physical education teachers’ inclusion practices using the Theory of Planned Behavior (TPB) (Ajzen, 1991). These studies have provided valuable understanding on issues associated with including youth with disabilities in physical education classes (e.g. Conatser, Block, & Gansneder, 2002; Kozub & Lienert, 2003; Theodorakis, Bagiatis, & Goudas, 1995). However, professional characteristics (e.g. educational background, training) and work environment limit the generalization of findings from previous studies of physical education teachers to afterschool program staff. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to identify factors influencing afterschool program staffs’ intention and behavior toward the inclusion of youth with disabilities in physical activity during afterschool programs using TPB.

TPB is a psychological theory that explains how a desired behavior is influenced by one’s beliefs and intention to perform that behavior (Ajzen, 1991, 2001; Blanchard et al., 2008; Francis et al., 2004; Kudlacek, 2008; Theodorakis, Bagiatis, & Goudas, 1995). Ajzen (1991) has suggested that one’s intention to perform a behavior is influenced by three types of beliefs (a) behavioral beliefs (attitude), (b) normative beliefs (subjective norms), and (c) control beliefs (perceived behavioral control). For example, afterschool program staff’s inclusion of youth with disabilities in physical activity (desired behavior) may be directly influenced by the staff’s intention. Staff members’ intent to include youth with disabilities is then effected by (a) their beliefs about the advantages, disadvantages,
and consequences about including them, (b) the social expectation they feel from others, and (c) their beliefs of their ability and control. By evaluating these beliefs and their relationship to intention and behavior, we may be able to identify the factors that help explain afterschool program staff’s intention and behavior toward including youth with disabilities in afterschool programs. This information can then be used to (a) expand the current knowledge about afterschool program staff, and (b) design interventions to target key factors that will assist in increasing staff member’s inclusion of youth with disabilities in physical activity.

Method

Participants

A total of 120 afterschool staff members participated in the study. After accounting for missing values, 91 surveys were included in the main analysis. Participants for this study were from 16 different sites, in 10 communities; within five non-profit afterschool organizations (some organizations had multiple sites in different communities). Staff members were defined as (a) over the age of 18, (b) employed by an afterschool program, and (c) provides direct service to the youth in their program. Table 1 includes detailed demographic information on the age, gender, education, and disability-related job training of staff members, as well as the types and numbers of youth with disabilities in their program. Fifty nine (65.6%) participants were between the ages of 18-24, twenty six (28.9%) between 25-34, and five participants (5.5%) were over the age of 35. The majority of participants had some level of college education or a college degree, 50.5% and 35.2%, respectively. All participants indicated that they did have youth with
disabilities in their programs. Eighty nine staff (97.8%) reported they had youth in their program with hidden disabilities (e.g., learning disabilities, ADD/ADHD, emotional disturbance), 76 staff (83.5%) indicated that youth with intellectual disability (e.g., Down syndrome, autism) were present in their program, and 52 participants (59.1%) had youth with physical disabilities (e.g., amputation, spinal cord injury, cerebral palsy) in their program. The amount of previous training on inclusion and/or disabilities varied. Thirty three participants (37.5%) had never received training on disabilities while 25 (28.4%) had received one training session although the length and content were not specifically defined.

Table 2.1

Demographics of Afterschool Program Staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency (N= 91)</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>65.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School site</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and recreation building</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based site</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disabilities in program</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of training (disability)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twice</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than twice</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Procedures

Afterschool program directors were contacted by the first author and asked if they would allow the researcher to come in and speak with staff about participation in the study. The TPB questionnaire was administered to staff during a meeting that was organized by the director. Staff's informed consent was obtained prior to data collection. The procedure for each survey administration included an introduction of the researcher, review of the informed consent document, time for staff to look over the survey, and time for the researcher to answer any questions that staff may have. Specific test procedures were approved by the researchers’ institutional review board. All participants agreed to participate in the study.

Measures

The instrument for this study was developed based on recommendations from previous research (Ajzen, 2001; Conatser, et al., 2002; Francis, et al., 2004; Kozub & Lienert, 2003; Kudlacek, 2008). Items were created based on what Francis et al. (2004) refers to as direct measures of attitude, subjective norms, perceived behavioral control, and generalized intention. Items were modified to reflect this study’s population and behavior of interest (afterschool program staff, including youth with disabilities in physical activity). Items were evaluated independently by the authors and an independent
researcher to ensure that a target, action context, and time were provided for each item. Content validity was assumed once one hundred percent agreement was reached by two independent experts in the field of disability research. A factor analysis was conducted on all items and resulted in one factor for each of the theory constructs. All factors loaded above .60, indicating with good confidence that items did in fact measure the intended construct. Internal consistency for all theory constructs was estimated through a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient analysis.

Fifteen demographic questions asked about gender, age, education, job, and types of afterschool program, and trainings they received about disabilities and physical activity. Attitude toward the behavior was assessed by a single stem question with a series of bipolar responses. The stem “Including a child with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program is” was followed by the 4 bipolar pairings (harmful-beneficial, good-bad, pleasant (for me)-unpleasant (for me), worthless-useful). Each pairing used a 7-point scale and responses were summed to get a total attitude score. Internal consistency for these items was $\alpha = .76$.

Subjective norms were assessed with three statements: “It is expected of me that I include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program,” “people who are important to me, want me to include youth with disabilities in my afterschool program,” and “people who are important to me think I should include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program.” Each question used a 7-point scale from strongly disagree to strongly agree. A total score resulted from the summing of responses. Internal consistency for these items was $\alpha = .75$. 
Perceived behavioral control consisted of three questions: “The decision to include youth with disabilities in physical activity in my afterschool program is beyond my control”, “I am confident that I could include youth with disabilities in physical activity as part of my role in my afterschool program,” and “for me to include youth with disabilities in my afterschool program is.” All three questions followed the 7-point scale previously mentioned except the first two questions were strongly disagree to strongly agree and the third question was very hard to very easy. Scores were summed for total score. Internal consistency for these items was $\alpha = .58$.

Intention and behavior were estimated based on the total summed score of three questions for each construct. Intention questions stated: “I intend to…”, “I want to…”, and “I expect to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program. Behavior questions started with “In the past 30 days” and continued to state “I have facilitated…”, “I have incorporated…”, and “I have included youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program”. Scaling and scoring for both constructs followed that of subjective norms. Internal consistency for both intention ($\alpha = .86$) and behavior ($\alpha = .84$) were adequate.

**Analysis**

Prior to conducting the main analysis, the data was evaluated for missing values on construct items, and participants with missing data were removed from the main analysis. Separate one-way ANOVAs were used to assess if age, gender, education, job title, or training impacted any of the five TPB constructs scores (attitude, subjective norms, perceived behavioral control, intention, and behavior). Path analysis was run to
determine the strength of the relationships in the model and also provided fit indices to examine if TPB is a viable model to assess afterschool program staffs beliefs about including youth with disabilities in physical activity. The indices used to determine model fit were based on recommendations of Brown (2006) and indices commonly used in TPB research. These included chi-square, Goodness of Fit Index (GFI), Root Mean Squared Residual (RMR), Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA), and Comparative Fit Index (CFI). In the selected model fit indices; the CFI and GFI use a 0 to 1.0 scale with 1.0 being perfect fit. RMR and RMSEA also use the 0 to 1.0 scale with a higher score indicating less of a fit to the model. SPSS 16.0 was used for the ANOVA and factor analysis. AMOS16.0 was utilized for the path analysis.

Results

Descriptive statistics and a zero order correlation matrix are presented in Table 2. Participants’ mean scores were relatively positive; attitude mean was 5.73 (SD= 1.11), subjective norm 5.53 (SD= 1.21), perceived behavioral control was the lowest mean with 5.15 (SD= 1.12), while intent had the highest mean of 6.06 (SD= 1.04) and the mean score for participant behavior was 5.57 (SD= 1.41). All correlations among theory constructs were significant to a .05 level except for attitude and behavior where no statistically significant correlation existed (r = .13, p <.05). Results from the ANOVA on TPB constructs indicated that age, gender, training, and education did not have a significant influence on any of the theory constructs.

Table 2.2

Correlation Matrix of Theory of Planned Behavior Constructs with Mean and Standard Deviation
In terms of the path analysis, results showed that TPB is an acceptable theoretical model to assess afterschool program staff’s beliefs about including youth with disabilities in physical activity (see Figure 1). All indices showed adequate level of fit, a chi-square of \( \chi^2(3, N = 91) = 3.24, p > .05 \) CFI= .99, GFI = .98, RMSEA = .03. According to Hu and Bentler (1999), a CFI value of .90 or greater and an RMSEA value of .06 or less are considered as excellent fit. Also value of GFI exceeded the .95 conventional standards. In addition, the path analysis revealed that intention was significantly predicted by a direct relationships from attitude (\( \beta = .17, p < .05 \)) and subjective norms (\( \beta = .53, p < .01 \)). Fifty three percent of intention was accounted by attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control. The direct relationship from intention to behavior was also statistically significant (\( \beta = .37, p < .01 \)), but accounted for 7.5% of model variance.

Figure 2.1

Theory of Planned Behavior Structural Coefficients for Afterschool Program Staff
Discussion

The primary purpose of this study was to identify factors influencing afterschool program staff’s inclusion of youth with disabilities in physical activity. This study utilized the TPB as a theoretical framework to explore the beliefs of afterschool program staff. Previous research using TPB indicated that teachers and instructor’s (pre-service and in-service) control beliefs, normative beliefs, and behavioral beliefs can be used to assess their intention to include students with disabilities in physical activity (Conatser, et al., 2002; Jeong & Block, 2011; Kozub & Lienert, 2003; Kudlacek, Valkova, Sherrill, Myers, & French, 2002; Theodorakis, et al., 1995).

This study found that subjective norms was the largest contributor to intention and suggest that afterschool staff are mostly influenced by the social response to expectations from those important or close to them. The results suggest that organizations should have a mission statement or philosophy that explicitly identifies the importance of inclusion. Anderson and Kress (2003) recommend that mission statements for recreation programs
should reflect the vision and values that direct a program or organization to meet their objective. An example of this would be the current Boys & Girls Clubs of America’s mission statement; “To inspire and enable all young people especially those who need us most to become caring, productive, responsible citizens” (Boys & Girls Clubs of America, 2010). While this mission statement does include “all” it might not be a clear indication that youth with disabilities are welcome. Mission statements that include “all ability levels” or “all stages of ability” may be a clearer indicator of inclusion (Anderson & Kress, 2003). The development of clear policies and procedures regarding inclusion can also indicate to all staff the importance the afterschool program places on inclusion.

Findings regarding the influence of attitude predicting intention are similar to the Conatser et al. (2002) study of aquatics instructors’ beliefs toward inclusion. Instructor attitudes were seen to have an impact on their intention to include youth with mild and severe disabilities. The current study supports the importance of staff attitudes. This suggests that trainings designed to help increase positive attitudes about youth with disabilities participating in physical activity may also help to increase staff intention to include these youth. Current research indicates that recreation staff training should be an ongoing process of awareness and skill building to provide appropriate inclusion for youth with disabilities (Anderson & Kress, 2003; Miller et al., 2010; Scholl et al., 2005). Trainings designed to focus on topics such as understanding some of the disabilities of the youth in their program, and understanding how to help youth be active in their program through planning and modifications may serve as a good starting point for
helping staff to have a positive attitude about including youth with disabilities in physical activity (Miller et al., 2010).

The results from the current study show no statistically significant contribution of perceived behavioral control to intention. This finding was contradictory to the previous studies in teacher education. Both Conatser et al. (2002) and Kudlacek et al. (2002) found perceived behavioral control was the best predictor of intention in instructors and pre-service teachers’ beliefs. Azjen (1991) suggested that as perceived behavioral control is under someone's volitional control the less it influences behavior. A plausible explanation of this unexpected result may be related to the staff’s beliefs on their ability and control. Afterschool staff members may feel they have no control over whether a youth with disabilities is included in their specific program. This study asked staff three global PBC questions (a) “I am confident that I could include youth with disabilities in physical activity as part of my role in an afterschool program,” (b) “The decision to include youth with disabilities in physical activity in this afterschool program is beyond my control,” and (c) “For me to include youth with disabilities in physical activity is part of my role in my current afterschool program.” The assumption was that staff would answer questions as if the youth were already members in the program, but staff may have felt these questions were asking about if they had control about youth being enrolled in the program. The difference may also relate to the low internal consistency for the items for this construct ($\alpha = .58$) and should be researched further.

In this study, intention was able to predict approximately 8% of behavior. The inclusion of self-report of behavior in the afterschool study allowed for a true path
analysis, and suggests that staff are including youth with disabilities in physical activity in afterschool programs. Kozub and Lienert (2003) have criticized current TPB research relating to teaching youth with disabilities for its absence of behavior appraisal. Azjen (2001) and Francis et al. (2004) indicate that in the TPB model behavior can be assessed in two ways (a) direct observation based on identified criteria for the behavior, and (b) self-report. In one of the few studies examining the inclusion behavior towards youth with disabilities, Conatser et al. (2002) found a significant direct relationship from intention to behavior by using the self-report of aquatic instructor’s behavior. Behavior in afterschool staff should be explored further with specific focus on determining if a criterion measure or direct observation tool can be used to gauge if a stronger relationship exists between intention and actual behavior.

This study examined afterschool program staff’s beliefs about including youth with disabilities in physical activity and, although findings from the study are promising, there are also some weaknesses. First, although staff who participated in this study were from 16 different sites in 10 communities, only five non-profit afterschool organizations were represented in the study (some organizations had multiple sites in different communities), which may facilitate a cohort effect. Second, only 91 afterschool program staff members participated without any missing data in the study. This, combined with the potential cohort effect, may create sampling issues. To help with these limitations, future research should work to increase not only the number of participating staff but also increase the number of program sites. More information is still needed to fully understand
what influences afterschool program staff to include youth with disabilities in physical activity.

Further research is needed to determine possible factors within TPB constructs that specifically influence afterschool staff. First, efforts should be made to identify factors influencing staff members’ perceived control using situations that are specific to their jobs. This may help to clarify other factors that contribute to perceived control and may help to get a better picture of how perceived control relates to intention. Second, the self-report measure of behavior should include more specific behaviors. These behavior measures should include questions specific to aspects of inclusion including, planning, adaptations, and facilitation of physical activity.

The major findings from this study indicate that afterschool programs that wish to include youth with disabilities should focus on how the program conveys its expectations of inclusion to staff. Afterschool programs may achieve this by having inclusion expectations in the employee handbook for new employees; include an inclusion policy as part of its policies and procedures, and by offering trainings that convey these expectations. Programs that collaborate with other entities (e.g., schools, churches, parks and recreation) should work together to identify an inclusion philosophy and/or policy, then identify how staff will be informed of these expectations. By working to give afterschool staff members clear expectations of inclusion, programs may be able to increase staff members intention and in turn behavior of including youth with disabilities in their programs.
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Effectiveness of In-service Inclusion Training on Afterschool Program Staff
Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the effectiveness of a 3 hour in-service training on afterschool staffs knowledge, intention, and behavior of including youth with disabilities in physical activity during afterschool programs. Eighty two participants were included in this study. Participants were stratified by site and randomly assigned into training or control groups. The training group participated in a 3 hour in-service inclusion training focusing on attitudes and expectations of inclusion. Results: Two separate 2 x 2 (group by test) repeated measures MANOVAs examined the effect of in-service training on inclusion intention, inclusion behavior, and knowledge and on attitude, subjective norm, and perceived control, respectively. These results indicate a significant interaction between group and test on knowledge. However, there were not positive in-service training effects on all other variables. Conclusion: In-service trainings can be an effective approach to increasing knowledge in afterschool staff. The implications of increased knowledge for afterschool staff and future research needs are discussed. Keywords: intervention, Theory of Planned Behavior, physical activity, disability
Effectiveness of Inclusion Training for Afterschool Program Staff

Over 8 million youth in the United States participate in afterschool programs (Afterschool Alliance, 2012). Quality afterschool programs have been found to benefit youth in a variety of ways including: increases in; academic scores, social emotional competence, health, peer acceptance, physical activity, and character development (Apsler, 2009; Mahoney, Lord, & Carryl, 2005; Trost, Rosenkranz, & Dwaltowski, 2008; Watts, Witt, & King, 2008). It has been suggested that youth with disability can benefit from quality afterschool programs (Riggs & Greenberg, 2004). A recent report from the National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (2012) indicate that nine percent of youth served by of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) have reported some type of disability (National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing, 2012). That number is much higher in a report by the Afterschool Alliance (2012) that 16 percent of youth attending afterschool programs have some kind of disability.

The positive outcomes reported by participation in afterschool programs could be of particular importance for youth with disabilities, as youth with disabilities typically experience a number of challenges when compared to their typically developing peers. Youth with disabilities may have higher rates of overweight and obesity (Rimmer, Rowland, & Yamaki, 2007), lower levels of physical activity (Foley, Bryan, & McCubbin, 2008), lack of knowledge and awareness about health behavior (Rimmer et al., 2007) and lower levels of social participation due to labeling, lack of adaptations, and attitudes about individuals with disabilities (Rimmer, et al., 2007).
There is a growing conversation in the field of afterschool research about the identity of program domains that contribute to positive youth outcomes. Palmer, Anderson, and Sabatelli (2009) discussed the growing body of research and identify six domains to represent the consensus on program quality. These six domains include; 1) supportive relationships, 2) intentional programming, 3) strong community partnerships, 4) promotion of youth engagement, 5) physical safety, and 6) continuous quality improvement. Their description of supportive relationships focuses primarily on staff and the impact they have on youth and program climate. Palmer et al. (2009) identified that staff contribute to a positive emotional environment, and impact youth engagement. This is supported by others who have identified that staff who are trained, attentive, engaged with youth, and are positive role models, have a positive influence on the outcomes of youth attending afterschool programs (Apsler, 2009; Daud & Carruthers, 2008; Riggs & Greenberg, 2004).

The ability for youth with disabilities to experience positive outcomes in afterschool programs may largely depend on the quality of staff, and their ability to include youth with disabilities in existing programming. A recent study examining afterschool program staffs’ intention and behavior of including children with disabilities in their program. Taylor and Yun (2012) utilized the Theory of Plan Behavior (Ajzen, 1991) to examine factors affecting staffs’ intention and behavior of including children with disabilities in afterschool programs. The Theory of Plan Behavior (TPB) is a psychological theory that explains how a desired behavior is influenced by ones intention to perform that behavior (Ajzen, 1991). In the TPB model, intention is determined by
first examining how behavioral beliefs, normative beliefs, and control beliefs relate to attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control. The model then assesses how attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control relate to intention and how intention relates to behavior (Ajzen, 1991). Results indicate that staff are mostly influenced by a social response to expectation from those important or close to them. In addition, staffs’ attitude is also an important predictor of staffs’ intention.

Considering the significance of staffs’ role in afterschool programs, training staff on how to meet the needs of youth with disabilities in physical activity may play an important role in increasing staffs’ inclusive behavior. Afterschool staff surveyed by the National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards and Student Testing (2012) indicate that in-service trainings/workshops are one of the most common forms of professional development that they participate in. However, little information is available to determine if this type of training is effective in changing afterschool staff’s intention, behavior, and knowledge. Therefore, the purpose of this study was to examine the effectiveness of a 3 hour in-service training on afterschool program staffs knowledge, intention and behavior of including youth with disabilities in physical activity during afterschool programs.

Method

Participants

A total of 152 staff participated in the study. After accounting for missing survey data, organization dropout, and training attendance, a total of 82 participants were included in the final data analysis. While a 50% drop out rate appears to be large, but
afterschool programs typically experience high rates of turnover (Afterschool Alliance, 2012) which could have contributed to participant attrition. Participants were dropped from the analysis for the following reasons; a) if they did not complete the pre or post surveys, b) if they were assigned to the training group but did not attend the training, c) if they left the training early, d) if they worked in only the before school program, e) or if they did not facilitate physical activity as part of their responsibility in their afterschool programs. Figure 3.1 shows the participant recruitment flowchart.

Figure 3.1
Participant attrition
Participants for this study were recruited through their afterschool organization. Organizations were identified through a web search on local and national afterschool organizations. In order for an organization to participate in the study, they had to be considered a youth development afterschool program as described by Riggs and Greenberg (2004). Programs had to explicitly attempt to promote positive development in more than one domain of functioning, and have implementation of content that focused on building success and competencies in areas such as academics, social emotional competence, tech, the arts, and physical activity (Riggs & Greenberg, 2004). Ten afterschool organizations were contacted to participate. To determine if the afterschool organization fit the selected criteria a staff member from the organization sat down with the primary researcher to describe the mission/purpose of the organization and the program content. One organization did not fit the criteria, one organization dropped out before initial data collection, leaving 8 organizations that participated in this study (see table 3.1 for organization characteristics)

Table 3.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Community Based Sites</th>
<th>School Sites</th>
<th>Teen Centers</th>
<th>Staff Recruited</th>
<th>Staff included</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization 2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization 3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization 6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization 7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization 8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participation criteria for afterschool staff included; 1) at least 18 years of age, 2) employed at least part time by a youth development afterschool program, and 3) provide direct service to youth in their program. Of the 82 staff included in the analysis, 30.5% (25) were male, and 69.5% (57) were female. Forty four percent of staff (36) were between the ages of 18-24, 34% (28) were aged 25-34, 6% (5) were aged 35-44, and 16% (13) were over the age of 45. Participants were primarily white non-Hispanic (89.6%) with other race comprising less than 10% of the entire group. Approximately 45% (37) of participants had attended “some college”, while 28% (23) were college graduates and 7% (6) had attended graduate school.

Sixty two percent of staff’s afterschool programs were at a school based site while 38% worked in a community based site (owned by the afterschool program, or the city). Forty six percent of staff (38) indicated that 50 or fewer youth attended their program daily, 38% (31) identified that 51-100 youth attended daily, and 12% (10) had 250+ youth daily in their program. Ninety three percent of staff (77) indicated that they did have youth with disabilities in their programs. The reported disabilities most present in their programs (indicated by staff) were; ADD/ADHD (87%), autism (68%), learning disabilities (67%), and severe emotional disturbance (43%). Fifty five percent (55%) of staff identified that they had received at least one training in the last year about working with youth with disabilities. Also, fifty percent indicated that they had received at least one training on physical activity in the past year (not specific to youth with disabilities).
Table 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant Demographics</th>
<th>Training (n=40)</th>
<th>Control (n=42)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45+</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black, African American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not Answer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school Graduate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not Answer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training Received</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Activity</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measure**

The measure used for this study included three sections; a) demographics, b) inclusion in physical activity, and c) knowledge.

**Demographics**

For this study 17 demographic questions are used to gather information about staff characteristics, program characteristics and participation in trainings. Staff were
asked what their job was, how long they had been in their job and if as part of their job they facilitate or supervise physical activity. Questions pertaining to the staff afterschool program include: its type (B&G Club, The Y), location (school, church), daily attendance, if youth with disabilities attend, and if they were aware of the type of disabilities the children in their program have. Other questions asked staff about the training they had received on inclusion and physical activity.

Inclusion in physical activity

The inclusion in physical activity measure for this study is a survey based on the theory of planned behavior. This survey is comprised of 19 questions measuring attitude, subjective norms, perceived behavioral control, intention, and behavior. Attitude toward the behavior is assessed by a single stem question with a series of bipolar responses. The stem “Including a child with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program is” followed by the 4 bipolar pairings (harmful-beneficial, good-bad, pleasant (for me)-unpleasant (for me), worthless-useful). Internal consistency for attitude was $\alpha = .64$. Subjective norms are assessed with three statements: “It is expected of me that I included youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program,” “people who are important to me, want me to include youth with disabilities in my afterschool program,” and “people who are important to me think I should include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program”. Internal consistence was $\alpha = .65$.

Perceived behavioral control consists of three questions: “The decision to include youth with disabilities in physical activity in my afterschool program is beyond my
control,” “I am confident that I could include youth with disabilities in physical activity as part of my role in my afterschool program,” and “for me to include youth with disabilities in my afterschool program is”. Internal consistency for perceived control was $\alpha = .60$. Intention questions state: “I intend to…”, “I want to…”, and “I expect to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program. Internal consistency for intention was $\alpha = .76$. The behavior questions start with “In the past 7 days, I have…” and continue to state 8 individual endings indicating an inclusive behavior that an afterschool staff might do as part of their role in their program. These 8 behaviors are: a) facilitated inclusion in physical activity, b) incorporated youth with disabilities in physical activity, c) included youth with disabilities in physical activity, d) done planning to include youth with disabilities in physical activity, e) prepared specific adaptations or modifications for youth with disabilities in physical activity, f) used different equipment or supplies for youth with disabilities in physical activity, g) modified tasks or rules for youth with disabilities in physical activity, and h) encouraged youth with disabilities to participate in physical activity with their peers. Internal consistency for behavior was $\alpha = .89$

Knowledge

Knowledge was assessed using 6 questions. The first three are true/false questions. Question one is about disability; “Down’s Syndrome is the most common disability receiving support services in schools”. The second question asks about approaches to inclusion; “The developmental approach to inclusion implies that everyone develops at different rates”. The third knowledge question asks staff "Individuals with
disabilities are generally as active as their non-disabled peers”. Questions 3 thru 6 are multiple choice questions. The first is regarding planning; “When planning for inclusion factors that should be taken into consideration are” this is followed by 4 answer choices. The next question is regarding behavior management; “What are the ABC’s of behavior management?” The final question is “Barriers to participation in physical activity for individuals with disabilities include?” Each correct answer was scored as a 2 and incorrect answers were scored as 1. Scores for the six questions were summed to get a total knowledge score. Internal consistency for knowledge $\alpha = .08$

This survey has been adapted from a previous instrument (Taylor & Yun, 2012) that’s scores have been found to be appropriate for use with afterschool staff (CFI=.99, GFI=.98, RMR=.06). In the previous instrument on the behavior questions, staff were asked about their behavior in that last 30 days. The authors noted that 30 days might be too long for a staff member to recall their inclusion behavior. Based on this, the current survey shortened the recall to the past 7 days. Also, in the previous survey the 3 behavior questions (I have… facilitated, incorporated, and included) were thought to be too general and not represent a full picture of inclusion. For this study five other behavior questions were added in the current survey aimed at more specific inclusion behavior for afterschool staff.

All questions utilize a 7 point Likert-type scale. Subjective norms, perceived behavioral control and intention questions use strongly disagree (1) and strongly agree (7) as end points. Behavior questions use never (1) and always (7) as endpoints. Mean scores
will be used for all constructs measured to produce a total score for each construct (Francis, Eccles, Johnson, Walker, Grimshaw, Foy, Kaner, Smith, & Bonetti, 2004).

**Post-Training measures**

The post-training measure was the same as the pre-training measure except for the removal of demographic questions.

**Procedures**

This study utilized a stratified random sample of afterschool program sites in Oregon. Afterschool organizations that could be classified as youth development programs were recruited to participate. Once organizations were recruited, staff were informed of the study in a group format. Staff were provided an informed consent document that was approved by the researchers institutional review board and approved procedures were followed. Staff who chose to participate filled out the first survey after receiving directions from the researcher. Once all participating staff from the organization completed the first survey, program sites within the organization were stratified into three categories based on the location and age of their participants. The three categories were a) community youth (4), b) school youth (19), and c) teen center (2). They were then randomized into control (n=50) and training groups (n=81). This process was completed for each organization as they were recruited. Training groups received a three hour inclusion training approximately two weeks after filling out the first survey. Two weeks after the inclusion training the training group filled out the second survey. Control groups did not receive the inclusion training, and filled out the second survey approximately four weeks after filling out the first. The control groups were
offered the training after completion of the second survey. Two organizations took advantage of the training opportunity. (See table 3.3 for site demographics)

Table 3.3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Demographics</th>
<th>Training (%)</th>
<th>Control (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Campus</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation Building</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Based Building</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Daily Attendance</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-50</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-100</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101-150</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>250+</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disabilities (% of staff reporting yes)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADD/ADHD</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Down’s Syndrome</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Retardation</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Emotional Disturbance</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>61.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing Impairment</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spinal Cord Injury</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerebral Palsy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Disabilities</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spina Bifida</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Disability percentages were reported staff

Training

The three hour in-service training consisted of topics including; a) expectation for inclusion, b) approaches to disability, c) overview of Down’s Syndrome, Autism, Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder, and learning disabilities, d) behavior management, e) physical activity, and f) planning for inclusion. The training was designed to give participants tools that they can use in their afterschool setting to include
youth with disabilities. The training format included lecture, brainstorming, small group activity, large group discussion, and scenario activities.

The expectations portion of the training covered organization expectations, parent expectations, youth expectations, and an activity that aimed to establish peer expectations. This portion of the training was designed to target staff’s subjective norms. To establish organizations expectations after organizations were recruited for the study, they were asked about their overall mission or philosophy, about their philosophy towards inclusion, and their specific expectations of staff in regards to including youth with disabilities in their afterschool program.

The approaches portion of the training focused on pros and cons of the functional and developmental approaches to disability. This was aimed at influencing staff’s attitude toward individuals with disabilities In the study by Taylor and Yun (2012) 4 disabilities were identified as being the most prevalent for those attending afterschool programs. These disabilities included Autism, Down’s syndrome, Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (ADD/ADHD), and Learning Disabilities. Basic information and strategies of the mentioned disabilities were included in this training. General learning characteristics, physical characteristics (if any), and teaching strategies were discussed specific to the afterschool environment. This portion of the training was aimed at influencing staffs attitude and subjective norms.

The behavior management portion of the training focused to overviewing the ABC’s (Antecedents, Behavior, and Consequences) of behavior management while trying to utilize positive behavioral supports. This section reviewed ways to document
types and durations of behaviors, identify potential precursors to unwanted behaviors, and ways to reinforce positive behaviors or discourage negative behaviors. This section was followed by a scenario activity where staff could utilize the presented information to move through the scenario questions. This sectioned was designed to influence attitudes and perceived behavioral control.

Physical activity was discussed in regards to recommendations and the current status for youth and adults. Information was presented for both the general population without disabilities and for individuals with disabilities. Increased risk factors and health consequences for individuals with disabilities was also discussed. This section finished by discussing facilitators and barriers to physical activity for individuals with disabilities based on Rimmer, Riley, Wang, Rauworth, and Jurkowski, (2004). It was the goal of this section to influence staff’s attitude and subjective norms.

The final sections of the training focused on planning for inclusion. This section discussed the importance of taking into account the person, task, and the environment when planning physical activity and adaptations for youth with disabilities. This section also included a scenario activity where staff identified potential solutions to the presented scenarios. The training finished with a couple key take home messages for staff. This final section of the training was designed to influence staff’s attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control.

The content for this training was developed by the primary researcher, and verified by an independent scholar, and one afterschool professional. The primary researcher has over 15 year of afterschool experience, and has trained at the local, state,
and regional level. She also has over 20 years’ experience working with youth with disabilities in both the afterschool and community setting. The independent scholar has 5 years’ experience in afterschool programs and has over 15 years’ experience working with individuals with disabilities in a sport and community setting. The afterschool professional has been working in the afterschool field for over 12 years, and has trained at the local, state, regional, and national level. The training was verbally described in detail to the graduate student and afterschool professional individually. After answering any questions, both individuals agreed that the content of the training was applicable and appropriate for afterschool staff. Two afterschool stakeholders reviewed the training and indicated to the primary researcher that the content was applicable and appropriate for the afterschool setting. All trainings for this study were conducted by the primary researcher.

**Analysis**

Descriptive statistics were run on attitude, subjective norms, perceived behavioral control, physical activity inclusion intention, physical activity inclusion behavior, and knowledge. Two separate 2 x 2 (group by time) repeated measures MANOVAs were conducted on attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control. and on physical activity inclusion intention, physical activity inclusion behavior, and knowledge, respectively. Alpha was set at a .05 level of significance.

**Results**

The descriptive statistics show a mean (with standard deviation in parenthesis) scores for attitude, subjective norms, perceived control, physical activity inclusion intention and physical activity inclusion behavior. Attitude for the control group was 5.16
(1.20) for the first survey and 5.73 (.92) for the second survey. The training group averages for attitude in the training group was 5.45 (1.21) for the first survey and 5.89 for the second survey. The scores for subjective norms for the control group were 5.08 (1.05) for the first survey and 5.14 (.99) for the second survey. Scores for subjective norms for the training group were 5.62 (1.04) for the first survey and 5.80 (1.14) for the second survey. Perceived control for the control group was 4.92 (1.25) for the first survey and 4.69 (1.01) for the second survey. The training group scores for perceived control was 4.92 (1.38) for the first survey and 4.91 (1.14) for the second survey. Physical activity intention for the control group was 6.05 (1.01) for the first survey and 5.91 (.90) for the second survey. The training group averages for physical activity inclusion intention was 6.50 (.68) for the first survey and 6.48 (.75) for the second survey. The average score for the control group for physical activity inclusion behavior was 4.51 (1.28) for the first survey and 4.36 (1.18) for the second survey. The training group physical activity inclusion behavior was 5.00 (1.36) for the first survey and 4.96 (1.80) for the second survey.

Table 3.4

Descriptive statistics of dependent variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control (n=42)</th>
<th>Training (n=40)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre Post Pre Post</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>5.16 (1.20) 5.73 (.92) 5.45 (1.21) 5.89 (.97)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Norms</td>
<td>5.08 (1.05) 5.14 (.99) 5.62 (1.04) 5.80 (1.14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Control</td>
<td>4.92 (1.25) 4.96 (1.01) 4.92 (1.38) 4.91 (1.14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion in PA Intention</td>
<td>6.05 (1.01) 5.91 (.90) 6.50 (.68) 6.48 (.75)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusion in PA Behavior</td>
<td>4.51 (1.28) 4.36 (1.18) 5.00 (1.36) 4.96 (1.80)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>9.19 (.83) 9.28 (1.04) 9.20 (1.04) 10.30 (.88)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Attitude, subjective norms, perceived control, intention, and behavior are average scores on a 7 point scale. Knowledge scores are the average of the sum of six questions
based on 2 point scale. PA= Physical Activity

Both inclusion intention and behavior were reported on a 7 point scale with 7 being the most positive. Knowledge scores were based on a 2 point scale. Average knowledge scores for the control group for the first survey was 9.19 (.83) and 9.28 (1.04) for the second survey. The training group scores were 9.20 (1.04) for the first survey and 10.30 (.88) for the second. Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 3.4. Correlations for all variables can be seen in table 3.5.

Table 3.5
Correlation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Subjective Norms</th>
<th>Perceived Control</th>
<th>Intention</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective Norms</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Control</td>
<td>.25*</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intention</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results from the first MANOVA indicate no interaction between group by time on attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control \( \lambda = .98, F (1,80) = .44, p > .05 \). Results from the second MANOVA indicated significant interaction between group by time, \( \lambda = .78, F (1, 80) = 7.33, p < .05 \). The follow up univariate analysis indicated significant interaction between group by time on knowledge, \( F (1, 80) = 21.43, p < .05 \), partial \( \eta^2 = .211 \). However, there were no significant interaction on inclusion
intention and behavior, F (1, 80)= .44, p>.05, partial $\eta^2=.006$, F (1, 80)= .12, p>.05, partial $\eta^2=.001$, respectively.

**Discussion**

Participation in training is one of the most frequently recommended strategies in preparing afterschool staff for inclusion (Devine, & Kotowski, 2012; Peter, 2009; Schleien et al., 2009). The in-service training provided in this study was able to increase staffs knowledge which has been identified as an important need in afterschool programs (Devine and Kotowski, 1999). The impact of knowledge on inclusion behaviors of afterschool staff is largely unknown and needs further exploration. However, other fields identify that knowledge plays a role in beliefs and perceptions toward youth with disabilities, and suggest that individuals with a better understanding of inclusion are more likely to make adaptations and provide supports for youth with disabilities (Buell, Hallam, & Gamel-McCormick, 1999; Ohan, Cormier, Hepp, Visser, & Strain, 2008). This is important because afterschool programs offer youth with disabilities opportunities to participate in physical activity with peers. Staff who are knowledgeable, willing to make adaptations and provide proper supports may be able to help youth with disabilities take advantage of these physical activity opportunities and lessen the gaps between them and their peers. Knowledge of inclusion may also lead to efficacy in staff. Buell and colleagues (1999) found a strong relationship between knowledge of inclusion and the belief that teachers can positively influence students with a disability. Afterschool staff are a key piece in the positive outcomes youth receive by participating in afterschool programs (Apsler, 2009; Daud & Carruthers, 2008; Riggs & Greenberg, 2004). If staff
are knowledgeable about inclusion and feel that they can have a positive influence on youth with disabilities, staff may be more likely to put forth effort and time needed to make modifications and include youth with disabilities in physical activity.

Although this study was able to increase staff knowledge there was no significant change in staff intention or behavior. There are a few of potential reasons for these unexpected results. First, the average scores for the training group at pretest was 6.50 out 7 and 5.00 out 7 on intention and behavior, respectively. This may create a ceiling effect making it more difficult to see a significant change in staff intentions and behaviors because they are already reporting these at a high level. In the future, researchers may want to identify an inclusion criteria screening for intention and behavior scores to account for high beginning scores. Second, while the theory of planned behavior has been deemed an appropriate theory to use with afterschool staff (Taylor & Yun, 2012) it is difficult to determine if the content of training was actually reflective of the proposed constructs. Even though the content of this training was evaluated independently by individuals who had expertise in afterschool programs, the theory of planned behavior, and individuals with disabilities, it may be possible that too small of a portion of the training focused on expectations of staff. A third possible reason for this training not to have had an effect on staff attitude, subjective norms, and perceived control could be the length of the training. This training was designed to represent common practices within afterschool programs and to accommodate the challenges afterschool programs face regarding professional development. A 2012 report by the National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing (CRESST) identified that 93.5% of staff
surveyed indicated that they were provided professional development opportunities. The most common types of professional development reported were training/workshops, program meetings, and site meetings. A recent study into the current funding challenges facing afterschool programs identified that professional development is one of the first things cut when programs are having challenges with funding (Afterschool Alliance, 2012). Other challenges such as high rates of turnover, being able to organize all staff to attend trainings and the lack of time allowed for part-time staff to participate in trainings were factors taken into account when deciding on the three hour length of this studies training (Afterschool Alliance 2012, Huang & Wang, 2012). It was determined that a three hour training would provide enough content to staff but not burden organizations so much that they would not be able to participate in the study. However it is possible that more time is needed to influence behavior. The length of the training may not be the only factor to consider, the methods used to train staff may also need to be taken into consideration. Studies exploring training effectiveness of staff working with individuals with intellectual disabilities found that the most effective training methods were, in-service training that provided multiple techniques (i.e role play, instruction, feedback or self-management) with verbal feedback coupled with coaching on the job (Van Oorsouw, Embregts, Bosman & Jahoda, 2008). This is consistent with other studies that indicate that in-service trainings alone may not be enough to impact staff behavior of working with individuals with disabilities (Haberlin, Beauchamp, Agnew, & O’Brien, 2012, Ling & Mak, 2012, McCabe, Davison, & George, 2007). The current study did employ multiple techniques (feedback, instruction, scenarios, brainstorm) and provided verbal
feedback to attendees during the training, but it did not include on the job coaching and could perhaps have had a more significant impact if on the job coaching were added to the current training content.

The primary limitation to this study is, due to the structure of organizations, there is potential for a cohort effect. Because of the sample size (n=82) there were not enough participants to conduct a multi-level analysis to account for this effect. Maas and Hox (2004) indicate that sample sizes less that 50 at level 2 (organization level) could lead to biased estimates. This study only had 8 organizations participating indicating that a multi-level analysis would not be appropriate.

Future research should look at both the efficacy and effectiveness of inclusion training for afterschool staff. First, more information is needed about mechanisms of behavior change in afterschool staff. Second, research should target the effectiveness of mixed training models for afterschool staff. Given the potential for limited time and funding for trainings these models should explore the use of short in-service trainings to increase knowledge and perceptions of disability along with on the job training that focuses on providing feedback to staff, and if possible take into account where staff are in their inclusion behavior. Another potential method of training that should be explored is the train the trainer approach. Haberlin, Beauchamp, Agnew, and O’Brian (2012) found that when community day staff supervisors were trained on applied behavioral analysis and then trained their staff that staff not only gained knowledge but at three month follow-up also maintained skill improvement compared to staff who were trained directly by a consultant. Based on the challenges that afterschool programs face with funding and
retaining staff this approach may provide a structure for on the job coaching and limit some barriers faced by afterschool programs to train staff to work with youth with disabilities.

Conclusion

This study identifies that a three hour in-service training is effective for increasing staff’s knowledge. This knowledge may in turn impact staff’s beliefs and perceptions about including youth with disabilities in physical activity but further research is needed. Potential reasons for the limited impact of this training on inclusion intention and inclusion behavior include; high inclusion intention and behavior at baseline, content not reflective of constructs, length of the training, and the methods of training.
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Chapter 4: General Conclusion
General Conclusions

The two studies presented in this dissertation highlight important factors that contribute to staff’s inclusion of youth with disabilities in physical activity and explore the effect of training staff to better include youth. Study one worked to identify key factors that influence afterschool staff and their inclusion of youth with disabilities in physical activity. This study examined the role attitudes, expectations, and perceived control play in staff’s intention and behavior. The results of the study identify that expectations of those close to staff play the largest role in staff intention and behavior toward physical activity. These results emphasize the importance of afterschool programs to clearly identify and convey expectations regarding inclusion to staff. Based on the results of this study the second study was designed to test the effectiveness of a three hour training primarily emphasizing expectations.

The second study present in this dissertation utilized a stratified random assignment of afterschool staff to explore the effectiveness of inclusion training on staff’s inclusion intention, behavior, and knowledge. This study found that staff’s inclusion knowledge was significantly increased based on the training, but inclusion intention and behavior remained unchanged. These results indicate that a three hour in-service training may be adequate to change staff knowledge but further research is needed to determine effective methods of changing afterschool staff’s inclusion intention and behavior.

These two studies identify the need for future research into inclusion training for afterschool staff. First, mechanisms of behavior change in afterschool staff inclusion behavior need to be explored. More information is needed about other factors that may
impact afterschool staff’s inclusion behavior and how to modify those factors. Second, the duration of the trainings needed to change staff’s inclusion behaviors. Further research is needed to determine to appropriate dose of training that is needed to change staff behaviors. Lastly, this dissertation suggests that effective training methods for impacting afterschool staff inclusion behavior need to be identified. In-service trainings coupled with on the job coaching, and training the trainer approaches may have some effectiveness in other areas of disability and health. It may be appropriate to test these training approaches within the afterschool population.
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APPENDIX
APPENDIX A: Literature Review

As the number of after school programs increase, the potential to find programs for youth and teens with disabilities to participate in outside of schools also increases. For youth with disabilities, the positive outcomes associated with after school programs may help bridge the social gaps they experience related to their peers and lessen some barriers to participation in social and physical activity. Although there are different types of programs, staff have been identified as a key factor in the quality of afterschool programs (Little, 2007; Little, Wimer, & Weiss, 2008; Riggs & Greenberg, 2004). Therefore, it is important to provide quality staff training on inclusion of youth with disabilities in afterschool program. The purpose of this literature review is to provide background information relating to staff development in afterschool programs. Literature will be discussed in this section and will be presented under the following topics: (a) physical activity, (b) afterschool programs, (c) inclusion, (d) theory of planned behavior, and (e) training staff.

Physical Activity

Physical activity has been identified as a major component of a healthy lifestyle, and has been a driving force for the creation of health promotion programs, epidemiological studies, and nationwide initiatives to increase physical activity (Center for Disease Control, 2013). The Physical Activity Guidelines for American’s identifies specific guidelines to PA participation for youth to engage in a healthy lifestyle. These guidelines identify that youth should participate in PA at least 60 minutes a day. It is suggested that this activity should include a mixture of aerobic exercise, muscle
strengthening, and bone strengthening exercise. The U.S department of Health and Human Services (2008) indicated that there is strong evidence showing that not only does PA substantially enhances physical fitness and health status, but youth who participate in PA have: (a) higher levels of cardiorespiratory fitness, (b) higher levels of muscular strength, (c) lower body fatness, (d) better cardiovascular and metabolic risk profile, (e) enhanced bone health, and (f) reduced symptoms of anxiety and depression. Although there are numerous positive effects of participation in PA the present challenge is that not enough youth are participating in enough PA to experience these health benefits.

Forty-two percent of youth of youth age 6-11 participate in 60 minutes of PA on a daily basis. Even more alarming is the drastic drop off in activity during adolescence where a mere 8% meet recommendations (Troino, Berrigan, Dodd, Masse, Tilert, and McDowell, 2007). The decrease in activity as children age puts them at higher risk for many of the negative health outcomes associated with a sedentary lifestyle in adulthood (CDC,2012). Over weight and obesity is one of the most common consequences associated with the lack of physical activity. Currently the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) estimate that almost 17% of youth in the United States are obese. Children who are overweight and obese are at higher risk for (a) orthopedic problems, (b) hyperlipidemia, (c) hyper tension, (d) pulmonary disorders, (e) gastroenterological problems, (f) insulin resistance, and (g) adverse social consequences (CDC, 2013). While issues related to lack of physical activity and the prevalence of overweight and obesity among youth in the U.S at the forefront of Public Health
concerns, youth with disabilities may face even more challenges in participating in an active healthy lifestyle.

It is difficult to assess the physical activity levels of youth with disabilities due to variability between and within disabilities. However, it is generally accepted that they are less active than their typically developing peers (Pan & Frey, 2006, Rimmer, Rowland, & Yamaki, 2007). Studies have examined to what degree youth with certain disabilities meet the current PA guidelines. Pan and Frey (2006) found that 47% of youth with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) met the recommended 60 minutes a day, however they found that it was achieved in shorter bouts than the recommended 10 minutes. Frey, Stanish, and Temple (2008) found mixed results in their review of physical activity for youth with Intellectual Disabilities (ID). They identified that there was no consistent evidence that indicated where youth with ID are compared to their typically developing peers. While the exact amount of PA youth with disabilities are participating in has not clearly been determined, what is known it that youth with disabilities who are inactive are at greater risk for adverse health effects than their typically developing peers.

Although, youth with disabilities have a 38% higher prevalence of overweight and obesity, they also face the increased risk for secondary conditions associated with overweight and obesity (BRFSS, 2008). Secondary conditions are preventable physical, mental, social or social conditions that result in addition to or related to an individual’s primary disability (WHO, 2013) The secondary conditions that youth with disabilities may face can include, type I diabetes, sleep apnea, joint pain, decubitus ulcers, depression, and social isolation (CDC, 2013). The current lack of physical activity by
youth with disabilities and the adverse health outcomes that are associated with this inactivity are concerning. The challenge then is to increase the PA of these youth. However, there are numerous barriers that youth with disabilities face when trying to participate in PA.

Barriers to physical activity for youth with disabilities include; (a) less time in or being excluded from physical education, (b) class sizes too large to fit the child’s needs, (c) individuals gross motor function or feelings about being able to be successful, (d) lack of access to facilities or community programs, (e) lack of social support, (f) lack of knowledge among staff, (g) lack of staff training to help facilitate PA (Rimmer & Braddock, 2002; Temple & Walkey, 2007; Rimmer, et al., 2007; Block & Obrusnikova, 2007; Maher, Williams, Olds, Lane, & Adelaide, 2007). A philosophy and practice of inclusion is an approach that can be used to help overcome barriers to PA.

Afterschool Programs

Approximately 8 million youth and teens attend afterschool programs. This number is expected to increase as the need for programs and the availability of funding increases (Little, 2008). Funding for afterschool programs has dramatically increased in the last ten years. In 1996 funding started at $40 million and has increased to $1.2 billion in 2008 due to initiatives like the 21st century community learning centers and the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLBA). The NCLBA has provided nearly 10,000 community based and school based programs across the country with partial or full funding to operate their programs. These programs serve almost 1.5 million youth and 91% of them are open four or more days per week (Afterschool Alliance 2013).
Youth attending afterschool programs vary. Boys and Girls Clubs of America indicates in their 2007 annual report that of the 6.5 million youth and teens attending their programs on over 4,300 sites nationwide 55% are male, 45% female; 11% are under the age of seven while 54% are in the 7-12 age range and 32% are between the ages 13 and 18. Thirty five percent of attendees are Caucasian, 31% African American, 21% Hispanic/Latino, 7% multiracial, 3% Asian and 3% Native American (Boys & Girls Clubs of America, 2007).

To meet the needs of a variety of participants and communities, multiple types of afterschool programs can be employed, but generally are categorized into three types, School-aged care, youth development and educational (Miller, 2003; Riggs & Greenberg, 2004; Smith, 2007). In the school aged care program, the focus is on providing a safe place for youth to go during the after school hours. These programs provide unstructured opportunities to participate in recreation, art & crafts, or time to work on homework but are predominantly seen as a place to “hang out” afterschool and generally does not contain purposeful programming to promote youth development. Youth development programs “explicitly attempts to promote development in one or more domains of functioning”. This is accomplished through organized programming in areas such as academics, health & fitness, character development, arts & music, or technology just to name a few (Riggs & Greenberg, 2004). The last type of program the educational programs focus specifically on enhancing student academic achievement and may be facilitated on school campus or in the community. Staff in educational programs are typically teachers or paraprofessionals and are focused on academic outcomes (Miller,
Positive outcomes for youth and teens participating in afterschool programs have been seen in multiple youth development domains. These domains including social, cognitive and behavioral competencies. Youth and teens who participate in afterschool programs are more likely to have increases in positive self-perception, and be accepted by their peers that those who do not attend afterschool programs (Daud & Carruthers, 2008; Durlak, Weissberg & Pachan, 2010; Mahoney et. al. 2005). Although somewhat inconsistent, research on academic success of youth and teens attending afterschool programs have found increases in reading achievement, and standardized test scores (Mahoney et. al, 2005; Vandell, Reisner & Pierce, 2007; Watts, Witt & King, 2008). In the behavioral domain, research has indicated that youth attending afterschool programs shown decreases in behavioral problems, increases in motivational attributions, and participation in moderate to vigorous physical activity that can contribute to the recommended accumulation of 60 minutes of activity daily (Mahoney et al., 2005; Trost et al. 2009; Vandell et al, 2007).

There is little evidence on what factors within afterschool programs are associated with specific positive outcomes, but there is a growing body of evidence that suggests there are key components in quality afterschool programs that play a role in the outcomes youth experience (Durlak et al. 2010; Little et al. 2008; Miller, 2003; Riggs & Greenberg 2004; Vandell et al. 2007). In Vandell’s (2007) longitudinal study of the outcomes linked to high quality afterschool programs she identifies that high quality programs have; a)
evidence of supportive relationships between staff and youth participants, b) evidence of rich and varied programming that provide academic support, recreation, art, and enrichment opportunities, and c) trained program staff. These components of quality afterschool programs are echoed by Riggs & Greenberg (2004) who also identify that staff and programming play key roles. They also identify from an ecological perspective that the mission or logic model of the program, the community, and the characteristics of the youth attending can impact program quality and outcomes.

One of the most consistent components to both program quality and youth outcomes was associated with staff. Riggs and Greenberg (2004) identify that trained attentive staff play a critical role in the quality of afterschool programs. Similarly, Daud and Carruthers (2008) found that staff played a role in all four of the major outcomes youth in high-risk environments receive by attending afterschool programs. This study found that youth attended the program because they felt a sense of belonging with other youth participants and program staff. Also, the development of positive values and behaviors were associated with the role modeling, discussions, and opportunities to practice behaviors that staff provide.

Inclusion

The U.S Census (2000) reports that 5.8 percent of youth age 5 - 15 (approximately 2.6 million) have a disability. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 2004 (IDEA) and section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act are critical pieces of legislation that advocate for the rights of youth with disabilities in schools and community settings. In a school setting, IDEA
provides students with disabilities the right to have individualized education program that are specific to each student and to be educated in the least restrictive environment for success. The ADA as well as the Rehabilitation Act concentrates on emphasizing individuals with disabilities rights to access programs, services, employment, and transportation similar to their typically developing peers. These key pieces of legislation aid in the emphasis of a philosophy of inclusion encompassing all areas of life for individuals with disabilities.

There is no consensus on definition of inclusion. Winnick (2011) explains inclusion simply as educating students with disabilities in the general education setting. While Block (2007) identifies that inclusion is a philosophy where all children regardless of abilities are educated in the same environment, an environment where each child’s individual needs are met. Block’s definition identifies two key pieces of inclusion that Winnick does not. First, “inclusion is a philosophy” he suggests that inclusion is an underlying idea that all individuals regardless of abilities can be involved in some way. Also, Block identifies that inclusion is educating a child in an environment where each child’s needs are met. This identifies that children with disabilities may have unique needs that need to be addressed for there to be inclusion. Both Winnick’s and Block’s definitions imply that inclusion is also about educating those with disabilities alongside their typically developing peers.

A recent study by Taylor & Yun (2012) found that staff from 20 afterschool program sites serving over 2000 youth and teens reported that youth with disabilities attend their programs. However, little is known about inclusion practices that programs
employ or outcomes that youth with disabilities receive from attending these programs. It has been suggested that youth with disabilities may see greater gains in executive functioning than those without disabilities by participating in afterschool programs (Riggs & Greenberg, 2004) but, the research up to this point is scarce.

Research related to inclusion in community programs indicates that youth with disabilities benefit when provided opportunities to participate in an inclusive setting. Fennick and Royal (2003) found that youth with autism who participated in inclusive community swimming or gymnastic programs expressed enjoyment of the program and increased their recreation skills. Similarly, Groff (2001) found youth with disabilities who participate in adapted sport programs had positive experiences and developed confidence and a sense of competence. While there are indications that inclusion in community programs may have positive outcomes for youth with disabilities, there is also evidence that staff play an important role in the success of inclusion.

Staff working with individuals with disabilities are a critical part of the success of inclusion in community programs (Devine & King 2006; Fennick & Royle, 2003; Jones, Ouellette-Kuntz, Vilela, & Brown, 2008; Magill-Evans, Darrah, & Adkins, 2003; Soresi, Nota, & Wehmeyer, 2011). Parents of youth with cerebral palsy attending community recreation programs identified that they are often frustrated by the lack of adaptations, and knowledge of staff to better include their children in activities (Magill-Evans, 2003). The importance of understanding how to adapt activities and how to engage youth with disabilities with their peers is echoed in Fennick and Royle’s (2003) pilot project for inclusion of youth with autism in community recreation programs. Parents of youth in the
program indicated that while they were pleased their children were increasing skills they wished that the staff working with them did a better job of engaging their child in activity with their typically developing peers that were in the class. Parents felt that the staff working with their child had them segregated working on skills rather than adapting parts of the class so their child could participate with the rest of the group. Project evaluators indicated that they should provide the staff with training to improve the range of inclusion approaches in recreation activities. The lack of staff knowledge of how to provide accommodations to individuals with disabilities and the lack of preparation on staffs part have also been identified as a barrier to inclusion (Devine & King, 2006).

While generally positive, attitudes of staff working with individuals who have disabilities can be associated with their age, gender, and education (Henry, Keys, Balcazar, & Jopp, 1996; Soresi et al, 2011). Henry et al. (1996) found that females had more positive attitudes about inclusion as did older staff and those with more education. Regardless of staff demographics researchers are consistent about the emphasis that staff need to be trained in order to provide quality inclusion for individuals with disabilities in community programs (Devine & King, 2006; Fennick & Royle, 2003; Henry et al, 1996; Jones et al, 2008; Magill-Evans, 2003; Soresi et al, 2011).

Trainings

Even though researchers have emphasized the importance of staff training there has been no research on the effects of inclusion trainings for afterschool program staff. In other community areas trainings have been identified as being able to increase knowledge and abilities associated with working with individuals with disabilities and their families
(Dunst, Trivette & Deal, 2011; Oorsouw, Embregts, Bosman & Jahoda, 2009; Woodward & Halls, 2009). Dunst et al (2011) identifies that adult learning characteristics and type of training affect the outcomes associated with training early intervention practitioners. This study examined the five different training types; 1) conference presentations (1-4 hours, single day), 2) day workshops (4-7 hours, single day), 3) multi-day workshop (10-12 hours, 2-3 days), 4) Field based (2-3 onsite visits) and 5) enhanced field based (2-3 site visits, onsite training, ~20 hours). These trainings are not only different in the type of training and number of hours but also differed in the adult learning characteristics that they provided. Trivette, Dunst, Hamby, & O’Herin (2009) identified 6 adult learning characteristics that are associated with better learner outcomes. These characteristics include methods and procedures associated with; 1) introduction, 2) illustrating the practice that was the focus of the training, 3) the learner use of the practice, 4) the learner evaluation of their experiences implementing the practice, 5) the learners reflection on their experiences implementing the practice, and 6) the self-evaluation of mastery of the focus of the training (Trivette et al., 2009). It is not surprising that Dunst et al. (2011) study found that the field based and enhanced field based trainings were associated with higher participant outcomes. These trainings were conducted over long periods of time (2-6 months) and contained more of the adult learning indicators in their trainings. What was surprising is that when examining the conference presentations, one day workshop, and multiple day workshops participants reported higher ratings of usefulness and abilities from the short 1-4 hour conference presentation than the full day or multiple day
trainings. This can be of use to organizations that may not be able to afford to facilitate
time intensive trainings.

Theory of Planned Behavior

The Theory of Planned Behavior created by Ajzen (1991) has emerged as one of
the most popular and possibly influential frameworks for the study of human behavior.
According to this theory human behavior is guided by three kinds of considerations:
beliefs about the likely consequences of the behavior (behavioral beliefs), beliefs about
the expectations of others (normative beliefs), and beliefs about factors that may hinder
performance (control beliefs). In their part of the whole theory, behavioral beliefs
produce a favorable or unfavorable attitude towards the behavior; normative beliefs
reveal perceived social pressure resulting in subjective norms; and control beliefs give
insight to perceived behavioral control. Together attitude, subjective norms, and
perceived behavioral control lead to the formation of intention. Intention is then assumed
to be an immediate antecedent of behavior given that there is a degree of actual control
over the behavior (Ajzen, 2002).
The theory of planned behavior has been used in a community recreation setting to measure aquatic instructors beliefs about including youth with disabilities in their programs (Conatser, Block & Gansneder, 2002). This study found that attitude, subjective norms, and perceived behavioral control all significantly predicted intention of aquatic instructors to include youth with disabilities in their community swim programs. In one of the few studies to also measure inclusion behavior Taylor & Yun (2012) found that the attitudes and subjective norms of afterschool staff significantly predicted their intention to include youth with disabilities in physical activity in their afterschool program. This study also found that intention predicted up to 8% of staffs inclusion behavior. These studies demonstrate the usefulness of this theoretical framework for use in community programs especially afterschool programs.

Summary

Although there is a growing body of evidence on the positive outcomes for youth and teens attending afterschool programs there is little that is known about how youth with disabilities are included in these programs. Staff are identified as critical pieces to afterschool program quality and to inclusion in other community settings but there is a need for a better understanding of afterschool programs staffs inclusion behavior. The theory of planned behavior has been seen as an appropriate theoretical framework for use with afterschool program staff and is able to predict a portion of afterschool staff behavior. Training staff to work with youth with disabilities in an afterschool setting may be accomplished in short trainings that include the six adult learning characteristics.
References


APPENDIX B: IRB Notification of Exemption

NOTIFICATION OF EXEMPTION

April 21, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principal Investigator:</th>
<th>Jeffrey A. McCubbin</th>
<th>Department:</th>
<th>Nutrition and Exercise Sciences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study Team Members:</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Researcher:</td>
<td>Jennifer Taylor, Kerri Vanderboom, Jennifer Morgan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Number:</td>
<td>4594</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Title:</td>
<td>Psychometric Properties of Survey for After School Program Staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source:</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission Type:</td>
<td>Initial Application received 03/29/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Category:</td>
<td>Exempt</td>
<td>Category Number: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above referenced study was reviewed by the OSU Institutional Review Board (IRB) and has determined that it is exempt from full board review. You may proceed with the research described in the protocol.

Expiration Date: 04/20/11

Annual continuing review applications are due at least 30 days prior to expiration date

Documents included in this review:

- Protocol
- Consent forms
- Assent forms
- Grant/contract
- Recruiting tools
- Test instruments
- Attachment A: Radiation
- Letters of support
- Attachment B: Human materials
- External IRB approvals
- Translated documents
- Other:
- Project revisions:

Principal Investigator responsibilities:

- Amendments to this study that impact the requirements for review must be reviewed prior to initiating the change. Please contact the IRB Office if you have questions about planned amendments.

- To ensure that changes to this research project have not altered the review category\(^1\), the Principal Investigator must complete a brief renewal application on an annual basis. Submit a continuing review application or final report to the IRB for review at least four weeks prior to the expiration date. Failure to submit a continuing review application prior to the expiration date will result in termination of the research, discontinuation of enrolled participants, and the submission of a new application to the IRB.

- All study team members should be kept informed of the status of the research.

- Reports of unanticipated problems involving risks to participants or others must be submitted to the IRB within three calendar days.

If you have any questions, please contact the IRB Office at IRB@oregonstate.edu or by phone at (541) 737-8008.

\(^1\) Review categories include exempt, expedited, and full board.
APPENDIX C: IRB Waiver of Documentation

INFORMED CONSENT

Project Title: Psychometric Properties of a Survey for Afterschool Program Staff
Principal Investigator: Dr. Jeff McCubbin
Co-Investigator(s): Jennifer Taylor, Department of Nutrition and Exercise Science

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

You are being invited to participate in a study that will gather information on afterschool program staff. This information will be used to develop a questionnaire that will aid afterschool programs in targeting trainings for staff that will help to increase the inclusion of youth with disabilities in physical activity during the afterschool program.
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APPENDIX D: Afterschool Staff Survey

AFTERSCHOOL PROGRAM STAFF SURVEY

The following are definitions for terminology used throughout this survey:

**Physical activity:** Any bodily movement produced by skeletal muscles that requires energy expenditure (WHO, 2010). In your afterschool programs this may be structured activity that is organized and led by staff or unstructured activity that youth might participate in during open gym, free play, or activities that are options for youth but not run by staff.

**Youth with disabilities:** Any youth that has a documented disability or a disability that has been identified by the parent/guardian. These disabilities may include but are not limited to learning disabilities, cognitive disabilities and/or physical disabilities.

**Afterschool program:** the program/organization in which you currently work.

SECTION ONE: Please answer the following questions to the best of your ability.

1. What best describes your current age?
   - □ 18-24
   - □ 25-34
   - □ 35-44
   - □ 45 & up

2. Gender? □ Male □ Female

3. Which best describes your current level of education?
   - □ High School Graduate
   - □ College Graduate
   - □ Some college
   - □ Graduate School
   - □ Other:

4. In the past week how many days have you participated in physical activity (at least 30 minutes/day)?
   - □ 0
   - □ 1
   - □ 2
   - □ 3
   - □ 4
   - □ 5
   - □ 6
   - □ 7

5. Which best describes your current job title?
   - □ Site/Unit Director
   - □ Athletic Director
   - □ Recreation Staff
   - □ Physical activity staff
   - □ Program Director
   - □ Education Staff
   - □ Technology Staff
   - □ Enrichment Staff
   - □ Other:

6. Which best describes the location of your afterschool program?
   - □ School site
   - □ Parks and Recreation building
   - □ Church
   - □ Community based site
   - □ Other:

7. What type of afterschool program do you work for?
   - □ Boys & Girls Club
   - □ Parks and Recreation
   - □ School District
   - □ YMCA
   - □ Other:

8. How many youth attend your afterschool program on a daily basis?
   - □ 0-50
   - □ 51-100
   - □ 101-150
   - □ 151-200
   - □ 201-250
   - □ 250+

9. Do you have youth with disabilities attending your afterschool program? (If no skip to #14)
   - □ Yes
   - □ No
   - □ Not Sure

10. Of the youth with disabilities who attend your afterschool program which disability groups are present?
    a. Physical Disabilities
       - (amputation, spinal cord injury, cerebral palsy...)
       - □ Yes
       - □ No
       - □ Not Sure
    b. Cognitive Disabilities
       - (mental retardation, down syndrome, autism...)
       - □ Yes
       - □ No
       - □ Not Sure
    c. Hidden Disabilities
       - (learning disabilities, ADD/ADHD, emotional disturbance...)
       - □ Yes
       - □ No
       - □ Not Sure
11. How many youth with disabilities would you estimate attend your afterschool program?
   - 1-10
   - 11-20
   - 21-30
   - 31-40
   - 41+

12. How many times a year does your afterschool program provide training on topics related to working with youth with disabilities?
   - Never
   - Once
   - Twice
   - More than twice
   - Other (please specify)

13. During the above mentioned trainings what topics are covered? (please check all that apply)
   - Disability awareness
   - Laws and regulations
   - Behavior management
   - Physical activity
   - Basic care
   - Socialization
   - Safety concerns
   - Other

14. How often does your afterschool program provide training on topics related to physical activity?
   - Never
   - Once a year
   - Twice a year
   - Three times a year
   - More than three times a year

15. What topics are included in the above mentioned trainings? (check all that apply)
   - Fitness
   - Lesson structure
   - Benefits of physical activity
   - Specific curriculums (i.e. spark®, Triple play)
   - Teaching strategies
   - Motivating youth
   - Incorporating learning
   - N/A

SECTION TWO
Please read each question in this section and select the answer that best describes how you feel about the question.

16. Including a child with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program is
   a. Harmful
   b. Good
   c. Pleasant (for me)
   d. Worthless

17. What other youth serving programs/organizations do is important to me.

18. In regard to including youth with disabilities, the approval of youth who attend my afterschool program is important to me.

19. In regard to including youth with disabilities, what other staff think is important to me.

20. In regards to including their children, what families of youth with disabilities think is important to me.

21. Taking attention away from other youth in the program to meet the needs of youth with disabilities is:

22. Youth with disabilities feeling discouraged when included in physical activity is:

23. Improving social skills in youth with disabilities is:

24. Youth with disabilities feeling overwhelmed when included in physical activity is:

25. Youth with disabilities being included by other youth is:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26. If I include youth with disabilities in physical activity, I feel they may get discouraged.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Being able to adapt games and activities makes it easier for me to include youth with disabilities in physical activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. If I include youth with disabilities in physical activity, I am providing them with choices.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. I have control over whether or not I receive inclusion training.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. I have control over being able to adapt games and activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Having a proper area/space to perform activities makes it easier for me to include youth with disabilities in physical activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Parents of other youth in the program want me to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. If I include youth with disabilities in physical activity, I feel the attention I give them will take away from the other youth in the program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. I have control over having the proper area to perform an activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. When a youth’s disability limits their participation, I am likely to include them in physical activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. I intend to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. If I include youth with disabilities in physical activity, I will be able to give them the attention that they need.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. I have control over having a variety of equipment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. When inclusion trainings are provided, I am likely to include youth with disabilities in physical activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Other staff want me to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. I have control over whether or not a youth’s disability limits their participation in physical activity during my afterschool programs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. If I include youth with disabilities in physical activity, I feel other youth in the program will also include them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. I expect to include youth with disabilities in physical activity in my afterschool program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Families of youth with disabilities want me to include their children in physical activity in my afterschool program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. It is expected of me that I include youth with disabilities in physical activity in my afterschool program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. I have control over whether or not there is enough staff in my afterschool program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. I have control over whether or not I have time to plan before my program starts.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. In the past 30 days, I have included youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program. (Leave blank if you responded no to question #9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. Youth who attend my afterschool program want me to include youth with disabilities in physical activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

50. What parents of youth without disabilities think is important to me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

51. Being able to provide the attention that youth with disabilities need is:

|   | Extremely Desirable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Extremely Undesirable |

52. Increasing the physical activity of youth with disabilities is:

<p>|   | Extremely Desirable | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Extremely Undesirable |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53. The decision to include youth with disabilities in physical activity in my afterschool program is beyond my control.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. Having enough staff makes it easier for me to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. When youth with disabilities understand the activity, I am likely to include them in physical activity.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. I have control over whether or not youth with disabilities understand the activity.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. Having a variety of equipment makes it easier for me to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. I am confident that I could include youth with disabilities in physical activity as part of my role in my afterschool program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. People who are important to me, want me to include youth with disabilities in my afterschool program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. I want to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. If I include youth with disabilities in physical activity, I am helping to increase their physical activity.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 62. For me to include youth with disabilities in my afterschool program it is: |
|---------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Very Difficult                  | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7     | Very Easy      |

| 63. Helping youth with disabilities feel part of a group is: |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Extremely Desirable                                         | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7     | Extremely Undesirable |

| 64. Providing choices for youth with disabilities is:       |
|-------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Extremely Desirable                                         | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7     | Extremely Undesirable |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>65. If I include youth with disabilities in physical activity, I feel they will be overwhelmed.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. If I include youth with disabilities in physical activity, I am helping them feel part of a group.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. Prior planning makes it easier for me to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68. Other youth serving programs/organizations want me to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69. If I include youth with disabilities in physical activity, I am helping to increase their social skills.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70. In the past 30 days, I have facilitated the participation of youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program. (Leave blank if you responded no to question #9)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71. I feel under social pressure to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72. People who are important to me think I should include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73. In the past 30 days I have incorporated youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program. (Leave blank if you responded no to question #9)</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74. Whether or not I include youth with disabilities in physical activity is entirely up to me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you for your participation in this survey!!!
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Team Members</td>
<td>Jennifer Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission Type</td>
<td>Continuing Review Application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Expedited Category(ies) 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Participants</td>
<td>300 Do not exceed this number without prior IRB approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waiver(s)</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Level for Children</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding Source</td>
<td>Proposal #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PI on Grant or Contract</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above referenced study was reviewed and approved by the OSU Institutional Review Board (IRB).

Approval Date: 02/06/2013
Expiration Date: 02/05/2014

Annual continuing review applications are due at least 30 days prior to expiration date

Documents included in this review:

- Protocol
- Consent forms
- Assent forms
- Alternative consent
- Letters of support
- Recruiting tools
- Test instruments
- Attachment A: Radiation
- Alternative assent
- Project revision(s)
- Attachment B: Human materials
- Grant/contract
- Other:

Principal Investigator responsibilities for fulfilling the requirements of approval:

- All study team members should be kept informed of the status of the research.
- Any changes to the research must be submitted to the IRB for review and approval prior to the activation of the changes. This includes, but is not limited to, increasing the number of subjects to be enrolled.
- Reports of unanticipated problems involving risks to participants or others must be submitted to the IRB within three calendar days.
- Only consent forms with a valid approval stamp may be presented to participants.
- Submit a continuing review application or final report to the IRB for review at least four weeks prior to the expiration date. Failure to submit a continuing review application prior to the expiration date will result in termination of the research, discontinuation of enrolled participants, and the submission of a new application to the IRB.
APPENDIX F: Informed Consent Document

CONSENT FORM

Project Title: Inclusion training intervention for afterschool staff
Principal Investigator: Joonkoo Yun, Ph.D.
Student Researcher: Jennifer Taylor
Co-Investigator(s): Jeff McCubbin, Ph.D.
Version Date: 08/03/2011

1. WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF THIS FORM?
This form contains information you will need to help you decide whether to be in this study or not. Please read the form carefully and ask the study team member(s) questions about anything that is not clear.

2. WHY IS THIS STUDY BEING DONE?
The purpose of this study is to assess the effectiveness of an in-service for afterschool program on inclusion intention and behavior of staff. This research will be used for a doctoral dissertation with the intent of publishing results and presenting at conferences.

Up to 300 afterschool program staff may be invited to take part in this study.

3. WHY AM I BEING INVITED TO TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?
You are being invited to take part in this study because you fit the study criteria of being age 18 and older, are employed by an afterschool program, and provide a direct service to the youth and teens in your programs.

4. WHAT WILL HAPPEN IF I TAKE PART IN THIS RESEARCH STUDY?

- If you choose to participate in this study you will be asked to fill out a survey that includes questions regarding your experience and perceptions about working with youth with disabilities.
- You will then participate in a three hour training on the topics of inclusion and inclusion in physical activity for youth with disabilities. This training will include small group discussions, talking through scenarios, and the presentation of current research in the field of inclusion and adapted physical activity.
- After participation in the training you will be asked to fill out a survey two weeks later and again 6 weeks after that training.
- Each survey is expected to take around 20 minutes to fill out. The training will last for 3 hours with a short break about half way through and time to fill out a short training feedback form.
• While all participants will fill out the surveys some programs sites will not participate in the training. These sites will be used as control sites and will be provided the training later if they wish.

Because it is not possible for us to know what studies may be a part of our future work, we ask that you give permission now for us to use your personal information without being contacted about each future study. Future use of your information will be limited to studies about afterschool staff and inclusion. If you agree now to future use of your personal information, but decide in the future that you would like to have your personal information removed from research database, please contact Joonkoo Yun at (541) 737-8584.

______ You may store my information for use in future studies.

Initials

______ You may not store my information for use in future studies.

Initials

5. WHAT ARE THE RISKS AND POSSIBLE DISCOMFORTS OF THIS STUDY?
While precautions have been taken there is a risk that we could accidentally disclose information that identifies you. Also, there is potential for some participants to feel uncomfortable answering some of the survey questions. If you feel uncomfortable, you may skip any of questions and proceed to the next one.

6. WHAT ARE THE BENEFITS OF THIS STUDY?
You will not get a direct benefit from being in this study. However, you may gain skills and knowledge that will help you to better include youth with disabilities in your afterschool program.

7. WILL I BE PAID FOR BEING IN THIS STUDY?
You will not be paid for being in this research study.

8. WHO WILL SEE THE INFORMATION I GIVE?
The information you provide during this research study will be kept confidential to the extent permitted by law. Research records will be stored securely and only researchers will have access to the records. Federal regulatory agencies and the Oregon State University Institutional Review Board (a committee that reviews and approves research studies) may inspect and copy records pertaining to this research. Some of these records could contain information that personally identifies you.

If the results of this project are published your identity will not be made public.
To help ensure confidentiality, we will use identification codes for all participants and only the research team will have access to study participant names. All data will be kept in a secure office.

9. WHAT OTHER CHOICES DO I HAVE IF I DO NOT TAKE PART IN THIS STUDY?
Participation in this study is voluntary. If you decide to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time without penalty. You will not be treated differently if you decide to stop taking part in the study. If you choose to withdraw from this project before it ends, the researchers may keep information collected about you and this information may be included in study reports.

10. WHO DO I CONTACT IF I HAVE QUESTIONS?
If you have any questions about this research project, please contact: Joonkoo Yun at (541) 737-8584 or Jennifer Taylor at (541) 737-3402.

If you have questions about your rights or welfare as a participant, please contact the Oregon State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) Office, at (541) 737-8008 or by email at IRB@oregonstate.edu

12. WHAT DOES MY SIGNATURE ON THIS CONSENT FORM MEAN?
Your signature indicates that this study has been explained to you, that your questions have been answered, and that you agree to take part in this study. You will receive a copy of this form.

Participant's Name (printed):

(Signature of Participant) (Date)

(Signature of Person Obtaining Consent) (Date)
APPENDIX G: Pre-Survey

AFTERSCHOOL PROGRAM STAFF SURVEY

The following are definitions for terminology used throughout this survey:

**Inclusion:** Philosophy of acceptance of diversity that focuses on individual differences and works toward promoting self-determined behavior (decisions reside with the individual and focus is on choice, decision making self-awareness and self-regulated behavior). Programming is characterized by adaptation of the skills, and techniques to accommodate individual differences.

**Physical activity:** Any bodily movement produced by skeletal muscles that requires energy expenditure (WHO, 2010). In your afterschool program this may be structured activity that is organized and led by staff or unstructured activity that youth might participate in during open gym, free play, or activities that are options for youth but not run by staff.

**Youth with disabilities:** Any youth that has a documented disability or a disability that has been identified by the parent/guardian. These disabilities may include but are not limited to learning disabilities, developmental disabilities, and/or physical disabilities. Afterschool program: the programs/organization in which you currently work.

**SECTION ONE:** Please answer the following questions to the best of you ability.

1. What best describes your current age?
   - [ ] 18-24
   - [ ] 25-34
   - [ ] 35-44
   - [ ] 45 & up

2. Gender?
   - [ ] Male
   - [ ] Female

3. Would you describe your ethnicity as Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin?
   - [ ] No, not of Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
   - [ ] Yes, Cuban
   - [ ] Yes, Mexican, Mexican American, Chicano
   - [ ] Yes, Puerto Rican
   - [ ] Yes, another Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin

4. How would you best describe your race?
   - [ ] White
   - [ ] Black/African American
   - [ ] American Indian or Alaskan Native
   - [ ] Asian
   - [ ] Pacific Islander

5. Which best describes your current level of education?
   - [ ] High School Graduate
   - [ ] College Graduate
   - [ ] Some college
   - [ ] Graduate School
   - [ ] Other:

6. Which best describes your current job title?
   - [ ] Site/Unit Director
   - [ ] Program Director
   - [ ] Enrichment Staff
   - [ ] Athletic Director
   - [ ] Education Staff
   - [ ] Recreation Staff
   - [ ] Technology Staff
   - [ ] Physical activity staff
   - [ ] Other:

7. In your current position do you facilitate or supervise any structured or unstructured physical activity?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No

8. How long have you worked for your current afterschool program?
   - [ ] less than a week
   - [ ] 1-2 years
   - [ ] 2-5 years
   - [ ] 5-7 years
   - [ ] 7-10 years
   - [ ] more than 10 years

9. Do you have experience working for other afterschool programs?
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] No (if no skip #10)

10. If you have worked for different afterschool program, how long did you work for them? (If more than one other program add total time worked for answer)
    - [ ] less than a week
    - [ ] 1-2 years
    - [ ] 2-5 years
    - [ ] 5-7 years
    - [ ] 7-10 years
    - [ ] more than 10 years

Yun: Afterschool staff training
11. What type of afterschool program do you work for?
   - Boys & Girls Club
   - Parks and Recreation
   - Other: 
   - School District
   - YMCA

12. Which best describes the location of your afterschool program?
   - School site
   - Parks and Recreation building
   - Other:
   - Church
   - Community based site

13. How many youth attend your afterschool program on a daily basis?
   - 0-50
   - 51-100
   - 101-150
   - 151-200
   - 201-250
   - 250+

14. Do you have youth with disabilities attending your afterschool program? (If no skip to #15)
   - Yes
   - No
   - Not Sure

15. Of the youth with disabilities who attend your afterschool program which disability are present in your youth? Please check all that apply
   - Attention Deficit Disorder ADD/ADHD
   - Autism
   - Down's Syndrome
   - Hearing Impairment
   - Mental Retardation
   - Learning disabilities
   - Severe Emotional Disturbance
   - Spinal Cord Injury
   - Other (please specify): 
   - Cerebral Palsy
   - Spina Bifida
   - Not Sure

16. How many times a year does your afterschool program provide training on topics related to working with youth with disabilities? (not including the training you are about to receive)
   - Never
   - Once
   - Twice
   - More than twice
   - Other (please specify): 
   - I have not worked for my afterschool program for a year

17. What is the typical duration of these trainings?
   - Less than one hour
   - 1-2 hours
   - 3-4 hours
   - 4-6 hours
   - Over 6 hours

18. How often does your afterschool program provide training on topics related to physical activity?
   - Never
   - Once a year
   - Twice a year
   - More than three times a year
   - Other (please specify): 
   - I have not worked for my afterschool program for a year

19. What is the typical duration of these trainings?
   - Less than one hour
   - 1-2 hours
   - 3-4 hours
   - 4-6 hours
   - Over 6 hours

SECTION TWO: INCLUSION
Please read each question in this section and select the answer that best describes how you feel about the question.

20. Including a child with disabilities during my afterschool program is: (please circle an answer for each letter in the left-hand column)
   a. Harmful
   b. Good
   c. Pleasant (for me)
   d. Worthless
   e. Beneficial
   f. Bad
   g. Unpleasant (for me)
   h. Useful

Yun: Afterschool staff training
### Section Three: Inclusion in Physical Activity

Please read each question in this section and select the answer that best describes how you feel about the question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>39. Including a child with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program is:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Harmful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Worthless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(for me)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>40. Most people who are important to me think that I should include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>41. It is expected of me that I include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. I feel under social pressure to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my current afterschool program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. People who are important to me want me to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my current afterschool program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Yun: Afterschool staff training
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44. I am confident that I could include youth with disabilities in physical activity as part of my role in my afterschool program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. The decision to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program is beyond my control.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. For me to include youth with disabilities in physical activity as part of my role in my current afterschool program is very difficult.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. I expect to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. I want to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. I intend to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**In the past 7 days I have...**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50. ...included youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. ...facilitated the participation of youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. ...incorporated youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. ...done planning to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. ...prepared specific adaptations or modifications to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. ...used different equipment or supplies to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. ...modified the task or rules for a youth with disabilities who are participating in physical activity during my afterschool program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. ...encouraged a youth with a disability to participate in physical activity with their peers during my afterschool program.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58. Down's Syndrome is the most common disability receiving support services in schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. A developmental approach to inclusion implies that everyone develops at different rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. Individuals with disabilities are generally as active as their non-disabled peers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>a.</th>
<th>b.</th>
<th>c.</th>
<th>d.</th>
<th>e.</th>
<th>f.</th>
<th>g.</th>
<th>h.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>61. When planning for inclusion factors that should be taken into account are:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. the length of the lesson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. the environment you are teaching in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. the youth characteristics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. the task you are asking to be done</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>a.</th>
<th>b.</th>
<th>c.</th>
<th>d.</th>
<th>e.</th>
<th>f.</th>
<th>g.</th>
<th>h.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Ask, Believe, Coach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Always Be Calm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Antecedent, Behavior, Consequence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Advise and Be Consistent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>a.</th>
<th>b.</th>
<th>c.</th>
<th>d.</th>
<th>e.</th>
<th>f.</th>
<th>g.</th>
<th>h.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63. Barriers to participation in physical activity for individuals with disabilities include:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. functional capabilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. cost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. access to facilities and programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Afterschool staff training*
APPENDIX H: Post-Survey

AFTERSCHOOL PROGRAM POST TRAINING STAFF SURVEY

The following are definitions for terminology used throughout this survey:

Inclusion: Philosophy of acceptance of diversity that focuses on individual differences and works toward promoting self-determined behavior (decisions reside with the individual and focus is on choice, decision making self-awareness and self-regulated behavior). Programming is characterized by adaptation of teaching skills, and techniques to accommodate individual differences.

Physical activity: Any bodily movement produced by skeletal muscles that requires energy expenditure (WHO, 2010). In your afterschool programs this may be structured activity that is organized and led by staff or unstructured activity that youth might participate in during open gym, free play, or activities that are options for youth but not run by staff.

Youth with disabilities: Any youth that has a documented disability or a disability that has been identified by the parent/guardian. These disabilities may include but are not limited to learning disabilities, developmental disabilities and/or physical disabilities.

Afterschool program: the program/organization in which you currently work.

SECTION ONE: INCLUSION

Please read each question in this section and select the answer that best describes how you feel about the question.

1. Including a child with disabilities during my afterschool program is: (please circle an answer for each letter in the left-hand column)

   | a. | Harmful | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Beneficial
   | b. | Good    | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Bad
   | c. | Pleasant| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Unpleasant (for me)
   | d. | Worthless| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Useful

2. Most people who are important to me think that I should include youth with disabilities during afterschool programs

   Strongly Disagree | Strongly Agree
   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. It is expected of me that I include youth with disabilities in an afterschool program.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. I feel under social pressure to include youth with disabilities during my current afterschool program.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. People who are important to me want me to include youth with disabilities during my current afterschool program.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. I am confident that I could include youth with disabilities as part of my role in an afterschool program.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. The decision to include youth with disabilities in this afterschool program is beyond my control.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. The decision to include youth with disabilities as part of my role in my current afterschool program is very difficult.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. I expect to include youth with disabilities during my afterschool program.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7

10. I want to include youth with disabilities during my afterschool program.

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

11. I intend to include youth with disabilities during my afterschool program.

    1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Yun: Afterschool staff training
### In the past 7 days I have...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>...included youth with disabilities during my afterschool program</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>...facilitated the participation of youth with disabilities during my afterschool program</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>...incorporated youth with disabilities during my afterschool program</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>...determined to include youth with disabilities in my afterschool program</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>...prepared specific adaptations or modifications to include youth with disabilities in my afterschool program</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>...used different equipment or supplies to include youth with disabilities in my afterschool program</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>...modified the task or rules for a youth with disabilities in my afterschool program</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>...encouraged a youth with a disability to participate in an activity with their peers during my afterschool program</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION TWO: INCLUSION IN PHYSICAL ACTIVITY

Please read each question in this section and select the answer that best describes how you feel about the question.

20. Including a child with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Harmful</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Beneficial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td>Unpleasant (for me)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Pleasant (for me)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Useful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Worthless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Most people who are important to me think that I should include youth with disabilities in physical activity during afterschool programs</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>It is expected of me that I include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I feel under social pressure to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my current afterschool program</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>People who are important to me want me to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I am confident that I could include youth with disabilities in physical activity as part of my role in my afterschool program</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>The decision to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during this afterschool program is beyond my control</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>For me to include youth with disabilities in physical activity as part of my role in my current afterschool program is very difficult</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I expect to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I want to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I intend to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the past 7 days I have...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>included youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>facilitated the participation of youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>incorporated youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>done planning to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>prepared specific adaptations or modifications to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>used different equipment or supplies to include youth with disabilities in physical activity during my afterschool program</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>modified the task or rules for a youth with disabilities who are participating in physical activity during my afterschool program</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>encouraged a youth with a disability to participate in physical activity with their peers during my afterschool program</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. Down's Syndrome is the most common disability receiving support services in schools T F

40. A developmental approach to inclusion implies that everyone develops at different rates T F

41. Individuals with disabilities are generally as active as their non-disabled peers. T F

42. When planning for inclusion factors that should be taken into account are:
   a. the length of the lesson         e. a, d, c
   b. the environment you are teaching in f. b, c, d
   c. the youth characteristics        g. all of the above
   d. the task you are asking to be done

43. What do the ABC's of behavior management stand for?
   a. Ask, Believe, Coach
   b. Always Be Calm
   c. Antecedent, Behavior, Consequence
   d. Advise and Be Consistent

44. Barriers to participation in physical activity for individuals with disabilities include?
   a. functional capabilities          e. staff knowledge
   b. cost                              f. equipment
   c. transportation                    g. b, c, d
   d. access to facilities and programs h. all of the above

43. What part of the training do you feel benefited you the most? and why?

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

44. Please describe if there are anything specific that you have implemented or changed due to what you learned in the training.

__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________
__________________________________________________________________________

Yun: Afterschool staff training
APPENDIX I: Training Detail

Inclusion Training

**Duration:** 180 minutes with a 10 minute break

**Topics:** Expectations of Inclusion, Approaches to Inclusion, Autism, Down’s Syndrome, Learning Disabilities, ADHD, Behavior Management, Physical Activity, Program Planning.

**Training Setup:** Trainings were conducted in medium to large rooms where all staff attending the training (5-20 staff) were able to clearly see the presenter and the projector screen. Large post-it’s were placed around the room based on the planned activities.

**Equipment:** Laptop, projector screen, projector, large post-it’s, poster markers.

Training Content

Each training began with an introduction of the trainer and a brief discussion of the training agenda. The trainer introduces the term inclusion and facilitated a brainstorm on what staff felt the term meant. This brainstorm was followed by a clear definition of inclusion that would be used for the duration of the training: a) a philosophy and attitude of acceptance and diversity, b) a process of advocacy, c) programming characterized by accommodation of individualized teaching techniques, and participation among peers.

**Expectations of Inclusion:**

*Program Expectations:* These expectations were derived from answers the program provided to the following questions:
1. What is your programs mission or philosophy (overall)?
2. What is your programs philosophy regarding inclusion?
3. What expectations do you have of your staff regarding the inclusion of youth with disabilities? (Please be specific)

*Parent Expectations:* These expectations were derived from Bennett, Lee & Lueke (1998), and Responses from a survey filled out by parents who have youth with disabilities participating in a community recreation program.
- Be Fair
- Recognize that their children are not their label
- Understand that their children have off days
- Be patient with their children
- Help them be successful in the best way they can

*Youth Expectations:* These expectations were derived from Goodwin (2001)
- Don’t assume
- Work with youth to find a solution
- Don’t use safety as an excuse
- Give youth a chance to try

**Staff Peer Expectations:** (Activity)

Objective: To have staff identify expectations that they have of each other in regards to inclusion.

**Supplies:** Scraps of paper, can to put papers in

**Directions:**
1. Pass out pieces of paper to all staff
2. Ask staff to write expectations that they may have of those they are working with in regards to inclusion.
3. Use verbal prompts if staff are having a hard time
   a. Think about times when you were having a hard time with a child with a disability
   b. Think about a time when you saw someone working with a child with a disability
   c. This about what you may need from co-workers when working with a child with a disability
4. Once you have given staff some time collect the papers in a can.
5. Draw papers out and read aloud reminding staff that these expectations are what you expect of each other and should be thought of when working with youth with disabilities in your program.
6. Discuss what is written and ask staff (who are comfortable) if they can provide some examples of what this might look like in their program.
7. Go though papers as time allows (if there are repeats you can skip through them making sure to identify that some expectations many staff have)
8. Make a summative closing to the activity and ask if there were any expectations that were not covered.

**Benefits of Inclusion:**
These benefits were derived from Auxter, Pyfer, & Huttettig (2001), Sherrill (2004) look in AF lit review),

- Promotes participation
- Can decrease isolation
- May lead to higher participation in physical activity, can increase confidence,
- May increase positive self-perception

**Approaches:**
The information for this topic was derived from Sherrill (2004), Winnick, 2011)

- Categorical approach
  1. Identifies the capabilities of the individual based on their disability
2. Pros: Quick, provides information on possible characteristics
3. Cons: Does not take into account individual differences, can lead to labeling and putting youth in a “box”

Functional approach
1. Focuses on the individual's abilities not the disability
2. Pros: Looks at the whole person not just the disability, allows for individualization of modifications
3. Cons: Takes time and effort

*While both of these approaches have pro’s and con’s it may be beneficial to use a combination of the two within the afterschool program to best serve the needs of the individual. Using a categorical approach may allow for staff to hit the ground running and be aware of possible behaviors they may see from the youth then as they begin to know the youth they can move into more of a functional approach and spend time identifying how to best meet their needs. The challenge in afterschool programs will be to make sure not to stay with a categorical mindset.

Disabilities:
This section included basic learning characteristics, physical characteristics, and instructional strategies for afterschool staff to use in their programs. There is emphasis placed on the fact that no two children with the same disability are going to behave the same and staff need to keep in mind the individual when using different strategies. Examples of how these strategies could be implemented in the afterschool setting were discussed.

Down’s Syndrome

Learning Characteristics
- Learn in the same way, but differ in the amount of information and rate at which they learn
- Short attention span
- Challenges dealing with the abstract
- Limited ability to generalize information
- Challenges problem-solving

Physical Characteristics
- Muscle Hypotonia (low muscle tone)
- Hypermobility (above normal mobility) in the joints
- Postural and orthopedic impairments
- Lordosis, ptosis, dislocated hips, kyphosis, flat pronated feet, and forward head.
- Atlanto-axial instability
• Pertains to the atlas (1st cervical vertebrae) and the axis (2nd cervical vertebrae)

Other physical characteristics
• Short stature & short legs and arms in relation to torso
• Small nose with flat bridge
• Exaggerated folds of skin around eyes
• Mild to moderate obesity

Instructional Strategies
• Capture attention
• Simple/concise directions
• Specific instructions
• Demonstrations/Prompts with verbal instructions
• Keep lessons/activities structured and consistent
• Provide success-oriented environment
• Repeat and review often
• Provide a lot of positive specific reinforcement not just "good job" but "you kept eye on ball"
• Maximize active participation
• Be firm and consistent when disciplining
• Select age-appropriate activities
• Be aware of medications and physical conditions (atlanto-axial instability)

Autism/Pervasive Developmental Disorder
• Difficulty with speech, language, and communication
• Difficulty relating to people, objects, and events
• Abnormal responses to sensory stimuli
• Have a moderate to severe range of socialization and behavior problems
• Impaired social interaction and communications
• Characterized by:
  • a lack of social skills
  • difficulty with social relationships
  • Poor coordination /Poor concentration
  • Restricted range of interests
  • Average to above average intelligence and adequate language skills in the areas of vocabulary and grammar.
• Appears to have a somewhat later onset than Autism
- Visual learners
- Unable to screen out irrelevant information
- Attentive to visual details
- Strong long term memory
- Memory of routines, lists, and rules
- Compliance- Once the student understands what to do, will do over and over again
- Specific Interest are priority

Instructional Strategies
- Allow time for familiarity with the instructor and activity
- Promote eye contact
- Use clear and consistent cues and prompts
- Provide effective reinforcement and feedback
- Use routines, schedules, and calendars
- Use pictures and demonstrations
- Structure the environment in a concrete manner
- Know the person - each person with Autism is very different in regard to “general” characteristics
- Minimize external stimuli, progress to focusing on relevant stimuli
- Start with structure and routine, then proceed to teaching toward transitions and less structure
- Individualized sports

Learning Disabilities
- One of largest group of students receiving special services in the United States
- According to the U.S. Department of Education (2012)
- Slightly less than 50% (2.8 million) of all students in special education
- About 5% of the total school-age population
- Input: recognizing shapes, position and size of items seen, issues with sequencing, screening out competing sounds
- Integration: challenges telling a story in correct sequence, putting facts together to see big picture
- Storage: difficulty learning new material without a lot of repetition
- Output: issues with spoken language, written language, and gross and fine motor issues.

How it manifest
- Reading
- Writing
- Nonverbal learning
• Disorders of speaking & listening
• Auditory processing
• Motor output problems

Some examples:
• Intelligent, but grades don’t show it
• High in some subjects and low in others
• Big difference in tasks requiring talking vs. not requiring talking
• Big difference in knowledge of specific facts vs. ability to apply learning to new situations
• Big difference in memory for things seen vs. things heard
• Substantially better performance when given more time (D.S. Greenway, PhD.)

ADD/ADHD
• ADHD is a combination of inattention and/or hyperactive-impulsive symptoms that are present in at least two settings and interfere with academic, social, and occupational functioning (American Psychiatric Association, 2000).
• About 30% of people with ADHD also have a LD (Fletcher et al., 1999).

Possible associated conditions
• Inattention
• Impulsivity
• No inhibition
• Hyperactivity
• Social perception inadequacies
• Perseverance

Behavior Management:
The objective of this section is to provide staff with basic strategies for identifying behaviors and steps to resolve them within the afterschool environment. This section begins with a brainstorm on the following questions:
1. Why do youth/youth with disabilities misbehave?
2. What are some of the things that happen right before the behavior that you notice?
3. What behaviors do you see?
4. What results from those behaviors?

Positive Behavioral Supports
Person-centered behavioral approaches
• To develop respect and trust
• Provide opportunities for appropriate interactions with peers at school and community
• Focus on prevention or reduction of bad situations
• Focus on instruction of communication skills and social skills
• Individualized and positive for all

Key Components
• Identifying a behavior
• Examining antecedents
• Exploring consequences
• Examining functions of behavior
• Considering ways to teach appropriate behavior

The ABC’s of Behavior Management

Behavior
• Clear and thorough descriptions that identify the behavior.
• Identify:
  • Frequency (how often the behavior takes place)
  • Where it happens
  • What it looks like
  • Duration (how long it happens)
  • Intensity (how strong it is)
  • How long it takes to occur

Antecedents
• What are things that happen right before the behaviors occur?
• Events
• Actions
• Objects
• People

Examples: Time of day, Location/Specific class, People/Crowds, Activity, Noise, Light, Heat/Cold, Medications, Communication problems (boredom, fear, stress, frustration, pain?), Daily occurrences…missed breakfast, didn’t sleep well, missed the bus, changes in a schedule

Consequences

Reinforcement:
• when something is presented or taken away that increases the positive behavior to be repeated
• Best when immediate, and age appropriate
• Intrinsic, Social, tangibles, PA, privileges
• Group contingencies, token economies, contracts
• Prompts, shaping and chaining

Punishment:
• when something is presented or taken away that decreases the likelihood that the behavior will be repeated
• Timeout, extinction, response cost, overcorrection and aversives (verbal reprimand)
- Not demeaning nor causes harm

Schedules of Reinforcement
- Continuous: reinforcement after every occurrence
- Ratio: reinforcement after a specified number of occurrences (i.e. every third time)
- Interval: reinforcement after a specific amount of time has passed since the last reinforcement

Suggestions for preventing behavior problems
- Tune into your group
- Manage pace
- Manage time efficiently
- Clear instructions
- Realistic goals
- Hold youth accountable
- Keep group attentive
- Appeal to values
- Be consistent
- Use proximity control
- Be a good role model
- Redirect disruptive behaviors
- Establish expectations early
- Avoid nagging
- Develop an environment of support/trust
- Take an interest in your youth

Activity: The objective of this activity is to a) provide staff with a situation that may present itself in their afterschool program and allow for them to practice the ABC’s. b) provide the group opportunity for discussion on how different situations can be handled.

Supplies: Large post-it’s, Scenario’s.
1. Break group into small groups (3-5)
2. Provide each group with a scenario
3. Allow time for the group to work through their scenario and answer the questions at the end.
4. Have staff write the information on the post-it to present to the group
5. After the allotted time have each group read their scenario and present how they answered their questions to the group.
6. Ask staff from the other groups if they have anything they would add

*Be sure to redirect staff to the ABC’s if they are getting off track in their handling of the situation. Also, remind staff that while we have to assume some things to complete this activity, that it is very important that we are asking questions of the youth, or parents to identify the situation.
The following are the different scenarios given to the groups. If there was more than 4 groups a second group may be given the same scenario to keep groups at a productive size so everyone has an opportunity to add their thoughts.

Scenario #1
Pete is an 8 year old boy in your afterschool program. Pete has down syndrome and while he enjoys participating in many of the physical activity programs that are offered Pete often decided that he does not want to follow the rules to the game being played and the other youth don’t think it is fair that he doesn’t have to follow the rules.

Scenario #2
Emma is a 11 year old in your afterschool program. Emma has attention deficit disorder and while she is in homework help finds it very difficult to focus. This lack of focus makes it hard for her to sit still and Emma will begin to wander about the room disrupting others trying to work.

Scenario #3
Arthur is a 15 year old in your afterschool program. Arthur has autism and finds it difficult to participate in gym activities. He is really excited about the new basketball program and would like to participate but when he goes into the gym for open gym time he gets overwhelmed and begins screaming after 10 minutes because of the noise.

Scenario #4
Dottie is a 10 year old in your afterschool program. Dottie has a learning disability and finds it very difficult to do math and comprehend what she reads. Dottie has joined your cooking program and is very excited about it but once in the program she gets very frustrated with her inability to understand and follow the directions, she begins to act out.

Each scenario was followed by the following instructions:
Answer the following questions:
- What is/are the major issue/s here?
- What are some antecedents that could be present in this situation?
- What are some short-term and long term plans that you could put in place to help manage (youth in scenario’s name) behaviors?

Physical Activity:
The objective of this section is to a) identify the importance of physical activity for youth with disabilities, b) identify the role staff play in helping or hindering physical activity for youth with disabilities, and c) identify some barriers that may exist in staffs’ afterschool programs that may be hindering physical activity. The information for this section was derived from The CDC (2012), NAHNES, Physical Activity Guidelines

Health benefits of physical activity
- People who are physically active have:
  - higher health related fitness,
  - a lower risk profile for development of a number of disabling medical conditions
  - lower rates of various chronic diseases.
- There is strong evidence that children and youth who are physically active have:
  - higher levels of cardiorespiratory fitness
  - higher levels of muscular strength
  - lower body fatness
  - better cardiovascular and metabolic risk profiles
  - enhanced bone health when compared to non-active children and youth.
- There is strong evidence that being physically active is associated with higher levels of functional health and decreased risk of falls in older adults.

Status of physical activity
- How many meet the recommendations?
  - 42% of children (60 min)
  - 8% of adolescents (60 min)
  - < 5% of adults (30 min)

Basics of PA
- PA decreases as age increases
- PA dramatically decreases in adolescents
- Males general more active than females

Physical activity for individuals with disabilities
- Youth
  - Similar age trends
  - Generally less active than peers
  - One study found that 47% of youth with ASD met guidelines but short bouts (Pan & Frey, 2006)
  - Can’t determine to what extent youth with ID meet guidelines due to lack of research (Frey, 2008)

- Adults
  - Similar patterns as adults without disabilities (Frey, 2004)

Potential health consequences
- Same health issues as TDP (CVD, Diabetes, increased risk of cancers and other health conditions. PLUS…
- Secondary conditions: a condition that results from a specific type of primary disability, birth defect or medical condition.
• Secondary conditions include
  • Pressure sores, depression, joint pain, social isolation…
  
What helps or hinders you being physically active?
  • Brainstorm with staff on the major things/people/environments that help them and prevent them from being active.

For individuals with some disabilities.
  Helps
  • Expectations from staff/volunteer
  • Supervision
  • Encouragement
  • Social support

Hinders
  • Lack of staff knowledge about disability and PA
  • Lack of transportation
  • Gross motor function
  • Equipment
  • Accessible space of facility
  • Lack of adaptations/modifications

Barriers
  • What are some barriers that exist in your programs that may prevent youth with disabilities from participating in physical activity?
  • How can you reduce barriers to youth who participate in your programs?

Planning For Inclusion:
The purpose of this section is to a) identify key variables in planning for activities within staffs’ afterschool programs, b) to provide staff an opportunity practice addressing key variables through activity, c) provide staff an opportunity to address different way to modify activities for youth with disabilities in an afterschool program setting.

Three critical pieces to consider
  • Person: age, gender, culture, disability, ability, motivation, attitudes. Can change over time.
  • Environment: facilities, space, equipment, lighting, temperature, noise Includes both Physical and emotional.
  • Behavior/Task: Rules, equipment, purpose.

Planning for inclusion
  • Keep the person, environment, and tasks in mind.
  • Plan for the spectrum
  • High Skill level
  • Low skill level
  • Include modifications in your planning

Modifying Activities
  Task
- **Purpose:**
- **Rules:**
- **Equipment**

**Activity:** Supplies: Large post-it’s, Scenario’s.

1. Break group into small groups (3-5)
2. Provide each group with a scenario
3. Allow time for the group to work through their scenario and answer the questions at the end.
4. Have staff write the information on the post-it to present to the group
5. After the allotted time have each group read their scenario and present how they answered their questions to the group.
6. Ask staff from the other groups if they have anything they would add

*Be sure to remind staff that the goal is to provide the fewest amount of adaptations to help youth be successful. Also point out that some adaptations may help youth without disabilities participate in new activities. Remind staff if about utilizing all variables and not to just focus on needing different or more equipment.

The following are the different scenarios given to the groups. If there was more than 4 groups a second group may be given the same scenario to keep groups at a productive size so everyone has an opportunity to add their thoughts.

**Scenario #1**
Tim is a 9 year old boy who has down syndrome. Tim has heard about the amazing science program that you are in charge of and really is excited about joining you next week.

**Scenario #2**
Carol is a 13 year old girl that has ADHD. Carol has come into your art program and plans to attend each week.

**Scenario #3**
Brice who is a 10 year old boy who has high functioning autism just came into your soccer program outside.

**Scenario #4**
Sandi is a 8 year old girls with a learning disability (input) who has just entered your cheerleading program.

Each of the scenarios were followed by these instructions:
Answer the following questions:

- What factors do you need to consider in regards to the learner?
- What factors do you need to consider in regards to the task?
- What factors do you need to consider in regards to the environment?
What modifications would you make to the task, environment, or equipment to help (youth’s name from the scenario) successfully participate in your program?

Take home message
- Each youth regardless of their disability
- Understand what is expected of you regarding inclusion
- There is no cookie cutter disability
- ABC’s of behavior management
- 3 key pieces to planning for inclusion: Person, environment, task.

Staff were asked at the end of the training to provide some feedback on the training.
APPENDIX J: Training Feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Feedback</th>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please rate the following:</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenters ability to engage participants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenters Lecture style</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What could be improved for the next training on this topic?

What portion of this training was most useful for you?

Any other comments you have for the presenter?

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Training Feedback</th>
<th>Site:</th>
<th>Date:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please rate the following:</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenters ability to engage participants</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presenters Lecture style</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group discussions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Materials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What could be improved for the next training on this topic?

What portion of this training was most useful for you?

Any other comments you have for the presenter?
APPENDIX K: Process Evaluation

**Afterschool Staff Inclusion Training Intervention**

| Start Time: |  
| Attendance: |  
| Break: |  
| Wrap Up: |  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Done</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>General comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is inclusion?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expectations</strong></td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parent Expectations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Peer expectations (bucket activity)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How does inclusion help IWD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion Look Like, feel like, sound like (Activity)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disabilities</strong></td>
<td>Down Syndrome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ADD/ADHD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Disabilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BREAK</strong></td>
<td>TIME:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Behavior Management</strong></td>
<td>ABC’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scenario Activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PA importance for IWD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Barriers to participation in PA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Planning for Inclusion</strong></td>
<td>Task, Environment, Learner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modifying: Task, Rules, environment, equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scenario Activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall Thoughts:

Participants:

Content: