TEXAS
Education Review

Journal Homepage: www.txedrev.org
Published online: September 2018
Submit your article to this journal

Translating Research to Practice: Getting Started with Afterschool-Based Physical Activity Programs

MARK URTEL, EDD
Indiana University—Purdue University Indianapolis

Volume 6, Issue 2, pp. 26-37 (2018)

To cite this article: Urtel, M. (2018). Translating research to practice: Getting started with afterschool-based physical activity programs. *Texas Education Review*, *6*(2), 26-37.
http://hdl.handle.net/2152/68279

Translating Research to Practice: Getting Started with Afterschool-based Physical Activity Programs

MARK URTEL
Indiana University—Purdue University Indianapolis

Comprehensive School Physical Activity Programs (CSPAPs) have been identified as an intervention toward improving physical activity opportunities for youth throughout the school day. One of the five elements of a CSPAP is afterschool programming. This paper translates the varied research about youth engagement in physical activity into a consumable axiom for those chosen to lead CPSAP efforts; more specifically, after school programming. In addition, the author provides an overview of his experience and perspective with preparing and delivering his own after school programs. In conclusion, the author addresses the significance of having principal support as you implement a CSPAP.

The CSPAP acronym is becoming quite evident in the formal written landscape that centers on public health initiatives and youth physical activity. CSPAP stands for Comprehensive School Physical Activity Programs and contains the following five elements: (a) Quality physical education, (b) before and after school physical activity, (c) physical activity during school, (d) family and community engagement, and (e) staff involvement. Before addressing how to translate research about CSPAP into practice, this paper will provide important foundational information about the history and context of this national initiative.

The genesis of CSPAPs is the culmination of a few decades of work on youth and physical activity research within a public health context that includes recasting the role of the in-school, and certified, Physical Educator to be a *Physical Activity Leader* (PAL). Notably, the designated PAL should not be considered the sole person expected to plan, prepare, and deliver all elements of a CSPAP, rather the PAL should be considered the point person in coordinating and facilitating a CSPAP, often by their ability to recruit and train colleagues, community partners, and advocates for the school to fully implement a CSPAP.

It is generally accepted that the formation of a CSPAP started with inter-professional dialogue within what was formerly known as the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance (AAHPERD) and centered on how to use various school and community resources to try to enable youth to achieve 60 minutes of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity daily (Beighle, Erwin, Castelli, & Ernst, 2009; Carson, 2012). This professional dialogue evolved and eventually led to a national branding effort and organized trainings using the "systems change" approach where currently this initiative is now hosted jointly between the Society of Health and Physical Educators America (SHAPE, formerly AAHPERD) and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) (Chen & Gu, 2017) with more recent endorsement, circa 2013, coming from the Institute of Medicine (IOM). Moreover, the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE) constructed a position statement that outlines the expectations and scope of a CSPAP for dissemination on a wider scale (NASPE, 2008).

Finally, what is even more noteworthy, and less well-known, is that prior to the PAL evolution, the organization formerly known as AAHPERD was crafting a national rollout of a newly coined initiative called *Director of Physical Activity* (DPA). Ultimately, based on multiple conversations with various organizations and affiliates in our field, the term DPA was shelved and PAL was the chosen moniker of the designated and trained school professional who would orchestrate efforts toward the five elements of CSPAP programming. The CSPAP initiative is based on much research and inquiry and stands today as a worthy intervention to promote physically active youth.

Current Topics

At the national level, CSPAP is evident through direct highlights on web homepages, marketing materials, and information sources at prominent agencies; for example, the United States Department of Agriculture, CDC, Active Living Research, Gopher Sports, Action for Healthy Kids, and the Spring Board to Active Schools all had recent dialogues, programs, or position statements promoting CSPAP events or training sessions, specifically. This referencing continues through to the state level, where a quick search reveals the following examples: (a) New York OPCE – Obesity Prevention Center for Excellence, (b) Nevada Wellness, (c) California School-Based Health Alliance, and (d) various state HPER professional associations, like Arizona Health and Physical Education and the Oklahoma AHPERD, where each state group or association focused on a CSPAP in either a conference session format or electronic promotion form. This state-level focus likely ends up at either university/college Physical Education Teacher Education (PETE) programs or at P-12 Community School Corporations, where the conversation centers on either how to infuse CSPAP ideology into pre-service teacher training or an overview of the benefits of a CSPAP to a limited set of stakeholders or vested staff members in hopes this will lead to CSPAP implementation.

As a result, much energy and human capital is currently being put toward the recommended implementation of a CSPAP. In fact, Chen and Gu (2017) completed a thorough review of the published literature on CSPAP and their findings revealed that there is a strong amount of research on the investigations of outcomes from existing elements of a CSPAP intervention, an even stronger amount of research on the university and college PETE faculty and pre-service teacher perceptions toward training in CSPAP, and an exceptionally strong amount of research on the key factors and explanations of CSPAP, along with the importance of wide implementation. While this attention is good and warranted, what gets less attention or is not as evident in the scholarly writings of this multi-component approach is the effort toward supporting "the people on the ground," the practitioners and program implementers, to efficaciously translate theory (research) into practice for the successful implementation of anywhere from one to five CSPAP components to occur.

Chen and Gu (2017) uncovered eleven articles on CSPAP tutorials, which seemingly would address the practitioners "on the ground," however, a closer look reveals that only two of those articles had practical aspects to them. This means the other nine articles addressed the typical description/prescription of a CSPAP or the PETE personnel and perceptions of this programming. In fact, one of the two seemingly relevant tutorial articles was titled "Theory into Practice: CSPAP" (Heidorn, Hall, & Carson, 2010). While the article served as a terrific overview and offered a compelling 30,000-foot view of how to form a CSPAP, the authors merely addressed how to begin the process of planning and preparing a CSPAP, with little in the way of implementation.

The second article, titled "Making it Happen" (Rink, 2012) referred to DPAs (as opposed to PALs) and was a premature look into the skills and techniques needed to change school culture through the implementation of a CSPAP. As a result, the article was a theoretical piece consisting of very general statements with meagre information or recommendations for in-school personnel to benefit from. To this end, one could argue that there exists little to no scholarship from the perspective of a PAL and how to translate research into practice for implementing an element of a CSPAP.

Thus, in writing this article, I strive to translate research (theory) into practice for current PAL's, or those interested in becoming a PAL, and to increase their ability to successfully offer a CSPAP component as part of their current educational responsibilities; particularly, afterschool programming. I will begin by broadly describing my relationship and experience within the CSPAP and PAL network and where my professional expertise lies. From there, I will transition into making connections between various research perspectives to find a common and easily implemented skill-

set or form of knowledge to assist with the preparation, planning, and delivery of an afterschool program. Finally, I will highlight the significance of which administrative support is essential for a CSPAP to thrive.

Author Background

For over 25 years I have been a PETE faculty member classically trained in Sport Pedagogy. I consistently embrace and infuse service-learning experiences as a high impact practice for my students in the classes I teach. I have also been afforded an exclusive opportunity to facilitate and direct in-school Physical Education in a K-8 building and over the years have also planned and delivered various afterschool programs in different school corporations. I also completed the inaugural DPA and PAL trainings, as sponsored by AAHPERD & SHAPE America, in Boston, Massachusetts, and Phoenix, Arizona, respectively. I have also delivered or co-delivered PAL trainings at six distinct workshops across three states. The workshop participants have included: principals, assistant principals, coordinators of physical education/health education, elementary classroom teachers, nurses, wellness committee team members, community partners, state department of education and department of health staff members, and, of course, licensed physical education and health teachers.

Additionally, I have successfully integrated CSPAP ideology into the PETE curriculum at Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis via course work that I teach and have consulted for recent graduates and alumni alike on how to best take the next step in starting an element of CSPAP. Taken together, the above experiences have uniquely positioned me to summarize an applied approach to translating research into practice.

Why Start an Afterschool Program?

From my perspective, as I have interacted with various stakeholders throughout my professional journey, the reasons school personnel want to engage in a CSPAP are (a) to try something new, (b) to accept a call to action that is coming directly from their principal or another district administrator regarding youth physical activity/fitness, and/or (c) to follow up on funding opportunities that were highlighted and linked to CSPAP enactment; they want to take advantage of the momentum or resources their district or an external funding agency may be offering them.

Goals, Objectives, and Outcomes of an Afterschool Program

Baker (2012) aptly summarizes goals as the broad reason of your program, objectives are specific and measurable ways the goals will be achieved, and outcomes are the measured result. It is at this point that I suggest the individuals who are working on program development take their time and be as intentional as possible when constructing the goals, objectives and outcomes they are striving for. Perhaps share their ideas, in writing, by trusted colleagues, who can be either discipline-specific professionals in other districts or teachers of other disciplines in their own building. Having multiple people reading your plan is a key strategy to ensure you are being clear and specific. By being clear and specific, one will be able to verbalize one's intentions to others and concisely advocate one's ideas, both of which are essential to developing a team of like-minded individuals to help meet one's goals. More specifically, you should be able to easily and successfully write out a goal with objectives and associated outcomes. Below is an example:

Goal: To include the 3rd grade in our after school physical activity program.

Objectives: Each eligible 3rd grade student will participate in one of the three after school physical activity options (i.e., running club, soccer, and dance).
Outcomes: 75% of 3rd grade students will have participated in the 6-week afterschool physical activity program.

By having these goals, objectives, and outcomes articulated in writing, you can now formulate a few plans which may include (a) recruiting or building a team of colleagues to assist you, (b) program preparation and delivery and, eventually, (c) assessment. Once your collective goals, objectives, and outcomes have been constructed you can then determine if the measures of success are feasible, and if so, then you can move onto next steps. These steps would typically focus your attention on establishing a timeline based on action items, gauge acceptable activities based on equipment, facility, and time of year, list possible barriers, identify possible solutions or enablers to overcome these barriers or obstacles, determine marketing strategies to raise awareness and then, perhaps most importantly, how to best acquire feedback on what you just offered. As a side note, collecting data (qualitative or quantitative) related to an objective is vital and should not be overlooked. As you move forward with your CSPAP, in hopes of either expanding your scope and procuring funding, or both, telling your story and demonstrating effect with data is a crucial element here.

Consequently, documenting impact of the afterschool program is central when you communicate with various stakeholders, community partners, and parents. Examples here could range from: (a) Number of students attending, (b) percent of eligible and possible students attending, (c) retention from week to week or month to month, (d) information from a written satisfaction survey from student participants, (e) information from verbal interactions (testimonials) from student participants, and, (f) comments from parents or guardians. Of course, implicit in all of this is that if you consider sharing this information to those outside of the school, you will need to follow the procedures of your school corporation to gain approval. Such approval may include blanket waivers or informed consent from parents and children, alike.

Finally, while the creation of goals, objectives, and outcomes are compulsory in constructing a successful afterschool program, they are not the prime determinant of success. Rather, program success is directly and highly dependent on *student involvement*. And student involvement goes beyond raised awareness and initial attendance, it really means adherence, retention, and active participation (Marks, 2000).

Planning Student-Centered Programming: Voice, Choice, Fun, and Friends

It has been argued that the design of a social environment can either optimize or disrupt a person's development, performance, or wellbeing (Ryan & Deci, 2000). Moreover, the personal characteristics that impact motivation and disposition are equally as important as the environment in determining the extent to which someone is persistent, engaged, and energetic toward something (Ryan and Deci, 2000). A deep dive into motivation is beyond the scope of this article; however, it is important for a practitioner to identify the determinants of youth participant motivation and employ them appropriately in the physical activity setting. In this section, I will highlight research and theories on youth development. While at times these are disparate, in both context and approach, I will then amalgamate these elements into a unified axiom for effective after school physical activity programming, coined Voice, Choice, Fun, and Friends.

Voice. Boomer (1982) first posited the notion that when students can "negotiate" curriculum options, they tend to have more buy-in. In effect, as program leaders, when we solicit

student input, invite them to contribute, or allow them to negotiate options within the program we are offering them *voice*. This concept was supported by Graham (1995) whose work established the ways in which a teacher's ability to listen and hear students' opinions will produce noticeable gains in participation. More recently, Rees et al. (2006) demonstrated the sustained impact that student *voice* has on participation, or the lack thereof, in a physical activity setting. Specifically, they found that when students are not "consulted" or provided voice in what activities they would like to participate in, they simply do not engage in physical activity.

Said differently – as program implementers – it is important to note that afterschool programming can look different, depending on your circumstance. Regardless, offering each participant a voice in an after-school program is possible for the practitioner. Specifically, a program leader can afford program participants voice in very high-level discussions which include what activity options there should be, all the way to low-level discussions which include the type of warm-up that will be used for the day. Other examples may include providing students a chance to weigh in on: team names, rules, strategies, and leadership roles (Hastie, 2003; Holdsworth, 1998).

Program personnel looking to create the ideal situation should survey the targeted participants prior to developing a tentative program to get a sense of what they would like to participate in. By adhering to Boomer's (1982) highest tier of "voice," you are both gaining support in your planning and tailoring your program to your students' goals, thus laying the groundwork for higher student engagement in physical activity. Of course, in this survey you need to provide feasible choices of activities based on your current situation. To accomplish this balance of voice with feasibility, the program planners should factor in the following: (a) Equipment availability, (b) facilities, and (c) the expertise of the program planners to assist with the options on which you survey the prospective participants. Providing for this voice early in your program will lead to higher participation and retention rates. This is especially true for the participants when they see that their voice had been factored into the planning process (Mitra, 2004).

Similarly, probing participants about other elements of the session that may be responsive to student voice will also bear positive results. Key opportunities to reveal what can be shifted from teacher mediated control to student mediated control are found at various times throughout a physical activity session. For example, these opportunities can originate at the beginning of a session where the program leader can ask participants to voice their preference about the order of the warm-up activities. Or, this can exist at the decision-making level when determining what, literal, activities should be adopted as their daily warm-up. Conversely, they may also be found at the end of the session where a program leader can ask for student voice as it pertains to highlights of the day, lowlights of the day, and parts of the daily programming that should be considered/reconsidered for next time.

Of course, there is a caveat here; if you solicit student voice and then do not acknowledge their contributions or simply ignore them, then student trust in you and your process will be violated.

Choice. Autonomy occurs when one is in a situation where they feel like they have some control and can make decisions on their own (Deci & Ryan, 1987). The ability to make a *choice* is considered autonomy. One of the most seminal works that showcased the impact of *choice* on student engagement in a physical activity setting was reported by Prusak (2000). In sum, by simply offering students a choice in activity selection there was a stark improvement in their (a) intrinsic motivation, (b) self-regulation, and (c) a decrease in external control (e.g., praise, reward, award, and acknowledgement). Ryan and Deci (2000) complement Prusak's (2000) findings in that a teacher can create an autonomy-supported (choice filled) environment which is essential to a student having the possibility of feeling competent and relatable to the material. Basically, if a setting cannot yield any

choices for a student, the likelihood of the student feeling competent and related is decreased (Ryan & Deci, 2000). The question becomes, how can you develop this environment? A potential answer might be offering students *choices*, early and often; in this way, program implementers are facilitating participants to feel like they are a trusted resource in this collaboration. And the choices you allow may seem innocuous and insignificant, but from the perspective of the participant, it means all the difference in the world. This was echoed by Rees et al. (2006) who found upon interviewing youth and adolescents (11-16 years of age), that the lack of *choice* of activities was identified as a precise reason that stops them from being physically active.

As a program planner, you can factor in student choice from the beginning of the programming to the conclusion of the programming. I have noted success when offering students a choice as it relates to the following: (a) Equipment being used, (b) field size to be played on, (c) music to be played, (c) team name, (d) a team chant, (e) a strategy to be created or explored with, (f) the choreography of a dance, (g) the goal for an activity, or (h) color jersey to wear. Additionally, Connell and Welborn (1991) noted some benefits of offering *choice* to students such as engagement and motivation to participate. As such, the task of the program implementer is to create opportunities for students to choose and choose often.

Fun. Common sense indicates that if students have fun, they will continue with an activity while if it is not fun, they will likely quit (Visek, et al., 2015). This is especially relevant as it pertains to establishing healthy physical activity habits early in life and then how those habits may track through adolescence into adulthood (Hills, Dengel, & Lubans, 2014). Beyond this common-sense argument, it is prudent to acknowledge that the foundational understanding of the complex interactions found within human motivation which leads to enjoyment are generally grounded in the Self-Determination Theory (Ryan & Deci, 1985). From this foundational piece, grew more understanding and comprehension related to enjoyment and participation by youth and adolescents to the extent Ryan and Deci (2000) saliently point out that Self-Determination Theory (SDT) is basically a framework that reveals intrinsic motivation as a contributor toward self-determined behavior, for example, actions that lead to health and productivity. In particular, (a) autonomy, (b) relatedness, and (c) competence make up intrinsic motivation and when a participant in an activity exhibits each of these three features the ensuing feelings of interest, enjoyment (fun), and satisfaction are then realized. This was echoed by Chatzisarantis, Biddle, and Meek (1997) as it pertained to their work on self-selection in physical activity/exercise where a key determinant was the perceived level of fun in the activity.

Additionally, Vallerand (1997) suggested that people will engage in an activity when they feel "efficacious" about the activity. More importantly, as a few scholars have noted, actual and perceived competence are not only determinants of participation in activity, but they ultimately lead to subsequent enjoyment of activity (Babic et al., 2014; Lubans et al., 2010). Another study clearly indicated that one of the strongest determinants to get youth to be physically active was *enjoyment*; it had to be fun (Rees et. al., 2006). This was reflected in two significant ways, first when the youth subjects answered a prompt on what caused them to be physically active, one of the top responses was that the activity had to be *enjoyable*. Furthermore, when responding to the prompt "What could be done or should be done to increase your participation in physical activity?" they also responded that *fun* should be emphasized.

The lesson here is that if students can control and calibrate their engagement in an activity, and thus feel somewhat in control and competent in the activity, then they will enjoy the activity. As a practitioner, it is important to realize that if a student is not having fun or the capacity for enjoyment is not there, the program will fail to meet its intended goals and objectives. In a sense, *fun* is the culminating feeling from a student that they are competent in an activity, they can make

decisions within the activity, and they have a sense of connection to others that are involved in the activity.

Friends. When a person feels a sense of connection, they experience relatedness. Ryan, Stiller, and Lynch (1994) showed that when children had a sense of *connection*, positive choices and pro-social behavior ensued. It is important to highlight that this connection is not limited to the activity itself, rather, most importantly, the connection made can be to their peers. Carlin, Murphy, and Gallagher (2015) found that school-aged youth favor school-based programs and activities when they can play and participate with their friends. Additionally, many researchers have noted that social context – who you are around – influences youth physical activity levels. Basically, according to Salvy et al. (2009) youth are more likely to engage in physical activity when their friends are around, as opposed to when they are alone. This may result from the realization that common forms of physical activities require other people to participate with (Pellegrini, Blatchford, Kato, & Baines, 2004) or it may lead to more complex realization constructs. Two such constructs are *companionship* and *affect*, where De Bourdeaudhuij et al. (2005) and Duncan (1993), note that youth choose to participate in physical activity when their friends are around. In other words, having a friend or friends engage in physical activity together can lead to a positive and supportive continuation of physical activity.

As such, when you can foster relationship skills with peers, you are supporting the relatedness component of the SDT. In summary, Ryan and Deci (2000) stated that "excessive control, non-optimal challenges, and lack of connectedness are disruptive…and result not only in the lack of initiative and responsibility, but also in distress and psychopathology" (p. 76).

In sum, as a program implementer of a student-focused CSPAP element, the first step in increasing the chances of success and for engaging the most students possible, is to focus on the salient axiom of *Voice, Choice, Fun, and Friends*. This guiding phrase is a composite of multiple areas of research that separately address student engagement, yet, when taken together provides an all-inclusive tenet to be followed. Do not program "at" students, or simply offer a program and hope that it works. Rather, make an intentional effort at offering students a voice so that you can learn what their areas of interest are and align your program accordingly. Next, offer students ample choices; early and often in your program, on both small and large scales. This affords program participants a sense of ownership. Then, factor in the basic need for enjoyment; if we ask or even expect students to engage in afterschool programs, not only do the activities need to be relevant and meaningful, they must also be enjoyable. Lastly, if we know that peer involvement and being around or building a network of friends is essential for involvement in physical activity, we must do what we can to ensure this type of relationship building occurs within our afterschool program.

Next Steps for Program Implementation

Building Support

For anyone considering starting an afterschool (or really any student-centered) program, it is critical to acknowledge that it will require support from building administrators. More particularly, when it comes to allocating necessary administrative or fiduciary resources, committing facilities for use with regular maintenance, communicating usage to affiliated interscholastic teams or even community groups that share facilities, having a principal on board with a possible after school program is critical. Other additional details that must be addressed such as transportation needs of student attendees or even possible food service that could be provided are impossible to verify

unless you have internal administrative support. Basically, the principal is a major element in being able to address the many logistical factors that lead to successful after school programs.

Aside from these logistics, it is crucial for the principal to align philosophically with the intended outcomes of your proposed programming. If there is not logistical support nor philosophical alignment, from the school principal to your program proposal, then this may be a fruitless endeavor. The good news in all of this is that, per the research, K-12 building principals do value lifetime fitness development for their students (Urtel & Vogel, 2011). So, the possibility exists that if you frame a new program properly, respectfully, and intentionally (i.e., have goals, outcomes, and objectives to foster lifetime fitness habits) with a very transparent student-centered model (e.g., Voice, Choice, Fun, and Friends), you have a high-level of opportunity for building-level support and sustained student involvement. It is imperative for the program implementer to understand that the long-held adage "so goes the principal, so goes the school" is consistently present in the literature for a reason; having internal administrative support is necessary for success (Brookover & Lezotte, 1977; Donham, 2008; Edmunds, 1979; Praisner, 2003).

For example, one of the after school physical activity programs I developed and implemented, the above guidelines were invaluable to me and the success of everyone involved. I integrated these same concepts into the course(s) I teach in the PETE program which are also linked to the local school that I had collaborated with. I facilitated the entire process from start to finish with my students and in direct consultation with the affiliated school principal. More particularly, I first met with the building principal after reading an article in a local newspaper about some needs and aspirations for students and this building overall. This meeting demonstrated the crucial internal administrative support. I then met with grade-level teachers who demonstrated interest along with the on-site physical educator who had not yet been introduced to CSPAP nor had they implemented anything similar, prior.

As a next step, based on the information from the school personnel, I worked with the students enrolled in the course I taught. We then developed a goal for the afterschool program with aligned objectives, and hopeful outcomes. Soon after, we administered a very concise choice-driven survey to allow the targeted students to rank possible activities; again, we did this based on the facility available to us, the equipment possible, and our areas of expertise and skills. We tentatively constructed an after school physical activity program that emulated the Voice, Choice, Fun, and Friends axiom; specifically, the program had three options, each meeting session, and they were (a) running club, (b) dance/rhythms, and (c) soccer. I presented this plan to the principal and shortly after receiving her approval, we started the afterschool program. This initial program ran two times a week for about 10 weeks, factoring in each of our respective academic calendars, and culminated with a year-ending family fitness night. Prior to this last evening of activities, we took the data we had been collecting all year (number of students per session, percentage of eligible students, retention rates from week to week and fall to spring) and presented this data to not only the building principal, but to other possible community partners, proximal to the school, in the hopes they would support our efforts, as well.

We thought the best way to celebrate this inaugural program and highlight our programming success would be to showcase our work to as many stakeholders as possible. However, we also felt that a smart way to do so would be to actively engage the families into the programming, so we developed a family fitness night. This night included students participating in the programs we offered all year, but we also modified them so that parents/guardians and siblings would be able to participate in the activities, as well. Along with these options, we also had informational health and physical activity booths set up, involving various community partners, so that parents/guardians could visit to add more perspective to the programming we offered. In fact, prior to this family fitness night we were able to effectively state the case that this program accomplished, and exceeded,

our goals, objectives, and outcomes. Using our assessment data, we could state emphatically that this was a value-added program that addressed a student need and emulated best practices. This resulted in multiple community businesses (including a church) asking how they could help. Knowing we had a family fitness night planned, we were able to present compelling data to various prospective community partners to gauge their interest and capacity to support our physical activity efforts. We invited them to not only attend the family fitness evening, but also to see if they had interest in providing support. Then we solicited donations from these groups. This resulted in each group that attended the culminating event to donate various items (e.g., bottled water, door prizes, athletic equipment, and healthy snack options) to aid the evening and the families that attended. As a result, each fall and spring, this afterschool program was the main attraction of the building and was highlighted during the meet the teacher night each fall. This continued until the principal retired. I believe that this experience served to not only recognize the skills and knowledge learned by the students, but it concomitantly served as a form of advocacy for the sustainment of afterschool programming.

Conclusion

In this article, I reframed current scholarship on CSPAPs and after school programming away from the researcher and more toward the lens of a practitioner. I have highlighted how this national initiative is grounded in research and gaining popularity in many public health contexts. Along with the typical research that is being completed, there is a need to address the practitioners directly. It is imperative that those who volunteer or are being asked to implement a CSPAP be afforded the chance to consume scholarship that is practical so that they can address and put into use immediately the strategic elements for success. I attempted to translate key research into practice to support this very request and even offered my own experiences with my students as an example. I ask my fellow scholars of CSPAP, education, educational policy, and public health to reflect on how their own research and lines of inquiry can directly assist newly minted PALs, those undergoing PAL training, or those doing PAL-like work in teacher education programs. If we consider how to support and add value to the practitioners and program implementers with translatable inquiry, we will have exceeded the work of those before us.

MARK URTEL, EDD, is the Chair for the Department of Kinesiology at Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis. Dr. Urtel received his doctorate in education from Indiana University and has been teaching physical education and physical activity for over 20 years. Dr. Urtel has spent over 12 summers helping out with and coordinating physical activity summer camps, eventually becoming camp director. Dr. Urtel's research interests include technology and physical activity, physical activity promotion among youth, and professional development and coaching education for fitness professionals.

References

Babic, M. J., Morgan, P. J., Plotnikoff, R. C., Lonsdale, C., White, R. L., & Lubans, D. R. (2014). Physical activity and physical self-concept in youth: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sports Medicine, 44*(11), 1589-1601.

Baker, B. (2012). How to write goals, objectives and outcomes that grant funders will love! Retrieved from: https://www.grantprofessionals.org/rc_files /27/How_to_Write_Goals_Objectives_and_Outcomes.

Beighle, A., Erwin, H., Castelli, D., & Ernst, M. (2009). Preparing physical educators for the role of physical activity director. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 80*(4), 24-29.

Boomer, G. (1982). *Negotiating the curriculum: A teacher-student partnership*. Sydney: Ashton Scholastic.

Brookover, W. B., & Lezotte, L. W. (1979). *Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement* (Occasional paper No. 17). East Lansing: Michigan State University, East Lansing Institute for Research in Teaching. ERIC document reproduction, 181 005.

Carlin, A., Murphy, M. H., & Gallagher, A. M. (2015). Current influences and approaches to promote future physical activity in 11-13 year olds: A focus group study. *BMC Public Health, 15*.

Carson, R. (2012). Certification and duties of a director of physical activity. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 83*(7), 16-29.

Chatzisarantis, N. L. D., Biddle, S. J. H., & Meek, G. A. (1997). A self-determination theory approach to the study of intentions and the intention-behavior relationship in children's physical activity. *British Journal of Health Psychology, 2*, 34-36.

Chen, S. & Gu, X. (2017). Toward active living: Comprehensive school physical activity program research and implications, *Quest,* 1-23.

Connell, J. P., & Wellborn, J. G. (1991). Competence, autonomy, and relatedness: A motivational analysis of self-system process. In M. R. Gunnar & L. A. Sroufe (Eds.), *Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology* (Vol. 22. pp. 43-77). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

De Bourdeaudhuij, I., Philippaerts, R., Crombez, G., Matton, L., Wijndaele, K., Balduck, A. L, & Lefevre, J. (2005). Stages of change for physical activity in a community sample of adolescents. *Health Education Research*, *20*, 357–366.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M., (1987). The support of autonomy and the control of behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*(6), 1024-1037.

Donham, J. (2008). *Enhancing teaching and learning: A leadership guide for school library media specialists*. New York, NY: Neal-Schulman.

Duncan, S. C. (1993). The role of cognitive appraisal and friendship provisions in adolescents' affect and motivation toward activity in physical education. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 64*, 314–323.

Graham, G. (1995). Physical education through the students' eyes and in students' voices: Implications for teachers and researchers. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 14*, 478-482.

Hastie, P. (2003). Chapter 5: Giving youth voice and choice: Strategies for empowerment, *Teaching for lifetime physical activity* (pp. 81-95). San Francisco, CA: Benjamin Cummings.

Heidorn, B. D., Hall, T. J., & Carson, R. L. (2010). Theory into practice: Comprehensive school-based physical activity program, *Strategies, 24(*2), 33-35.

Hills, A. P., Dengel, D. R., & Lubans, D. R. (2014). Supporting public health priorities: Recommendations for physical education and physical activity promotion in schools. *Progress in Cardiovascular Diseases, 57*(4), 368-374.

Holdsworth, R. (1998). Two challenges. *Connect, 110*, 15-17.

Lubans, D. R., Morgan, P. J., Cliff, D. P., Barnett, L. M., & Okely, A. D. (2010). Fundamental movement skills in children and adolescents. *Sports Medicine, 40*(12), 1019-1035.

Marks, H. M., (2000). Student engagement in instructional activity: Patterns in the elementary, middle, and high school years. *American Educational Research Journal, 37*(1), 153-184.

Mitra, D. (2004). The significance of students: Can increasing "student voice" in schools lead to gains in youth development? *Teachers College Record, 106*(4), 651-688.

NASPE (2008). A position statement from the National Association for Sport and Physical Education: Comprehensive school physical activity program. *Strategies: A Journal for Sport and Physical Educators, 21*(6), 29-22.

Pellegrini, A.D., Blatchford, P., Kato, K., Baines, E. (2004). A short-term longitudinal study of children's playground themes in primary school: Implications for adjustment to school and social adjustment in the USA and the UK. *Social Development*, *13*, 107–123.

Praisner, C. L. (2003). Attitudes of elementary school principals toward the inclusion of students with disabilities. *Exceptional Children, 69*(2), 135-145.

Prusak, K. A. (2000). The effect of choice on the motivation of adolescent females in physical education. *Dissertations Abstracts International, A61*, *2*, 484.

Rees, R., Kavanagh, J., Harden, A., Shepherd, J., Brunton, G., Oliver, S., & Oakley, A. (2006). Young people and physical activity: A systematic review matching their views to effective interventions. *Health Education Research, 21*(6), 806-825.

Rink, J. (2012). Making it happen. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 83*(7), 24-25.

Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*(1), 68-78.

Ryan, R. M., Stiller, J., & Lynch, J. H. (1994). Representations of relationships to teacher, parents, and friends as predictors of academic motivation and self-esteem. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 14*, 226-249.

Salvy, S. J., Roemmich, J. N., Bowker, J. C., Romero, N. D., Stadler, P. J., & Epstein, L. H. (2009). Effect of peers and friends on youth physical activity and motivation to be physically active. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, *34*(2), 217–225.

Urtel, M. & Vogel, N. (2011). K-12 physical education: The principal perspective. *National Teacher Education Journal, 4*(1), 5-14.

Vallerand, R. J. (1997). Toward a hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 29, pp. 271-360). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Visek, A. J., Achrati, S. M., Manning, H., McDonnell, K., Harris, B. S., & DiPietro, L. (2015). The fun integration theory: Towards sustaining children and adolescents sport participation. *Journal of Physical Activity & Health*, *12*(3), 424–433.