

INTERNSHIP REPORT:  
PROJECT DOUBLE CHALLENGE,  
MCGILL UNIVERSITY

CENTRE FOR NEWFOUNDLAND STUDIES

---

**TOTAL OF 10 PAGES ONLY  
MAY BE XEROXED**

(Without Author's Permission)

CATHERINE LAIR









Title Page

INTERNSHIP REPORT: PROJECT DOUBLE CHALLENGE, MCGILL UNIVERSITY

by

© Catherine Lair

A report submitted to the  
School of Graduate Studies  
in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree of  
Master of Physical Education  
Memorial University of Newfoundland  
February 2005

St. John's



Newfoundland

## Abstract

This report is the result of a four month internship, the main goal of which was to evaluate a component of the professional preparation program run by McGill University for physical education and kinesiology students. The component evaluated, Project Double Challenge (PDC), was an on-campus requirement of McGill's adapted physical activity course EDKP 396 in which university students worked with individuals with a disability. These individuals were adults who came from l'Atelier le Fil D'Ariane, a tapestry workshop, and children and teenagers who came from REACH and Chambly Academy. Another goal was to suggest improvements to PDC to make it more relevant for both McGill and REACH students. Three types of investigation were completed. The first was a review of literature plus a series of interviews with REACH teachers; the second was an ongoing investigation that consisted of follow-up interviews with McGill students; the third was the distribution of questionnaires to REACH teachers and McGill students. The results show that PDC is a well run program. Since improvement is always possible, some tools designed to enhance communication between REACH and McGill were created. A series of 20 recommendations that emerged from the different investigations, and my personal experience throughout the internship, are presented.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to give special thanks to Dr. Greg Reid of McGill University for the opportunities he gave me and his support throughout my internship. I would also like to thank the class of EDKP 396 of the 2004 winter semester, most particularly the six students who participated in the follow-up interviews. Thank-you to all the employees and students of REACH who were a great source of inspiration and support.

## Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iii
Table of Contents	iv
List of Appendices	vi
Chapter 1	1
1.1 Purpose of the internship	2
1.2 Project Double Challenge	2
1.3 History of Project Double Challenge	4
1.4 REACH	5
Chapter 2 Evaluation of Project Double Challenge	7
2.1 Introductory Investigation on Project Double Challenge	7
2.1.1 Professional Preparation Literature Review	7
2.1.2 Reason for Practicum	11
2.1.3 Project Double Challenge	11
2.1.4 Dr.Greg Reid's Interview	12
2.1.5 Mr.Yves Fournier's Interview	13
2.1.6 REACH Homeroom Teacher's Meetings	15
2.1.7 Chambly Academy Physical Education Teacher's Interview	16
2.2 Ongoing Investigation of Project Double Challenge	17
2.2.1 Experience as Teacher Assistant	17
2.2.2 Experience at REACH	19
2.2.3 Follow-up Interviews of Six McGill Students	20



2.2.3.1 Phenomenological approach	21
2.2.3.2 Interview questions	21
2.2.3.3 Interview answers: common themes	23
2.2.3.4 Limitations of the interviews	30
2.2.4.5 DVDs of the interviews and Wednesday in action	30
Chapter 3 Personal Contribution to Project Double Challenge	32
3.1 Student Information Sheet	32
3.2 Introductory Video	35
3.3 Equipment Review	36
3.4 Summary Report Card	37
3.5 McGill Personal Program	39
Chapter 4 Final Investigation of Project Double Challenge	41
4.1 Questionnaire for REACH Teachers	41
4.1.1 Questionnaire analysis	41
4.1.2 Recommendations from REACH teachers	44
4.2 Questionnaire for McGill Students	45
4.2.1 Students' questionnaire analysis	46
Chapter 5	52
5.1 Reflections	52
5.2 Recommendations for the future development of PDC	54
5.3 Conclusion	58
References	60
Appendices	64

## List of Appendices

A) REACH Educational Project	64
B) Reflections	67
C) Parents/Guardians Permission Letters to Videotape Five Students	69
D) REACH Student Information (old)	70
E) REACH Student Information (new)	73
F) Physical Education IEP	74
G) Parents/Guardians Permission Letters to Videotape All Students	80
H) Equipment Order for EDKP 396 winter 2004	81
I) Summary Report Card	82
J) Student Outline for the Summary Report Card	84
K) McGill Personal Program	85
L) Questionnaires for REACH Teachers	86
M) Questionnaires for McGill Students	88
O) Executive Summary	92
CD Interview Transcripts	

## Chapter 1

This report is the result of a four month internship that took place during the 2004 winter semester from January to the end of April. Throughout the semester, time was spent between McGill University in Montreal and REACH, a school in Saint-Lambert, for individuals with disabilities. The main goal of this internship was to evaluate a component of the professional preparation program run by McGill University for its physical education and kinesiology students. The component evaluated, Project Double Challenge (PDC), was an on-campus requirement of McGill's adapted physical activity course EDKP 396 in which university students worked with individuals with disabilities. The project is called Project Double Challenge because it is a challenge for both the student and the individuals with disabilities.

The first chapter of the report provides general information about the context of the internship, the purpose of the internship, PDC including its history, and information about REACH. The second chapter of the report includes an overview of the investigation on PDC including a short review of literature on professional preparation, followed by the results of interviews and meetings with the various people involved in PDC. This is followed by results of the ongoing investigations with the McGill students. Chapter three describes my contributions to the improvement of PDC. Chapter four presents the results from the questionnaires distributed to the McGill students and the REACH teachers. The conclusion of this report presents personal reflections and recommendations for the future development of PDC.

Since much of the content of this report is about the author's personal experiences during the internship, this report is written in the first person.

### *1.1 Purpose of the Internship*

The main goals of this internship were to evaluate and to suggest improvements to PDC to make it more relevant for both McGill students and REACH participants.

In order to have a clear picture of PDC, a direct participation and investigation of all aspects of PDC was necessary. Therefore, I assumed the role of a student by attending every lecture, I acted as a teacher assistant to understand the real experience and issues of McGill students, and I spent some time at REACH interacting with the students and staff either during their physical education classes or during special school activities.

I also acted as a liaison between the different persons involved in PDC including Dr. Greg Reid the instructor of EDKP 396 at McGill, Mr. Yves Fournier the physical educator of REACH, and the students from both REACH and McGill. I also engaged in an introductory, ongoing, and a final evaluation process with informal and formal interviews and direct observations, along with the development and delivery of questionnaires to McGill students and REACH teachers.

### *1.2 Project Double Challenge (PDC)*

Project Double Challenge is an on-campus practicum experience for second-year McGill undergraduate students in kinesiology, or physical education teaching or non teaching programs. PDC is a mandatory laboratory component of the compulsory course, Adapted Physical Activity 396 (EDKP 396). For the practicum, all McGill students

registered in that course work one-on-one with a child or an adult with an intellectual or pervasive developmental disability. However, when the number of McGill students is higher than the number of participants, pairs of students work together with the more challenging participants.

This year there was also one student assigned to help everyone with aquatic instructions when they were in the pool. This was a good idea since the student was very knowledgeable and enthusiastic and felt more comfortable in the water than other McGill students.

All participants came to the McGill Sports Complex on Wednesday mornings during the winter semester for nine two-hour, sessions. During these sessions the student-participant pair used a variety of facilities in the Sports Complex including; the gymnasium, gymnastics room, Field house, swimming pool, dance studio, wrestling room, fitness studios, and squash courts. In PDC, McGill students were referred to as "Coaches" and the REACH students and other participants were referred to as "Partners."

PDC uses a client-centered approach, and the program is individualized to meet the needs, interests and abilities of each participant. As requirements of PDC, the coaches performed a physical activity assessment, set four terminal performance objectives (TPO's) and taught and evaluated the progress of their partners. The primary purpose of PDC is to provide McGill students with the opportunity to interact with individuals with disabilities; dispel misconceptions about them and; hopefully, to develop positive attitudes toward working with them. This purpose is consistent with the main goal of a practicum experience as outlined by Sherrill and Buswell (1998), which is to facilitate the



development of positive, accepting, inclusive beliefs and attitudes. PDC also enables the coaches to apply the skills learned in class.

### *1.3 History of Project Double Challenge*

PDC began in 1978 with twelve adults from the Montreal Association for the Mentally Retarded. The original name was Project McGill, and the program consisted of a physical fitness program followed by skill development and swimming, ending with a final group game or dance and refreshments. In 1979, the project was renamed Project Double Challenge and some children from Peter Hall School in Montreal, as well as the adults, were involved. A total of 45 individuals participated. The numbers diminished to 40 by 1980 and then to 30 in 1981. The adult participants of 1981 came from L'Atelier Le Fil D'Ariane, and this group is still active in the project.

In 1978, a position paper published by the Adapted Programme Special Interest Group expressed the need for a compulsory Adapted Physical Activity course.(CAHPER, 1978) McGill University was one of the first universities to implement their recommendation. This meant that more students enrolled in the course and, therefore, the need for more participants with disabilities for PDC. For the past few years, the number of McGill students enrolled in the Adapted Physical Activity course has ranged from 55 to 85. The course is offered once a year during the winter semester. The first participation of students from REACH was in 1986 and, more recently in 2001, they were joined by students from Chambly Academy.

Since 1978, PDC has consistently progressed through the ongoing work of EDKP 396 instructor, Dr.Greg Reid.

#### *1.4 REACH*

The acronym REACH stands for Realistic Educational Alternatives for Children with Handicaps. The REACH school is located in Saint-Lambert and is a public Anglophone special school and part of the Riverside School Board. The clientele attending REACH are students with intellectual disabilities, learning disabilities or pervasive developmental disorders. Most older students began their schooling in regular schools which were later judged to be inadequate for them, while some students (ages four to six years) started directly at REACH in what is known as the “early stimulation group.”

The school population of 52 students is divided into six different classes. Each class has a special education teacher and one or two support personnel. Students are assigned a class according to their age and level of functioning. Two teachers, Yves Fournier and June Bastoss, teach physical education. The class known as the early stimulation group, and two classes with lower level of functioning, ages 7 to 21, participate in 30 minute physical education classes four times a week. The three other classes have physical education for two periods of 90 minutes each. Since REACH does not have a gymnasium, these groups use a city gymnasium which is a 10-minute walk from the school.

The McGill University’s Project Double Challenge is included in the highlights section of the REACH's educational project (See Appendix A). Mr. Fournier is an outdoor enthusiast and he takes students outdoors to pursue outdoor activities such as cross country skiing and snowshoeing. Some students at REACH also participate in the Défi Sportif, a sporting event for individuals with disabilities. PDC allows REACH's students

to interact with new people, try different activities, discover a new facility and get the personal attention and instruction they often need.

## Chapter 2 Evaluation of Project Double Challenge

The evaluation process occurred in three main phases; an introductory investigation, an ongoing investigation and a final investigation. The introductory investigation took place before the start of PDC in January. This first investigation was based on a literature review and meetings with different persons knowledgeable about PDC. The ongoing investigation consisted of four follow-up interviews with six McGill students, my personal observations as a teaching assistant in the program and my experience at REACH. The final phase of investigation took place following the last day of PDC, and used questionnaires given to REACH teachers and McGill students.

### *2.1 Introductory Investigation on Project Double Challenge*

Different sources of information were investigated during the introductory evaluation of PDC. I started the process with a literature review and by talking to individuals with past experience of PDC such as Dr.Reid and teachers from REACH, who were of great help. Therefore, semi-formal interviews were used as a first means of investigating PDC. Individual interviews were conducted at the beginning of the semester with Dr.Reid, each teacher of REACH, and the physical education teachers from Chambly Academic.

#### *2.1.1 Professional Preparation Literature Review*

According to the literature, professional preparation should involve an adapted physical education course and a field based experience (practicum) with the future clientele (Churton, 1986; Connolly, 1994; Hodge, Tannehill & Kludge, 2003).

The practicum should be well structured and supervised by an instructor with an adapted physical education background (Churton, 1986; Hodge, Tannehill & Kludge, 2003). A mix of physical and social activities should be part of the practicum (Connolly, 1994). Connolly stated that a practicum must "be a realistic but not altogether discouraging preview of what lies ahead" (p.323). Similarly, Hodge et al. (2003) recommended that the practicum should be success-oriented. A self-reflection process, in the form of journal writing, where a student questions their personal conduct should be part of the practicum (Connolly, 1994; Hodge et al, 2003).

Many formats of practicum for adapted physical education are reported in the literature, with researchers trying to find which type of hands-on experience has the most positive effect on the attitude of students towards working with individuals with disabilities. One of the major questions raised in the literature is the optimum location of the practicum. Which is the better experience, the on-campus or the off-campus practicum? There is two main distinctions between the on-campus and off-campus practicum. The first distinction is the location. For the on-campus practicum the participant with disabilities would meet with the university student at the university. For the off-campus practicum the university student would be the one who travels to meet with the student with disabilities at a location outside of the university, their school for example. The second distinction concern the structure of the program. The on-campus practicum would be organized and supervised by the university instructor. The off-campus practicum requires that the university student integrate a program already in place, without the direct supervision of the university instructor.



Research has demonstrated that both the off-campus and the on-campus practicum positively affect the attitude of future physical educators. Some research demonstrates that, the on-campus location is more favorable to a positive attitude change than the off-campus practicum (Hodge & Jansma, 1999). In a more recent study, Hodge, Davis, Woodland and Sherrill (2002) concluded that there is no significant difference in attitude change between an on-campus and an off-campus practicum.

The on-campus practicum has advantages for the instructor; more control over the selection of participants, the activities taught, the use of equipment and facilities, more control over student's progress, and a smaller ratio of participants to students. Another important point is that students are directly in charge of an individual or a small group rather than just observing. Therefore, the students are fully involved and it is easier to evaluate them. One argument against an on-campus practicum is the fact that it does not reflect the "real-world" setting (Hodge & Jansma, 1999) since the participant with disabilities is not in an inclusive setting.

Research also analyzes factors that could possibly influence the attitudes and the perceived competence of students. Among these factors, are teacher and future teacher related variables such as gender, age, perceived competence and past experience. Teachers and future teachers have a positive attitude if they perceived themselves as being competent, (Rizzo & Vispoel, 1991; Block & Rizzo, 1995; Rizzo & Kirkendall, 1995; Hodge et al, 2002), if they have more academic preparation (Block & Rizzo, 1995; Rizzo & Kirkendall, 1995; Conatser, Block & Lepore, 2000) and if they have experience with individuals with disabilities (Kowalski & Rizzo 1996; Folsom-Meek et al, 1999).

Hands-on experience enables the students to perceive themselves as being more competent (Connolly, 1994; Hodge et al, 2002; Hodge et al, 2003).

In most studies, the teachers' gender does not appear to be a significant variable for predicting favorable attitudes toward teaching individuals with disabilities (Rowe & Stutts, 1987; Hodge & Jansma, 1999). However, one study by Folsom-Meek, Nearing and Groteluschen (1999) find that females had a more positive attitude than males. Another study by Hodge (1998) suggests that females with previous experience with individuals with disabilities had the most positive attitudes. Hodge and Jansma (1999) demonstrated that students who had previous experience with individuals with disabilities had more positive attitudes toward teaching students with disabilities than those with no prior experience.

A study by Rizzo and Vispoel (1991) suggested that younger teachers have more favorable attitudes toward teaching individuals with disabilities. Other research indicated that undergraduate students in their final year have a better attitude than first year students, probably because they have more experience and academic background (Rizzo & Kirkendall, 1995).

Other variables studied concern the individuals with disabilities, such as the severity of their disabilities and their age. Physical education teachers have a more favorable attitude to students presenting mild disabilities (Block & Rizzo, 1995; Rizzo & Kirkendall, 1995; Kowalski & Rizzo, 1996) and with younger students (Kowalski & Rizzo, 1996).

### *2.1.2 Reason for Practicum*

A practicum experience can fulfill many goals. During the experience, students can apply the theory learned in class and improve their teaching skills. By playing an active role in their learning process, they can also increase their motivation (Sherrill, 1988). Direct contact practicum experiences with a person with disabilities has also been demonstrated to be a good way to positively influence the attitude of future physical education teachers towards teaching such individuals (Rowe & Stutts, 1987; Hodge & Jasma, 1999) if the interactions are frequent, pleasant and meaningful (Hodge, Tannehill & Kludge, 2003). One practicum by Hodge, Davis, Woodard and Sherrill (2002) did not conclude that there was a significant improvement in the attitude of students after a practicum. This could be due to the fact that the practicum instructor had a different philosophy which did not focus on attitude change but more on the disabilities, laws, activities modifications, assessments, and program development. Another explanation could be that the test used in this study (Physical Educator's Attitude Toward Teaching Individuals with Disabilities III (PEATID-III)) was not appropriate because it is a test made to evaluate the attitude of teachers in an inclusive setting which was not the practicum setting. The reason why some students kept their negative attitude could be fear, the lack of experience, and uncertainty (Rowe & Stutts, 1987).

### *2.1.3 Project Double Challenge*

According to the literature the professional preparation for future physical educators offered by McGill University is on the right track. The adapted physical activity course includes a practicum (PDC) with self-reflection (See Appendix B). One of the

drawbacks of PDC is that it is not conducted in an inclusive setting such as the actual school system. However, the one-on-one experience increases the comfort level of the coaches and is a great first experience. The fact that PDC is not done in an inclusive setting does not diminish the challenge of it because some of the students from REACH are probably more challenging than a child who could function in a regular school. The one-on-one situation is a good progressive learning experience which should lead to the ability to teach more than one student at the time as you gain experience.

By definition, adapted physical activity involves adaptation; therefore there is no direct solution to a problem "if then... answer" solution. Throughout PDC the coaches have to use problem solving to adapt activities and teaching progressions to the needs and abilities of their partners.

The reflections are a good medium to think critically about best practice, to identify moral, social, and ethical issues, to address problems and to reflect on attitudinal and behavioral aspects of working with people with disabilities (Hodge et al, 2003). In their problem solving process, the coaches sharpen their critical thinking skills and increase their self confidence in decision making. The coaches are independent learners; they learn to think for themselves.

#### *2.1.4 Dr.Gregory Reid's interview*

Dr.Reid is the EDKP 396 instructor and he is working on the improvement of PDC since 1978. From the interview with Dr.Reid two main concerns regarding EDKP 396 and more particularly PDC were generated. The first issue was about the effectiveness of communication between the people involved in PDC at McGill

University and at REACH. The second issue was the doubt that the practicum experience is starting too soon into the semester, which gives a very short period of time to prepare the McGill students. This last issue can be debated for a long time. However, the best ways to find out what would be the best professional preparation would be to try different approaches and then compare them. For instance, the course could be spread over two semesters with one hour of lecture per week each semester and PDC during the second semester. In that case the credits of the course would have to be divided between each semester: one and a half and one and a half credits or one and two credits. According to Dr.Reid this approach is theoretically possible but the University does not like that type of model. Investigation of measures involved in the improvement of communication will be discussed later in this report.

#### *2.1.5 Mr.Yves Fournier's Interview*

Mr.Fournier is the physical education teacher at REACH. He believes that REACH's students are very fortunate to have the opportunities to participate in PDC. The students benefit greatly from the one-on-one instruction, the personalized program, the social interaction, and the different facilities used such as the pool. It also gives them more choices of activities and opportunities to experience new sports. Mr.Fournier observed that the students' level of attention, motivation and participation is higher at McGill than during his physical education classes.

From the meeting with Mr.Fournier special recommendations were addressed. His major concern about PDC was about the safety of his students; he would like to see the safety in the gymnastic room increased. He would also like to be informed of the terminal



performance objectives(TPO's) chosen by coaches for all REACH students, to verify if they are appropriate. He believes that a component of the lesson should include knowledge based activities for the more fonctionning students, and that the students participating in Le Défi Sportif a sport event for individuals with disabilities in Montreal should have some specific training to prepare them to compete in their events. He also believes that the lesson should not only include basic physical skills but also some concept of cooperation, opposition and expression.

Finally, since the school does not have easy access to a swimming pool, he would like to see all students have the same opportunities for swimming instruction. When asked about the McGill summary report from the coaches, Mr.Fournier mentioned that he did not read them because they are too lengthy and not always relevant.

Mr.Fournier recommendations were all taken into consideration. The gymnastics room was organized with the safety equipment needed every Wednesday morning before the beginning of the session by one of the teacher assistants. However, throughout the session the coaches often moved the apparatus, creating an unsafe zone and potential danger. This problem will be addressed in the final recommendations at the end of this report. At week five in PDC, I gave Mr.Fournier the corrected TPO's that I had gathered from the other teacher assistants. Since Dr.Reid wanted the McGill students to judge for themselves if their TPO's were suitable for their partner, Mr.Fournier's input was not required. After discussion Mr.Fournier mentioned that he also wanted to get the TPO's to follow his students progress during the Wednesday sessions but he only received the TPO's halfway into the semester. However, it would have been difficult to give them sooner because the McGill students have to assess their partner, construct the TPO's and

pass it to their teaching assistant. The teacher assistants then have to meet with the students and make recommendations, if necessary, and finally the students have to correct them.

Mr.Fournier's recommendation to add a knowledge based component into the lesson was discussed in class by Dr.Reid. Some descriptive examples were given to the students to explain that specific suggestion. Dr.Reid also mentioned that whenever possible all participants should have some swimming instruction. The coaches were notified in the student's information sheet if their partner would be participating in Le Défi Sportif and if so in what events. The student information sheet also included individualized program suggestions such as; team concept, swimming, basic skills.

#### *2.1.6 REACH Homeroom Teacher's Meetings*

The individual meeting with the six homeroom teachers had two distinct purposes. The first was to introduce myself and explain the nature of my practicum. Then I questioned them about their impression of PDC. I concluded the meetings by informing them that I was available anytime if they had any concerns or new ideas for PDC. The teachers were very enthusiastic about my practicum. They were also very positive about PDC. Here are some of their statements: "Good program because most of them need one-on-one work", "Great, put people together", "The teams bond immediately, friendly", "Kids love it, it is beneficial for both sides", "Kids learn new skills e.g. racquetball", "Kid receive individual attention".

When I questioned them on the summary reports sent by McGill students at the end of PDC, I realized that only one teacher read the report. The others told me that they

did not read it or only read it partially. I was also informed that some of the past summary reports were sometimes inappropriate because the information was not always accurate. Therefore, it was not possible to send them to the parents or caregivers.

During the meetings, the teachers made recommendations in regard to the ways McGill students should interact with REACH students e.g. "don't let the kids get away with stuff", "always use the same verbal commands", "be careful, some students are reluctant to change". Two teachers mentioned that coaches should give more swimming instruction and less free time in the pool. Finally, the head teacher Ms.Shacter believed that McGill should pay for half of the transportation cost from Saint-Lambert to McGill Sports Complex which represents \$242.00 per week.

These meetings with REACH's teachers indicated that the PDC was much appreciated by both the REACH students and their teachers. The summary report appears to be an ineffective mode of communication in its present form. The need to create a more concise report that would communicate only the relevant information to the teacher and to the parents or caregivers seemed obvious. Finally, after a discussion with Dr.Reid about sharing the cost of the transportation, we concluded that it was only a misunderstanding from both parties. McGill always paid for half of the transportation cost but a few years ago REACH stopped sending the bills so Dr.Reid thought that they had decided to pay the full amount. This was surprising and very good news for Ms.Shacter.

#### *2.1.7 Chambly Academy Physical Education Teacher's Interview*

Chambly Academy is an Anglophone junior high and high school, and part of the Riverside school Board. The students with intellectual and physical disabilities are

included in mainstream physical education classes with the other students. I briefly meet with one of the three physical educators of Chambly Academy: they were unaware of the participation of some of their students in PDC.

After discussion, one of them told me that he finds it difficult to include the students with disabilities in activities. The two main reasons were the large group size and the limited gym space. He also told me that it was easier to include them when individual activities such as dance were organized. I asked him what they would be working on during the next few months and was told that it would be volleyball and track and field. I then made the suggestion to the McGill coaches who had partners attending Chambly Academy to work on these skills so as to make the Chambly student's participation in their physical education class easier.

## *2.2 Ongoing Investigation on PDC*

The progressive investigation consisted of the observations and the insight gained during my experience as a teacher assistant at McGill, my involvement at REACH and the follow-up interviews of six McGill students.

### *2.2.1 Experience as Teacher Assistant*

At McGill I was one of three teacher assistants for EDKP 396 courses. The first task was to read a few student reports from the previous year to become more familiar with PDC. The reading of these reports gave me a general understanding of the challenges faced by students during their project. Another task was to assist Dr.Reid in the pairing of coaches and partners. During this process several things had to be taken

into consideration: the language spoken, the gender, the age of the partner, the experience of the coaches, the program of the coaches, and coaches and partner preferences. This pairing task was very complex work, but it was worthwhile to take the time to create pairs that seemed most appropriate.

The Kinesiology students had priority to work with an adult if they wanted, because the Kinesiology program is more a fitness program and also a non-teaching program. It is important to mention that most of the adults were French speaking only, so the unilingual Anglophones did not have the same opportunities. The issue of the relevancy of PDC for the Kinesiology students was raised many times by some of the coaches during the semester because the structure of PDC used a teaching approach. Moreover, next year the Kinesiology program will have a science prerequisite and will become more oriented toward the science of movement than fitness. As a result the relevancy of PDC for the new Kinesiology students will have to be re-evaluated.

The main responsibilities of the teacher assistants were to follow a group of McGill students throughout their practicum experience. I met with them on two formal occasions; the first meeting was to rectify TPO's set for their partner and the second meeting was to discuss and adjust their task sequences if necessary. Throughout the semester, I supported them during the Wednesday session and helped them as needed. I was also available to any McGill student who had questions or concerns about REACH students. My last duty as a teacher assistant was to evaluate the final report of the seventeen students for whom I was responsible.

During evaluation of their final report, I realized that some students followed very closely the report from last year and did not use this year's guidelines enough. Therefore,



their report included the same mistakes as last year's students. I also found that they were not critical about last year's report even after the shortcoming of these reports had been pointed out. After talking with Dr.Reid and the other teaching assistants about this a decision was taken that the students would only keep the report on the participant from the previous year for the two first weeks of the semester. The cover pages of the reports will indicate that photocopies are prohibited.

The student's reflections included in their final reports gave me insight into their personal experiences, challenges and successes. This information provided me with new ideas on how to improve PDC. It also reinforced the relevancy of the modification that I proposed during the semester as well as the ones I thought about recommending for the future. These recommendations are discussed at the end of this report.

### *2.2.2 Experience at REACH*

In order to gain as much as possible from the time spent in REACH, I participated in different activities like bi-weekly ice skating at the local skating rink, French classes and a three day winter camp in Val-David. Prior to the camp, I helped students with the preparation of the cooking of the food.

The time spent at REACH interacting with the students gave me opportunities to know them a little and to create a relationship with them. Therefore, it helped me to assist the coaches who had partners from REACH. My presence at REACH also gave me a real experience where I learned something about the adapted education milieu. I learned specific ways to interact with REACH students and also many behavioral techniques that I shared with McGill students during our weekly meetings.

### *2.2.3 Follow-up Interviews of Six McGill Students*

The purpose of the interviews was to gain a general understanding of the McGill student's personal experiences throughout PDC. The interviews were one of the tools used to "take the pulse" of PDC through the eyes of coaches. Six volunteer coaches were interviewed. The group consisted of three students enrolled in the physical education program and three enrolled in the kinesiology program. Halfway through PDC practicum one coaches made a change of program from kinesiology to physical education, a change that she made because of her positive experience with PDC. All coaches were in the second year of their program. Their partners all attend REACH school, range in age from 5 to 14 and have different levels of functioning. Only one partner was verbal, two of them had limited verbal skills and two were non-verbal.

The interviews took place at four different times: prior to the first meeting with their partner; just after the first meeting; halfway through the experience; and after the last Wednesday meeting. The interview questions were constructed throughout the semester with the participants' answers from past interviews, with different cues from partners and teachers, personal observations during the Wednesday experience as well as with coaches' questions during the Monday and Friday lectures. A phenomenological approach was utilized during this interviewing process. The goals of the interview were to gain a feel for their lived experience, to gain coaches' input and to identify issues in order to improve PDC.

### *2.2.3.1 Phenomenological approach.*

"Phenomenology refers to the description of one or more individuals' consciousness and experience of a phenomenon... the purpose of phenomenological research is to obtain a view into your research participants' life-worlds and to understand their personal meanings (what it means to them) constructed from their life experience." (Johnson & Christensen, 2000, p.315). This approach was used in a non-research context.

### *2.2.3.2 Interview questions.*

#### *Prior to the first meeting*

1. Are you looking forward to your first meeting with your student? (partner)
2. What did you do to get ready for it?
3. Are you nervous about it?
4. What do you think this project will bring to you?

During the first classes some coaches seemed very nervous about their first encounter with their partner and that is why I wanted to know how the interview participants felt about it. I also wanted to know how they prepared themselves and what they believed they would gain from their participation in PDC.

#### *After the first meeting with the partner*

1. Was the first meeting as you expected?
2. Did you find that your preparation was useful and sufficient?
3. What worked well during your first session?
4. Did you feel comfortable with your student?
5. What are you going to modify or repeat next week?

This second interview was to gain their first impression about the meeting with their partner. I wanted to know if their first session was more or less what they expected. I also wanted to engage them in a self-evaluation process of this first encounter. I wanted to know if they were ready, well prepared and comfortable with their partner. Finally, based on these answers, I wanted to know what they would modify or repeat for the next week. The question about the comfort level came to my mind when I observed that some coaches did not look comfortable with their partner's appearance or behavior. I also observed that some coaches were not even talking to their partner or were speaking very loudly.

#### *Halfway through the experience*

1. What could EDKP 396 do to prepare you more effectively?
2. How are you feeling about this experience so far? Are you comfortable? Can you see where this project is going?
3. What have you learned so far? Are there specific techniques you learned while you were working with your partner?
4. Describe your best or worst moment? What was rewarding?

I was wondering what they thought about the Monday and Wednesday lectures and if they had any suggestions to improve these. The other questions were more to get a feel for their experience at this point and make a comparison with the beginning of their PDC experience. I was also trying to find out what was most challenging for them and trying to make them think about something that could help them.

*.After the last Wednesday*

1 Intro: On the first interview I asked you what you thought this project would bring you and you answered:... (here I repeat to each participant the answer that they gave me during the first interview, then I asked the question).

Question: I would like to know if this is what you really gained from this experience?

2 Did you learn anything personal about yourself?

3 Overall, did you enjoy this experience?

The last interview had two purposes; the first was to see if they gained what they thought they would. The second was to gain an overview of their learning experience and see if this was a positive experience for them.

#### *2.2.3.3 Interview answers: common themes.*

*Prior to the first meeting with their partner (First interviews were two days before the first meeting with partner)*

**Participant's preparation:** Four participants mentioned that they read last year's report about their student, one of them also read the class notes and another one mentioned that he "carefully studied all the things that we went over in class". Besides the reading preparation, a group bought stickers as rewards for their partner and decided to come early for the first meeting. Another stated that he "done some thinking about it". From these short answers it is possible to see that their preparation for the first meeting with their partner was not very extensive. Perhaps some reading suggestions concerning their partner's disabilities could be a useful addition to their preparation. To save time and money, books and articles about all disabilities present in the group participating in PDC could be placed on reserve at the education library.

**Participant's nervousness:** The coaches interviewed seemed nervous for two main reasons. The first was the fact that this was a new experience for some of them and also because they perceived the experience as being challenging. Here are some examples of comments in various categories.

**New experience:** "First experience teaching", "first experience with student with disabilities", "I haven't done anything like this before", "don't know the kid", "little nervous, going there blind."

**Challenging:** "Nervous because from reading the report it seems that she is not going to be wanting a part", "very anxious because I think that I might want to work with these types of children", "don't know how well I'd be with the kid", "one on one it's gonna require a lot of patience, a lot of energy"

**Participant's future gains:** They all believed that they would gain something positive from PDC; personal development and professional knowledge. In the last interview the same question was asked to see if they really gained everything they believed they would. Here are some comments from the participants regarding this question.

**Personal development:** "Make me a better person", "give me an appreciation and respect for people regardless of where they might differ on the outside, on their exterior appearance", "personal kind of not satisfaction but just like a good feeling"

**Professional knowledge:** "Help me on my future stages and as well as my career", "different perspectives of teaching kids", "how to teach how to present the materials", "hands on project", "learning at first hand", "have some training to present the materials", "to help that specific population."

**Miscellaneous:** "Amazing project", "amazing experience."

Comments on REACH students short video: "Video was pretty cool", "looking at the video today was also a nice tune."

*After the first meeting*

**Participants' expectations:** After their first meeting with their partner four participants realized that it was going to be harder than they had imagined. "More than what I expected, it was very challenging", "I didn't think her attention span was gonna be that short, "we felt hopeless", "expected to be a lot better", "hopefully be able to establish a friendly relationship with him, that was my own expectation (did not happen)."

On the other hand one participant had a better experience than expected: "Never say how he grabbed me as soon as we got into the pool, has he trusted me, that good feeling there". The last participant's expectations was as perceived: "As I expected I was really nervous"

**Evaluation of preparation:** The participant's answers on preparation showed that they all had lesson plans but for different reasons they did not follow them. Some lesson plans were inappropriate for their partners' abilities or behaviors. It could also be due to the fact that during the first meeting the coaches did not really know how to act with their partners. It seemed that they wanted to get to know them slowly. They tried to communicate and to find out what their partner liked but mostly I believe they were only making sure that the first session would run smoothly. Therefore, some partners were taking the lead during the session. That's why I believe some of the participants mentioned that: "We didn't do anything that we had planned", "just did informal (assessment)", "he gave me very few chances to assess him", "we pretty much didn't do anything in my lesson plan", "it changed all when we where there, because, depending on

what he will do or depending on what was available", "we were really scared to be stern (scared of her reaction)."

**Challenges of the first meeting:** Communication appeared to be the biggest challenge. In REACH approximately thirty five percent of the students are non-verbal and fourteen percent have limited verbal skills. From the group selected to participate in these interviews, there were four non- verbal partners out of five. So this group was not representative of the population participating in PDC and this must be taken into consideration when looking at the interview answers. The participant's comments are as follows: "Communication is kind a hard", "not responsive", "not very expressive", "more like Project Quadruple Challenge, this is so hard", "It was more challenging, I found that her attention span is very short", "you really have to be specific in what you want the kid to do"

**Level of comfort with the partner:** Even if each participant had different levels of experience with children in general and with persons with disabilities, it was surprising to see that they all felt pretty comfortable with their partner. Here are some of their statements: "I'm a very very huggy kind of person, so I was happy that he felt comfortable to hug me", "feel comfortable", "she cute", "good first relationship." One participant had mixed feelings about it: "Comfortable with some aspects of him but some aspects were not comfortable because he tends to be belligerent and contrary." Finally, one female participant experienced a situation in the changing room when she became uncomfortable because she did not know what to do as she did not know if she should change in a changing room full of children.



**Other comments:** "The teachers were always around (to help)", "have to be excited about everything we do", "Her shadow K. was so supportive"

**Modifications for next week:** The answers of the participants to this question did not go the way I had expected. They told me very specific things that they were going to do.

"Focus on keeping her attention with me", "next time I think I want to vary it up a bit, do more sports, get him in the pool", "To build on the plan that we saw the TPO's that he did last year and anything with him being in the pool." I was looking for a self-evaluation of their interaction with their partner. I was not looking for information on their schedule or activities planned for next week. Sort of like: "The first session I did that but it did not work so this week I'm going to try... "

*Halfway through the experience*

**Course content:** It seem evident that the students are very satisfied with the lectures:

"Course is pretty much on the cutting edge of understanding what we are trying to understand", "nothing can be better", "Dr.Reid is such a good teacher and any question...he can address it right away... he gives us a specific example, personal experience so it becomes real for us.", "Interesting class", "no better way that the class can be taught". Opinions were mixed on the possibility of transferring the theory learned in class during the Wednesday experience: "I find a lot of things you learn in class you can apply it", "hard to take what we learned in class and to apply it." These different opinions could probably be explained by the fact that the participants had partners with very different levels of functioning. One participant suggested that the course could: "Maybe more hands on activities, maybe learn about different disabilities and know how to approach them". She also mentioned that she did not find that there was a lot of info in

the textbook about different disabilities. Two participants thought that the best experience was on the Wednesdays: "I've learned more with her than in the lectures." One mentioned that it is because you get instant feedback and also because you learn by trial and error.

**Participant's feelings about experience:** All participants were positive about PDC:

"Feel positive about it... become handy later... important learning experience... valuable... much bigger than I expected", "great experience", "really enjoy it", "she's warming up to me more... get more things done". One group felt good about their experience because their partner was easier than mentioned in the previous year's report. They did not know why but thought that it was probably because she had matured or maybe that they had made the difference. One participant even stated that she changed her program from kinesiology to physical education because of her experience in PDC as the project made her realize what she really wanted: "I like teaching him and I like being with him... love to see him get excited."

**Participant's learning:** Since each participant has different experiences, they all learned different teaching styles and behavioral approaches. However, they all believed that patience was a must: "Takes a lot of patience, takes a lot of energy", "need a lot of patience", "a lot slower, the movement, the progress than I have anticipated, so it takes a lot more patience." Another interesting aspect discussed was the need for creativity because the activities have to be fun: "you have to hide what you're trying to teach."

*After the last Wednesday (Final thoughts week nine)*

**Participant's gain from experience:** These last interviews began with an introduction where I repeated what they had stated in the first interview about what they believed they would gain from this experience. Three agreed that they gained everything they believed

they would and that they even gained a lot more. Some additional learning was: "A way to teach these types of people", "no matter how much you plan something, things will go wrong", "a sense of the human experience", "talk less but show the movement a lot more." One participant believed that he would only realize how much he had learned and experienced in two or three years. Two participants also learned that they should not take some situations too personally; for example when their partner has a tantrum they should realize that maybe they have nothing to do with that. Only one participant mentioned that she did not gain what she thought she would. For instance, she did not believe that her participation in PDC made her a better person.

**Personal learning:** Patience and firmness are the two common words emerging from the interviews. Some participants realized that they are very patient, others realized the opposite. "I learned that actually I have a lot of patience, I accept a lot of behaviors that are outside of really what I would like", "I learned that, I use to think that I was that super patient type of person and I learned that my patience can go over the limit", "I thought that I had more patience than I did", "I was really hard on myself... it takes a lot of in order to work with these type of children... patience". Participants also realized that besides patience they needed a lot of firmness: "learn that you have to be firm to get things done your way", "I'm going to have to become more firm with my students."

**Overall experience:** Out of six participants in these interviews only one participant had an overall negative experience. As she stated: "At the beginning I was excited... near the end S. started kind of not liking me... stepping away from me... I was having a hard time... enjoying the experience" "Didn't click with me at the end." Here are some of the positive statements from the other participants: "Good experience better than just the text

book, we are lucky", "I enjoy hugely", "I had a really good time", "always, felt like we were making progress and that felt good", "definitely enjoy the experience... nine weeks it's not long"

As the weeks went on the need for the participants to share their experiences with me seemed to increase. Sometimes they run off track and forget the questions they were asked. It was very interesting to follow the progression of their experiences and to see their relationship with their partner evolve over time, either becoming stronger or disintegrating as the weeks went by. Their insight about their experiences made me realize the benefits of the practicum in their learning paths.

#### *2.2.3.4 Limitations of the interview.*

Since the participants were selected on a voluntary basis this could imply that they had a positive attitude about this experience. It could also mean that they were motivated, as they liked to help and be involved. The context of the interviews was not very consistent; they were done in different locations where I could find a quiet space. Moreover, the students always seemed in a hurry to get to a class or to a team project meeting.

A compact disk with the interview transcripts is available at the back of this internship report.

#### *2.2.4.5 DVDs of the interview and Wednesday action.*

The DVDs include the four interviews with each participant with the addition of short clips about their experiences. The short clips include the first meeting with their partner in Thomson Hall, the introduction of each partner either by the coach or by the

partner, some short clips of their actions in the gymnasium or swimming pool and the last day of PDC in Thomson Hall. A written authorization was gained to film the five REACH students (See Appendix C). The use of two DVD disks was necessary because the software "iMovie" (Macintosh) could process only 90 minutes of film per disk. On the first disk there are six video chapters: Project Double Challenge, Two Days Before First Meeting, Project Double Challenge start in five minutes, including a clip where the coaches introduce their partners, First Impression January the 23<sup>rd</sup> week one, Aquatic Experience, Halfway Through February 20<sup>th</sup> week 5. Chapter six includes a section where the partners are in actions: Dry Land Experience. The second disk included the last two chapters, Final Thoughts Week nine and Nearing the End. This DVD was made for the evaluation committee and is not included in the report for the general public.

## Chapter 3 Personal Contribution to Project Double Challenge

The introductory and progressive investigation gave me some insights about what could be improved in PDC. As a result, some tools were created and some actions taken throughout the Winter semester 2004.

Before the beginning of PDC the Student Information sheet was modified and the information on each student was verified with REACH homeroom teachers. An introductory video of REACH students was created and presented to the McGill students prior to their first meeting with their partners. During PDC I spend some time gathering equipment, reviewing what was available, and making a list of equipment needs for next year. I also did a short presentation on adapted equipment and equipment choice. Halfway through the semester a Summary Report Card was created to replace the present summary. These new tools and their application were then evaluated and modified for future years.

Following the final investigation of PDC a McGill Personal Program sheet was created to try out next year.

### *3.1 Students Information Sheet*

In the introductory meeting with Dr.Reid the need to increase interaction between the REACH physical education program and PDC was mentioned, as well as the need to ensure that both the McGill and REACH benefit from participation in PDC. The Student Information Sheet for the coaches was the first communication tool used to fulfill these needs.

The format of the Student Information Sheet was modified and some information was added. In past McGill students had received information about all students attending REACH prior to their first meeting with their partners. The student information was given on two separate sheets of paper (See Appendix D) and included student name, date of birth, gender and an alert/comments section. At the beginning this last section alert/comments included only very important information about what to be aware of. However, over the year this section expanded to include more information such as; diagnosis, toilet training information, communication skills, interest or abilities, special behavior problems, and other teacher comments.

This mode of information was problematic in two ways. Firstly, the section on alert/comments was confusing because of its broad nature. Secondly, this confidential information was shared with the entire class. I believe it is more professional to give the McGill students only the information concerning their partner rather than the information on all students. As a result another Student Information Sheet was created (See Appendix E). This one still included the same general information such as the name, date of birth and student's gender. However, the information in the Alert/Comments section was structured under different themes as follows: diagnosis/alert, communication, toilet-trained, behavioral and physical skills.

Two other aspects were added to meet the request made by Mr.Fournier. These were (a) program suggestions, and (b) the student's participation in the Défi Sportif. When the Student Information Sheets were ready I met with each teacher to ensure that the information was correct and also to add other pertinent information if necessary. The Information Sheet on their partner was given to the coaches prior to the first partner

meeting. A copy of the Physical Education Individual Educational Plan (IEP) was also given to the McGill students working with the younger students. The IEP gave information about the child's competency in mobility, physical activity, locomotion, manipulation, cooperation, opposition, expression, health and wellbeing, and attitude in class (See Appendix F).

The content of the new Information Sheet is more organized and the additional section containing the program suggestions creates a connection between the physical education program at REACH and what is being done at McGill. In order to perform a basic evaluation of the program suggestion section, a comparison between partner TPOs and the Défi Sportif section of the program suggestion was done. This comparison gave an indication of whether or not the coaches followed the program recommendations suggested by Mr. Fournier for the 23 students participating in Défi sportif. The suggested activities were: swimming, floor hockey, running, soccer, volleyball, long jump, standing broad jump and shot put. The swimming activity suggestion were the most followed where five partners out of seven had a swimming TPO. The running activity was followed with nine out of 13 partners, and floor hockey with 10 out of 15. Out of the 24 that had suggested soccer only eight partners had a soccer TPO. The most left out activity was volleyball with only one out of 11. Some activities suggested were included in the students TPO's. Other activities like shot put (four partners); long jump (five partners) and standing broad jump (three partners) were not included at all. The Shot put, the standing broad jump and the long jump were three physical activities that were harder to implement, due to the unavailability of facilities and equipment or the lack of technical knowledge by the coaches. The coaches might also have forgotten about the suggestion or



simply decided not to follow them because these activities were not really appropriate. Dr.Reid discussed many times in lectures that the activities chosen should be transferable into their partner's life. For example, it is unlikely that their partner will go on a Saturday to a park and do shot put with his/her friends. The inclusion of the swimming suggestion in the TPO could only be due to the fact that Dr.Reid mentioned that all students if possible should be involved in an aquatic learning experience.

These comparisons between the activities suggested and the activities chosen for TPO's only give a brief overview of whether or not Mr.Fournier's suggestions were used. Some coaches mentioned that even if the activities suggested were not in one of their four TPO's they included the activities in their lesson plan. A more complete investigation will have to be performed to determine if the coaches followed Mr.Fournier's recommendations.

### *3.2 Introductory Video*

During the first lecture of the semester every time Dr.Reid talked about PDC it was easy to feel the level of anxiety rising in the audience. The questions directed by the McGill students to myself and to Dr.Reid made me realize that most of them were not familiar with or had no experience interacting with individuals with disabilities. They also seemed pretty nervous about their first meeting with their partner. In order to try to decrease their level of anxiety and to give them a face to look for on the first day an introductory video of the REACH students was created.

The first step was to write a letter to gain permission from parents/caregivers to film the students (See Appendix G). Thirty six students were allowed to participate in the

video. Since Mr.Fournier also teaches the French class he suggested that the students who could speak introduce themselves in French. In their introduction they had to state their name and two activities they liked to practice, for example, "Bonjour mon nom est Catherine, j'aime la natation et le ski alpin". The non-verbal students were introduced by Mr.Fournier. Following their introduction each student performed a physical task such as; jumping on a trampoline, passing and dribbling a basketball, skipping or dancing. The last few minutes was a demonstration by two female students dancing the swing with Mr.Fournier. The 21 minute video was presented at the end of a lecture, two days before the beginning of PDC and the first meeting with the partner.

### *3.3 Equipment Review*

Mr.Fournier used some adapted equipment that is very good for students with limited physical abilities. In January, Mr.Fournier showed me some equipment that he believed McGill should have for PDC. During the first session of PDC I observed that the coaches mostly used sports equipment designed for adult interests and abilities, for example a man size official weight basketball used for a 5 year old. This type of equipment is not attractive and is surely of inappropriate size and weight for a child even more so for a child with disabilities.

I met with Mr.Stéphane Leblanc, the "equipment man", to discuss the availability of equipment adapted for children; he showed me different equipment that could be used during PDC. I gathered some equipment and did a brief presentation on equipment choices and showed the coaches what was available at McGill. Mr.Leblanc and I reorganized the equipment in the storage room to make it easily accessible to the coaches

during the Wednesday sessions. We also realized that there was a lack of equipment choice and quantity and from this observation and Mr.Fournier's recommendation, I decided to create a list of the equipment needed in cooperation with Mr.Lebanc, Dr.Reid and Mr.Fournier. Mr.Lebanc made a first list; and to this I added the equipment I believed was necessary and presented it to Mr.Fournier and Dr.Reid. They recommended that some items be removed and some be added. The equipment list included mostly different types of balls and other elementary types of equipments, the total cost of which was a little over a thousand dollars (See Appendix H). The request was approved by the department and the equipment was ordered for next year.

### *3.4 Summary Report Card*

The Summary Report card is a card for REACH students, parents/caregivers and teachers. The idea of a Report Card originated from the teacher's interviews at the beginning of the semester, my experience in teaching swimming, and from Dr.Reid feeling that communication between the REACH and McGill could be improved. For the past year the McGill students had to do a summary, of approximately five pages, of their final report to give to REACH's teachers.

From the interviews I realized that only one teacher out of six had read their student's summary report and also that the reports were not sent to parents or caregivers. I concluded that this mode of communication was not very effective and so I created a new communication tool that would be easier and faster to consult and interesting for teachers, parent/caregivers and REACH students (See Appendix I).

Having taught swimming, I thought about the format of the swimming card, which was composed of a checklist and a section for the instructor's comments and suggestions for improvement. Since all students from REACH have a whole range of physical abilities, the checklist was not suitable, so a more personalized approach was needed. The checklist was replaced by a list of four physical activities done during PDC. Throughout the semester the coaches and partners had to work towards the accomplishment of four TPO's. These TPO's were simplified into actions/physical activities and written down in the Report Card.

The first draft of the Report Card was presented to Dr.Reid, Mr.Fournier and Ms.Shacter, REACH head teacher, for approval. Mr.Fournier and Ms.Shacter really liked the new format and the personalized touch of the front-page picture. Ms.Shacter mentioned that it would be a good souvenir for the students. Dr.Reid recommended that I create an outline for the McGill students, explaining how to fill out the report card to make sure that the final product would have some consistency (See Appendix J). The suggested changes were made and presented to the coaches in class.

The cover page of the Report Card was personalized with a picture of the coach and partner underneath the McGill logo. This extra touch was well appreciated by everybody and gave a very professional look to the Report Card. Most cards had a picture of the coach and partner together; these pictures were taken with a digital camera, added to the Report Card and printed by me at REACH. For next year this task could be assigned to a teacher from REACH, to a teacher assistant, or to a McGill student. It could also be a responsibility of each coach to take a picture with their partner and electronically add it to the Summary Report Card and print it. To do it that way the

Summary Report Card would have to be on WEB city ( McGill student web) and a piece of 90 pound white paper would have to be available to them. This year the Report Card was given to the coaches and they only had to write the information on it and give it to their partner's homeroom teacher at the end of the last session of PDC. This was certainly a good professional practice.

In the teacher questionnaire Mr.Fournier mentioned that he would like to see a section in the evaluation of the partner's autonomy, attitude, motivation, responsibilities, or interest in play. After discussing about this request with Dr.Reid, we concluded that it was not the responsibility of the coaches to evaluate the behavior of their partner. The first argument was that the duration of PDC is too short to make such evaluations and also McGill students are not working on behavioral goals but on physical goals. Therefore, this proposal of Mr.Fournier was not included in the Report Card.

The term "Summary" was added to the original "Report Card" term to distinguish it from the Report Card from the school. The term "Action" was also changed for "Physical Activities" to improve the comprehension of the teachers and parents/caregivers.

### *3.5 McGill Personal Program*

The McGill Personal Program (See Appendix K) is another tool created to increase communication between the coaches, teachers and parents/caregivers but it was not implemented this semester. The idea came from two sources: the teacher questionnaire and the interview with Dr.Reid. The teachers from REACH mentioned that they would like to be informed of the activities that their students work on during PDC.

The desire to increase communication between coaches and parents/caregivers and teachers could be fulfilled with this additional communication tool. This sheet only includes the student's name, their simplified personal TPO's and the coach's signature. It will be very easy to fill out and could be given to the teacher at week fourth<sup>th</sup> so they could follow the progression of their students and send it to the parents/caregivers.

## Chapter 4 Final Investigation of Project Double Challenge

The final investigation consisted of an analysis of two questionnaires; one for McGill students and the other for REACH teachers.

### *4.1 Questionnaire for REACH Teachers (See Appendix L)*

The purpose of the questionnaire was to obtain the teachers' impression of Project Double Challenge (PDC). The questionnaire consists of five open-ended questions. They were personally delivered to each REACH teacher the week following the end of PDC. If the teachers were absent I placed the questionnaire in their school mailbox. Some teachers filled them out with the input of their class's teacher assistant.

#### *4.1.1 Questionnaire Analysis*

The following section includes a transcript of the questions and answers of the entire teachers questionnaire and an analysis of the answer by theme (recommendations).

1) What would you like to see **change** in Project Double Challenge?

\* "Some students have mentioned that they would like to have more team sports e.g.

basketball, hockey. Maybe we could go for 10 full weeks and not miss the two weeks for March break."

\* "More preparation for the McGill students, such as coming to meet the kids before the first meeting. This would give us a chance to explain some of the kids' needs, for example the importance of using pictos and other visuals."

\* "Pousser au maximum l'apprentissage des habilités en piscine sans négliger sur les autres activités ex: ne pas jouer au ballon en piscine. Focuser sur des éducatifs afin de

faire progresser l'élève au max. Déjà certains points ont été améliorés cette année et cela a été positif (ex: présentation vidéo de l'élève sur vidéo avant la session, circuits de locomotion pour les petits et préparation sécuritaire des sols, bulletins plus concis pour le prof et les parents). Peut-être une autoévaluation de l'élève avec son coach à la mi session afin de vérifier la pertinence de ses objectifs et l'ajustement de ceux-ci si nécessaire.

Utiliser une formule brève avec critères concis."

\* "Maybe three weeks into the program the McGill students could give the teachers and the support personnel a list of the goals they will be working on with the students, rather than just at the end of the ten weeks."

\* "Everything is great."

\* "It would be great if the program lasted longer; the students and coaches just get to know one another and it ends. After the second or third sessions, it would be nice to have a few minutes to talk with the coaches to let them know that if they have questions about the students that they can ask. I felt the students were shy about asking. I understand, they want to develop their own rapport, but I would like that they know they are welcome to talk (ask) if they like. Also it would be nice to meet with them for a couple of minutes the first day (or before) to develop a rapport with them. It would be neat to have them visit the school."

2) What would you like to see remain the same in Project Double Challenge?

\* "Format is great! Love the new report that goes home to include the parents. It is important to keep the dialogue open and on going between the McGill students and teachers."

\* "Pretty much everything, it's a great program."



\* "La formule d'un coach élève est très bonne. Le nombre d'objectifs à travailler avec l'élève semble très bon. La supervision des profs de McGill est très bonne aussi."

\* "The overall set-up is good the way it is. Our students really benefit from the experience and the possibility of trying out all the different equipment and sport venues."

\* "The good organization and hard work of everyone involved, despite the fact that some of our students are more challenging than others."

\* "I think it is a great program. I liked that the students each have a program set up for them, and that students sometimes have two coaches. The coaches are enthusiastic and willing! It is wonderful! The REACH students benefit greatly!"

3) What do you think about the student Report Card as a way of communication between McGill students/parents-caregivers and REACH teachers?

\* "It was terrific. Excellent means of communication. Well thought out and meaningful."

\* "Very good! Maybe a bit short?"

\* "Très bien et agréable. Joindre certain critères de base à évaluer par l'élève qui se retrouveraient sur tous les bulletins ex: autonomie, attitude, motivation, responsable, intérêt au jeu."

\* "I think the change in reporting, with the summary booklet, is a positive change. It is more concrete and gives the parents a clear indication of what their child does at McGill."

\* "I think it is a great idea to inform parents in detail about what their kids do at McGill. The picture on the front is also a nice touch. Maybe there should also be a progress report half-way just to give parents an idea of what they are working on."

\* "I thought the report card was great! It is a nice keepsake and a great way for the parents to know what was worked on, and how to continue working on it. I had a good response from the parents too!"

4) Do you have any other comment in regard of Project Double Challenge?

\* "Looking forward to next years! Thank you to all concerned!!!"

\* "Bravo!"

\* "A positive experience for our students and hopefully for the McGill students as well."

\* "Overall, I think Project Double Challenge is a great program! It provides REACH students with new faces and new challenges! (And it provides McGill students who may or may not have experience with children who have disabilities with the challenge too!)"

#### *4.1.2 Recommendations from REACH Teachers*

Ten recommendations emerged from this questionnaire. These recommendations were not unanimous among all teachers.

1. Have McGill students focus on sports, facilities and activities not available in the school environment e.g. introduction to squash, weight lifting, swimming, track and field...
2. Focus on the importance of using the PICTOS (small images used as a communication tool) and signs with the non verbal students. Maybe organize a workshop on the different communication tools and how to use them.
3. Longer project and a session in the fall.
4. Visit the school to meet with the students and the teachers before the start of the program.

5. Organize official meetings with coaches and teachers at the beginning or after two or three sessions in PDC.
6. Have more information on the summary report card.
7. Sharing the TPO's with the teachers and the parents half-way through PDC.
8. Organize more team sports because they believed that it would be very beneficial for their students.
9. More interaction between teachers/technicians and McGill students.
10. Have the older and more functional students do a self evaluation of their behavior and learning.

#### *4.2 Questionnaire for McGill Students (See Appendix M)*

The purpose of the questionnaire was to gain feedback with regard to PDC and some aspects of Adapted Physical Activity 396. The questionnaire had three different parts with the first one containing a series of seven statements (closed end formats). The students had to answer by circling a particular level of agreement on each statement (A 5-point Likert scale); Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Undecided/Neutral, Agree, Strongly Agree. The second part included five open ended questions the third part contained items about the student and the partner profile (selected demographics): gender; program enrollment; past experience with individuals with disabilities; level of functioning and age of the partner. These selected demographic variables will be useful to make a comparison between the answers of the students and to find possible relationships between these variables (Porretta, Kozub & Lisboa, 2000). Porretta and Kozub's recommendations in *Survey Research Workshop in Adapted Physical Activity* were

followed in constructing the questionnaire. The format of the Physical educators' Attitude Toward Teaching Individuals with Disabilities-III (PEATID III by Terry Rizzo, 1995) questionnaire was also used as a guide as well as the McGill University Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education questionnaire. Folsom-Meek and Rizzo (2002) have demonstrated that the PEATID III is a reliable and valid survey to use with future professionals. However, it is more relevant for off-campus school inclusive settings than for on-campus practicums (Sherrill & Buswell (1998).

#### *4.2.1 Student questionnaire analysis*

The questionnaire was given out during the last class of the semester following the McGill evaluation of the course. Of the 55 students present in the classroom, 54 answered the questionnaire.

The data of the first seven questions and the questions about themselves in the last section of the questionnaire were analyzed using the "Statistical Package for Social Studies" (*SPSS*).

The only significant difference that emerged from the analysis of questions one to seven is the relationship between the level of experience of the students and the perceived course work and training needed to feel comfortable interacting with people with disabilities. The students with some experience were those who answered that they needed more course work and training with a significant difference of .005. This could be due to the fact that they knew the challenges involved in teaching individuals with disabilities as opposed to those with no experience.

Question number seven presented some interesting results: two students circled a reason for disagreement regardless of their overall positive experience. One of them answered that PDC was a positive experience for her (SA) however, she circled insufficient course preparation in the second section as a reason for disagreement. Another student answered "agree" and wrote in the second section: relevancy to Kinesiology. I inferred that they had a positive experience despite the fact that one student believed that the course preparation was insufficient and the other student brought up the issue of the relevancy of the course to Kinesiology students.

With regard to the last part of the questionnaire, which related to the demography of the group, two correlations were significant. The first was that the younger partners had a lower level of functioning, with a significant difference of .049. This result is not a surprise since there is a class for early stimulation with students of 4 to 6 years old.

The second one is that the Kinesiology students were paired up with older partners, with a significant difference of .031. I concluded from this that the students/partners match up process was done correctly since Dr.Reid and I intended to match the kinesiology students with older partners. All of the other analysis performed showed no statistical differences.

The descriptive data of questions 8 to 12 were analyzed thematically, where the answers to each question are regrouped by similar characteristics, area of concern.

For question number eight the format of PDC, the resources available and the course work are some common themes. The question was: what should remain the same in PDC? The more common response was in regard to the format of PDC. Eleven respondents wrote that they liked the time frame of PDC, three mentioned that they

thought the weekly visit is appropriate and two wanted the format of two classes and one practicum to remain the same. Two respondents also mentioned that the resources were adequate. Three respondents stated that the instructor, Dr.Reid, should remain and two of them that the equipment and space available during the practicum was great. Both the report card for the partner and the summary student report were mentioned to be relevant by three respondents. Finally, both the REACH student information sheet and the weekly Reflections activity were reported twice as things that should remain. Respondent number nine stated that "I liked doing the reflections and I enjoyed everything about project double challenge."

Question nine asked what would the students like to see change in PDC? The response data showed some common themes emerged; the format and the course work. The respondents also made some suggestions for PDC. Seven respondents mentioned that they would like to see the time spent with their partner increase whereas five believed that sessions are needed and two wanted more than two hours in each session. In contrast, two respondents mentioned that two hour sessions were too long and that 90 minutes would be better. These conflicting results demonstrate that the time frame must be approximately right or maybe that it could be too short or too long depending on the partner, especially the ones who did not use the swimming pool due to medical or personal reasons. REACH teachers also suggested that the number of sessions be increased.

Regarding the course in general: three respondents mentioned that they would have liked to have more preparation before the start of PDC. One respondent stated that they "felt very unprepared for what I was doing." Also before the start of PDC, three

students mentioned that they would have liked to acquire more knowledge about the different disabilities. One of them wrote "I feel as though we should learn about the disorders at the beginning of the course." Two wanted more information about their partner and two respondents believed that teacher assistants should give them more help. Three respondents liked the idea of working in groups of two with one partner and finally two stated that fewer TPO's would be better.

One suggestion made was about the organization of an outing for all the participants. However, an outing would not necessarily be appropriate for all students. Moreover, it would be in contradiction to the philosophy of PDC which promotes a personalized program, according to the needs of the partner. Another suggestion made by two people was the implementation of class discussion about their own experience. This suggestion was very good and therefore put in the recommendation section for future years. Finally, one respondent reinforced the idea of doing the course and PDC over two semesters, with the lectures in the fall and PDC and the last lecture during the winter session.

Question nine was open ended and provided the opportunity for coaches to make critical comments about PDC. The low number of respondents to this question suggested that PDC was generally well appreciated by the coaches and that they did not see that any major change were needed to improve PDC.

The purpose of question 10; What have you gained from this experience? was to evaluate if PDC fulfilled the intended goals. Respondents mentioned that they gained personal benefits like; confidence (10), patience (nine) and experience (four). They also gained something in regards to people with disabilities; a better understanding of them

(nine), ways to deal with them (five) and knowledge of their different disabilities (three). Another gain mentioned was that the experience changed their attitude toward people with disabilities (eight). Finally, the respondents gained respect for people who worked in the field (four). Here, some interesting thoughts from the respondent included "I will never look or think about a person with a mental / physical disability the same way (student 39)", "I have also gained a lot of respect for people who work in the field. (student nine)", "I also now am less judgmental and afraid when I see people w a disability. I am accepting. (student 32)"

Responses to question eleven clearly suggested that the students had a different interpretation of the question. This may be either because the students did not read the question word for word or did not understand it. The question was as follows: How could EDKP 396 prepare you more effectively for your future career? I believe that 19 out of 38 respondents who answered this question understood the question in a different way such as: How EDKP 396 prepared you for your future career? The structure of this question was probably not clear enough and it was also incorrect to ask them to judge the course in relation to their future career since they probably did not know what their career will be. Therefore, if we want to reuse this questionnaire question 11 will have to be removed or rewritten. For example: How would you improve EDKP 396? Despite that misunderstanding, three respondents would have liked to learn more about disabilities.

The last question of this section was included in the questionnaire so the respondents could have a last chance to write a comment about EDKP 396 or PDC. The question was: Do you have any other comment with regard to EDPK 396 or Project Double Challenge? The majority of comments were positive; good experience (seven),



enjoyable (seven) and beneficial (three). One respondent (student 21) mentioned that the experience was very enlightening and another respondent stated that: "Maybe Kin students could have another assignment that relates more to Kin. For example writing a fitness program that meets the child's needs. Or doing a fitness assessment (confidentially) and work with that for the program."

## Chapter 5

This last chapter includes my personal reflections, twenty recommendations for the future development of Project Double Challenge (PDC) and the conclusion of this report.

### *5.1 Reflection*

My first and only contact with individuals with disabilities occurred during my teaching internship in my undergraduate physical education degree at Université de Montréal. For this internship, I chose a special needs school, with students with all kinds of disabilities. During those six months, I realized that I had to adapt my teaching to every student, in order to meet their needs. This was a good first-hand experience that caught my attention and increased my curiosity for this field.

The following year I was working as a substitute teacher in different schools on the south shore of Montréal. The students with disabilities were no longer in their special need school but were included into the neighborhood school. I realized that some physical education teachers did not have the knowledge and the resources to teach these children with disabilities. This is where my idea of pursuing some graduate studies in the field of adapted physical activities originated. During my graduate studies I was mostly interested in inclusive physical education.

When I found out about PDC I thought it was a great professional preparation for future physical education teachers and kinesiologists. This hands-on experience seemed the best way to initiate the student to the field of adapted physical activities and give them the tools to adapt their program. I was very anxious to be part of this project where I

would be involved in many ways. This internship gave me the opportunity to gain additional experience with children and adolescents with different disabilities. It also gave me the opportunities to act as a teacher assistant.

Even if I did not have a whole lot of experience with that clientele, only six months, I found that the interaction with them was natural for me and that they were very receptive to me. The coaches from McGill made me realize that the suggestions I gave them and my interventions with their partner were very successful. This gave me confidence to interact more with both the coaches and their partners. My experience teaching physical education was definitely a good background for this internship.

My role as a teacher assistant was a learning experience, which I greatly enjoyed. Following university students in their learning process was a very interesting aspect of my internship. Their reflections during the interviews and the meetings gave me much insight. I also liked to be involved helping out some pairs (coach/partner) during the Wednesday sessions. Finally, I found that the university environment was very stimulating. Therefore, I would not mind exploring that career path for the future. However, I am not ready yet for the Ph.D. but teaching older students at College level for instance really appeals to me.

The introductory investigations gave me the impression that there was not much to change or improve in PDC. Everybody seemed satisfied with the project and I did not find many problems to solve. I realized that I would have to be creative with the idea that there is always place for improvement. Therefore, I focused on small steps to improve PDC. Throughout the semester, I gathered some insight from different people involved in PDC and constructed a list of recommendations for the course for future years. The

modifications made would have to be simple, useful and easy to apply in the following year when I would not be there.

### *5.2 Recommendations for the Future Development of PDC*

1. Information sheet: I recommend keeping the new format of the information sheet (See Appendix E). The school secretary needs to ensure that all information in the sheet is correct every year by showing it to the homeroom teacher. It is also necessary to have the REACH physical education teacher complete the section Défi Sportif and program suggestions for all students before it is sent to McGill. The information sheet needs to be sent to the EDKP 396 instructor in January at less two weeks before the beginning of PDC.
2. Summary Report Card: I recommend keeping the new Summary Report Card (See Appendix I). It is necessary to have either a McGill student, a teacher assistant or a teacher from REACH take care of the pictures of the pairs coach/partner. The person responsible should also be in charge of printing the Summary Report Card on 90 pounds white paper to ensure consistency. The coaches should then fill them out and pass them to their partner teacher's on the last day of PDC.
3. McGill Personal Program Sheet: I recommend that the coaches use the McGill Personal Program Sheet (See Appendix K) to communicate the TPO's to the teachers and parents at week four of PDC. This tool would also increase communication between the different parties.

4. During the preparation weeks in January, the EDKP 396 instructor should ask coaches to focus on sport, facilities and activities not available at REACH e.g. squash, weight room, swimming, track and field.
5. During the preparation weeks in January, the EDKP 396 instructor should organize a visit to REACH so that coaches could meet with their partner, teacher and technician in their own environment.
6. I recommend that during the REACH visit a workshop on communication tools, use of PICTOS and signs be presented. This communication workshop could be organized and conducted by one of the REACH teachers.
7. I recommend that the coaches organize team sports to be done at the beginning of each session as a warm-up activity. This would be for the more agile partners and there could be two categories of abilities. The adults from Le Fil d'Ariane could also join in.
8. At week four into the program, a self-evaluation process could be used by the coaches of the more functional partners. The partner would reflect on their progress in the program. This will empower them; they will become more knowledgeable about their participation, and learn the self-regulation process.
9. For every Wednesday session the organization of the gymnastic room should remain the same; set up by a teacher assistant, in a circuit fashion, where partners can move from one activity to the other. At the beginning of PDC, coaches must be notified that they are only allowed to do minimal changes, to ensure the safety of their partners. For example, a minimal change would be to modify the height of a bench. It would not be acceptable to remove a mattress under apparatus or to move apparatus without assuring proper safety

conditions. If the coaches want a specific circuit, they would only have to come early that morning and set it up with the teacher assistant.

10. During two lectures the EDKP 396 instructor should engage groups of four or five coaches in a structured discussion about their Wednesday's experience. One lecture could occur after the first week of PDC and the other one at week five. These discussions could take many forms; for example the coaches could share their challenges, best moment, and teaching strategies. This exercise could also be conducted in the form of a case study where they present their personal Wednesday challenges and the group brainstorm and propose possible solutions to the problem. The groups could either be formed of coaches with partners of similar levels of functioning or similar ages. This exercise could make them realize that everybody has different experiences and they may also gain new tips, activities and ideas from each others.

11. The EDKP 396 instructor should give the lecture on autism and intellectual disabilities at the beginning of the semester instead of at the end; in doing so, the coaches will have the basic information they need to understand their partner a little better.

12. The EDKP 396 instructor should make sure that the sand pit is available to practice the standing broad jump and the long jump for the partner participating in this event at the Défi Sportif.

13. The EDKP 396 instructor should organize the swimming pool facilities so that there would be either a section of the pool or a different time slot reserved for the beginner swimmer or for a partner who works better when there is less noise and distractions.

14. During the next PDC in 2005, the EDKP 396 instructor should evaluate the relevancy of PDC in its current form for the Kinesiology students starting in the new program.
15. The EDKP 396 instructor should look at the possibility of modifying the practicum experience for the kinesiology students. For example, propose to some McGill students with disabilities that they participate in a special on-campus program. This program could either focus on rehabilitation, research or fitness, depending on the needs and interests of the participating students.
16. On Wednesday morning, before the beginning of each session, the equipment men should gather, outside of the equipment room in the gymnasium, all the equipment relevant to younger children and all the equipment needed to work with partners presenting lower physical abilities. This will give a better visibility of the available equipment.
17. During the preparation weeks in January the EDKP 396 instructor should present a slide show of participants in action from the previous year and mention their names so the coaches can identify their partner. This will decrease the level of anxiety prior to the first meeting and will be easier and faster to construct than the video presented this year.
18. The EDKP 396 instructor should propose that each coach finds articles on their partner disabilities. These articles could be put on reserve at the education library in order to share information with classmates and to build a file for each disability.
19. Have a graduate student develop a web site with information about different disabilities and contraindication and program suggestions, like the NCPAD web site:  
[WWW.ncpad.org](http://WWW.ncpad.org)

20. Give the previous year's report on the partner to the McGill students for a period of two weeks only, with a mention of "not for reproduction" on the cover page.

### *5.3 Conclusion*

This internship gave me opportunities to acquire a range of knowledge, as well as personal and professional experiences. I gained additional knowledge in adapted physical activities. I renewed my enthusiasm for adapted physical activity with the experience of teaching individuals with intellectual disabilities and pervasive development disorders. My role as a teaching assistant allowed me to experience interacting with students at the university level. I also developed a whole new professional area in my investigator role.

My direct participation in all aspects of PDC put me in the best possible position to investigate. I had direct contact with coaches, partners, and their teachers. The investigations performed during this practicum demonstrated that PDC is a well run program. Therefore, my personal contribution to the improvement of the program consisted of small tools that were meant to improve the communication between REACH and McGill. Another contribution was a series of twenty recommendations that emerged from the different investigations and personal experiences. The decision to follow or reject these recommendations and to keep the communication tools is in the hands of Dr.Reid.

Much of the supporting documentation from this internship is available in electronic form on a compact disk which should be found at the back of this internship



report. In the event of the CD being missing, please contact the School of Human Kinetics and Recreation, Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, NL, Canada.

## References

- Block, M.E. & Rizzo, T.L. (1995). Attitudes and attributes of physical educators associated with teaching individual with severe and profound disabilities. *Journal of the Association for Persons with Severe Handicaps*, 20(1), 80-87.
- Canadian Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation.(1978). *Position paper on adapted programmes*. Ottawa: Author
- Churton, M.W. (1986). Addressing personnel preparation needs to meet the challenges of the future. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 3(2), 118-123.
- Conatser, P., Block, M. & Lepore, M. (2000). Aquatic instructors' attitudes toward teaching students with disabilities. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 17(2), 197-207.
- Connolly, M. (1994). Practicum experiences and journal writing in adapted physical education: Implications for teacher education. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 11(3), 306-328.
- Folsom-Meek, S.L., Nearing, R.J., Groteluschen, W. & Krampf, H. (1999). Effects of academic major, gender, and hands-on experience on attitudes of preservice professionals. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 16(4), 389-402.

Folsom-Meek, S.L. & Rizzo, T.L. (2002). Validating the physical educator's attitude toward teaching individuals with disabilities III (PEATID-III) Survey for the future professionals. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 19(2), 141-154.

Hodge, S.R. (1998). Prospective physical education teachers' attitudes toward teaching students with disabilities. *Physical Educator*, 55(2), 68-77.

Hodge, S.R. & Jansma, P. (1999). Effects of contact time and location of practicum experiences on attitudes of physical education majors. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 16(1), 48-63.

Hodge, S.R., Davis, R., Woodard, R. & Sherrill, C. (2002). Comparison of practicum types in changing preservice teachers' attitudes and perceived competence. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 19(2), 155-171.

Hodge, S.R., Tannehill, D. & Kludge M.A. (2003). Exploring the meaning of practicum experiences for PETE students. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 20(4), 381-399.

Hogan, P.I. (1990). Problem based learning and personnel preparation in adapted physical education. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 7(3), 205-218.

Johnson, B. & Christensen, L. (2000). *Educational Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Kowalski, E.M. & Rizzo, T.L. (1996). Factors influencing preservice student attitudes toward individuals with disabilities. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 13(2), 180-196.

Porretta, D.L. & Kozub, F.M. *Survey Research Workshop in Adapted Physical Activity*. USA

Porretta, D.L., Kozub, F.M. & Lisboa, F.L. (2000). Documentary analysis of survey research in adapted physical activity: 1984-1998. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 17(3), 286-296.

Rizzo, T.L. & Vispoel, W.P. (1991). Physical educators' attributes and attitudes toward teaching students with handicaps. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 8(1), 4-11.

Rizzo, T.L. & Vispoel, W.P. (1992). Changing attitudes about teaching students with handicaps. *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 9(1), 54-63.

Rizzo, T.L. & Kirkendall, D.R. (1995). Teaching students with mild disabilities: What affects attitudes of future physical educators? *Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 12(3), 205-216.

Rowe, J. & Stutts, R.M. (1987). Effects of practica type, experience, and gender on attitudes of undergraduate physical education majors toward disabled persons.

*Adapted Physical Activity Quarterly*, 4(4), 268-277.

Sherrill, C. (1988). *Leadership Training in Adapted physical Education*. Illinois: Human Kinetics.

Sherrill, C. & Buswell, D. (1998). *Instructor's manual and test item file to accompany textbook*. Boston, MA: WCB/McGraw-Hill.

## **REACH- Realistic Educational Alternatives for Children with Handicaps**

### **EDUCATIONAL PROJECT**

#### **Our Mission:**

REACH offers an alternate educational program within the continuum of services offered by the Riverside School Board.

REACH promotes the autonomy and development of students with intellectual handicaps or with pervasive developmental challenges. Through our professional staff, parent and community partnerships, REACH enables each student to grow socially, cognitively, physically and emotionally in a safe and caring environment and to take his/her place in our changing world.

#### **Our Vision:**

We, the staff and students of REACH, believe in a safe and caring community of learners that fosters individual growth and autonomy.

#### **Values and Beliefs:**

We believe that REACH is a place where students are respected and respect others.

We believe in innovative and varied teaching strategies and techniques.

We believe in small group and individualized instruction and the use of up to date technology.

We believe in life-long fitness, and...

We believe in open communication between home and school

#### **Special Programs Offered:**

- \*Elementary and Secondary Functional Academics

- \*French second language program

- \*Dynamic physical education program

- \*Social Skills Training

- \*Integration into the community

- \*Life Skills Training

- \*TEACCH (Treatment and Education of Autistic and related Communication for Children) Classes

- \*Work Study and Sheltered Workshop Programs

- \*Travel Training-to develop the students' autonomy with regard to traveling with independence within the community (walking and/or taking the public transportation).

- \*Yummy Lunch Program- the students learn life skills necessary to plan and prepare a lunch that is sold within our school community. \*Music Program

**Special Services Offered:**

- Occupational Therapy
- Language and Communication Specialist
- Physiotherapy (to be introduced soon)
- Collaboration with professionals (social- workers, psychiatrists, educators etc.) as necessary on an on-going basis
- Individualized Education Program for each student and evaluation and reporting to parents monthly
- Nurse from CLSC visits weekly or as necessary

**Highlights:**

- Low student –staff ratios
- Special Education teacher and technician in every class
- Computers in every class
- Door to door bussing
- McGill University's Project Double Challenge ( 9 weeks of one to one coaching at the McGill Campus, by McGill Phys.Ed students who plan specialized programs for our students.)
- All-year outdoor sports program
- Exciting outings-for example our winter camp trips and our annual bike trip
- Partnerships with the community

**Community Partners:**

- CLSCs (Centre Local de Service Communautaires))
- CMR (Centre Montereigien de Readaptation)
- CRDI (Centre de Readaptation-Deficience Intellectuelle)
- Quebec Special Olympics
- McGill University
- Concordia University
- Vanier and Dawson Colleges
- Defi-Sportif
- Fonds Jeunesse, Sam Soloman Foundation, ArtsSmarts
- Local Businesses / IGA
- MEQ (Ministere d'Education du Quebec)
- Preville Fine Arts Center
- Borough of Saint Lambert
- And many, many volunteers...

***History***

1968 South Shore Learning Center was established  
1971 Moved to Hazel Cross School

1973 Moved to Victoria Park School

1999 Moved to Present Location and named REACH

**Special Features**

- Warm family atmosphere
- Studio Kaleidoscope on site (sheltered ceramic workshop)
- Pleasant location in residential Saint Lambert
- Safely enclosed building and secure grounds
- Spacious park-like setting
- Close to businesses, library and community centers (Arena, Pool and Fields)



Adapted Physical Activity 396

**Reflections**

After each session of Project Double Challenge you must engage in reflection about what happened over the two-hour period; what was positive, what was negative, what was neutral...and why? Scholars have argued that this practice enhances professional development and it has been supported in the adapted physical activity research literature (Connolly, 1994; Hodge, Tannehill, & Kludge, 2003) Your final reports must include a section of weekly reflections.

The following should assist in preparing your reflections, although each question does not have to be answered every week.

1. **In the beginning...**How did you feel before, during and after your first practicum experience? What factors contributed toward your nervousness, confidence, or downright fear? What could APA 396 do to prepare you more effectively for this first encounter, or is it something you just have to experience?
2. Did you interact with teachers or teaching assistants and what information did you gain? Is there information you need, where will you get it?
3. What activities occurred and why/how did you select them?
4. What insights have you gained about the person, your daily preparation, the environment, and the selected tasks? What will you repeat and what changes might you consider? Why?
5. What positive events occurred and why do you think they were positive? How did the positive event affect subsequent time during the practicum?
6. What activities worked best for your partner, why? What activities flopped? Why?
7. What negative events occurred and why? How did they affect subsequent time during the practicum? Is it an event that might be avoided in the future, if so, how? How will you address this event if it occurs again?
8. Was the time sufficient? Too short? Too long? How did you adjust?
9. What behaviours of your partner affected the way you progressed and what adjustment did you make?
10. What rules or routines have you used or discovered?
11. What reinforcement techniques are you using, what prompting is necessary?
12. How do you communicate with your partner? How do you know he/she is having fun, learning, or frustrated?
13. **As the weeks go on ...**how are you feeling about this experience? (ie. I am not as tired after the two hours as I was after the first day, my planning is easier because I generally know what to expect, I am gaining more confidence, I am always uptight because I never know what to expect)

14. **Toward the end of the practicum...**what are the most rewarding, challenging, or frustrating aspects about teaching individuals with a disability?
15. **Toward the end of the practicum...**what have you learned about yourself, your planning, what best practices have you discovered?

Appendix C  
Produced by: Catherine Lair

**Parents/Guardians Permission Letters to Videotape Five Students**

January 23, 2004

Dear Parents / Guardians,

As part of my "stage" at McGill and REACH I intend to interview and videotape four McGill students during their teaching session on Wednesday morning. A few McGill students have volunteered to participate in my project. One of them is your child's coach.

This video will be included in my final report. This report will be shown to my evaluation committee composed of four university instructors. After the evaluation the video will be destroyed.

Would you please sign the following authorization and return it to the school as soon as possible. Thank you for your cooperation.

Catherine Lair

---

I give permission for my child \_\_\_\_\_ to be videotaped during the Double Challenge Program at McGill University

---

Parent/ Guardian Signature

Date

471 Green Street  
Saint Lambert, Qc J4P 1V2

450-671-1649  
450-671-4600 (Fax)

Appendix D  
Produced by: REACH

**REACH Student Information Sheet (old)**

NAME	BIRTHDATE	SEX	ALERT / COMMENTS
Student 1	June 16, 1984	M	Down Syndrome
Student 2	March 31, 1991	M	Autistic, non-verbal, very active good mobility and locomotion skills, loves water
Student 3	November 9, 1987	M	Ritalin - tantrums, can be physically aggressive
Student 4	December 1, 1989	M	Difficulty buttoning and zipping
Student 5	December 6, 1994	M	Autism / non-verbal (male preferred), loves water can tantrum aggressively, needs to be reminded to go to the bathroom
Student 6	April 12, 1991	M	Autism, difficulty with transition, mild cerebral palsey needs to be reminded to use the washroom
Student 7	September 5, 1994	F	limited verbal skills
Student 8	September 9, 1993	F	limited verbal skills, short attention span, <b>be firm</b> , set limits, 1 to 1
Student 9	June 29, 1994	F	runner, very active, tantrums, <b>loves water</b> , p.d.d., autism set routine, use pictos, limited verbal skills
Student 10	May 3, 1991	F	very little verbal skills, use communication book
Student 11	July 6, 1997	M	Non-verbal, second language, not toilet trained, loves water, fearless, autistic tendencies
Student 12	October 25, 1985	M	hearing aids, Down Syndrome
Student 13	July 7, 1990	M	plays rough with others, doesn't keeps hands to himself
Student 14	June 27, 1998	M	myctonic dystrophy, unsteady - careful especially with stairs not toilet trained, limited language, loves water
Student 15	February 9, 1989	M	Autistic, tantrums, requires routine
Student 16	December 7, 1988	M	Needs definite limits
Student 17	September 3, 1991	M	nervous attempting new things
Student 18	January 17, 1999	M	Autistic, non-verbal, may tantrum and bite himself, not toilet trained
Student 19	August 30, 1984	M	Autistic tendencies
Student 20	July 22, 1993	M	Impulsive behaviour needs not to be stressed

Student 21	December 9, 1995	F	DiGeorge syndrome, needs reminders for toilet, limited verbal skills
Student 22	July 24, 1998	M	non-verbal - not toilet trained
Student 23	March 14, 1991	M	Runner, not toilet trained, non verbal, Downs Syndrome low interest in physical activities, possible seizures runner, will test (1-1)
Student 24	May 22, 1990	M	Fragile X, sensitive emotionally
Student 25	April 7, 1993	M	Not toilet trained, non-verbal, tantrums, routine needed warning of changes, 1 to 1
Student 26	May 30, 1999	M	non-verbal,,, process of toilet training, may be aggressive when frustrated
Student 27	October 8, 1991	F	Autistic, non-verbal, cries often, toilet trained but needs to be taken
Student 28	May 18, 1983	F	Down Syndrome
Student 29	August 13, 1987	M	
Student 30	March 28, 1985	M	non-verbal, autistic, (self mutilating)
Student 31	August 6, 1992	M	Language difficulties in expressing himself
Student 32	January 9, 1991	F	wears hearing aids, speech difficulties
Student 33	June 24, 1999	M	non-verbal, not toilet trained, Down syndrome, extremely active
Student 34	July 27, 1997	M	non-verbal, not toilet trained, Down Syndrome, extremely active needs to be firm, loves water
Student 35	February 8, 1989	M	Down Syndrome
Student 36	July 27, 1985	F	Female coach please
Student 37	November 2, 1996	F	very limited language, possible seizures must wear helmet
Student 38	July 17, 1995	F	Down Syndrome, 1 to 1, <b>needs someone who can set limits and be very firm</b> , has toileting accidents
Student 39	July 7, 1993	M	autistic, language difficulties, tantrums sometimes
Student 40	November 1, 1986	M	Not toilet trained, non-verbal, muscular dystrophy, can sign, resistant to authority
Student 41	March 6, 1987	M	Williams Syndrome, very verbal but needs definite boundaries
Student 42	January 19, 1986	M	autistic tendencies
Student 43	March 1, 1996	M	1 to 1, not good with transitions, set routine, can have tantrums, autism, limited verbal skills, loves water
Student 44	April 19, 1990	M	Language difficulties in expressing himself

Student 45	February 19, 1999	M	autistic, not toilet-trained, runner
Student 46	May 10, 1986	M	
Student 47	July 31, 1985	M	Non-verbal, bites when agitated, 1 to 1
Student 48	July 11, 1991	F	Down Syndrome
Student 49	December 2, 1986	F	
Student 50	January 20, 1983	F	weak ankles

Appendix E  
Produced by: Catherine Lair

**REACH Student Information (new)**

**NAME:** Student 30

**BIRTHDATE:** March 28, 1985

**SEX:** M

**DIAGNOSIS/ALERT:** autistic

**COMMUNICATION:** non verbal, but understands what you tell him, you also need to tell him to stop

**TOILET-TRAINED:** Yes

**BEHAVIOR:** loves swimming

**PHYSICAL SKILLS:** good swimmer

**PROGRAM SUGGESTION FROM REACH:** use a lot of demonstration  
**Défi Sportif:** volleyball, swimming (crawl, back crawl 25m), soccer

Appendix F  
Produced by: REACH

**Physical Education IEP**

<b>MOBILITY</b>		
<b>1,1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>To identify different body parts.</b>		
<b>1,2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
To move his body and body parts in different ways:		
To move different body parts in different ways:		
To walk slowly		
To walk fast.		
To hop on two feet in one place		
To hop on two feet going forwards		
To hop on two feet going backwards.		
To hop on one foot in one place.		
To hop on one foot backwards and/or forwards.		
To run slowly.		
To run fast.		
To crawl a distance of		
To move like a four footed animal for a distance of		
To roll on a longitudinal axis		
To do a forward somersault		
To do a backward somersault		
While on his back, move backwards with his legs.		
<b>1,3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
To be able to put the body in different positions maintaining balance		
To reproduce a basic posture by varying positions with or without aid by maintaining balance		
<b>1,4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
To link together different locomotor and non locomotor actions		
To link together identical actions:		
running		
rolling		
walking		
jumping		



leaping		
galloping		
moving like a four footed animal		
To link together different actions:		
running		
jumping		
rolling		
walking		
leaping		
galloping		
moving like a four footed animal		
<b>PHYSICAL ACTIVITY</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2,1</b>		
The child should be able to make different types of physical effort to produce quality muscular results		
To execute simple exercises.		
To do flexibility exercises		
To do cardio-respiratory activities		
To do muscular effort activities.		
To do relaxation activities.		
<b>LOCOMOTION</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3,1</b>		
To move on the ground or on different apparatus, adapting to the space and obstacles		
To be able to go over an obstacle course of various shapes and sizes		
To be able to go under an obstacle course of various shapes and sizes.		
To be able to go around obstacles of different shapes and sizes		
To be able to go through obstacles of different shapes and sizes.		
To climb a ladder placed in a vertical position.		
To go down a ladder placed in a vertical position.		
To climb a slanted ladder.		
To go down a slanted ladder.		
To be able to move sideways on the jungle gym		
To jump from a certain height		
To jump from a certain height and control his landing.		
To slide down a slide in a sitting position		

To hang on a horizontal bar		
To swing on a horizontal bar		
To swing on a cable in a sitting position		
To swing on a cable in a standing position.		
To move forward when hanging on a bar.		
To walk with the help of an object (mini-hoop, etc.)		
To jump with a jumping ball		
To jump on a mini-trampoline.		
<b>3,2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
To execute locomotor and non-locomotor actions on high surfaces while maintaining balance		
To maintain balance while moving on high surfaces (ex. balance beam)		
.....when he walks forward		
.....when he moves sideways		
.....when he walks backwards		
.....when he jumps		
To maintain balance while adopting different positions on a high surface		
To maintain balance while alternating positions and places on a high surface		
<b>3,3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
To move safely on somewhat uneven terrain using various pieces of equipment		
To move forward while sitting on a scooter		
To move backwards while sitting on a scooter		
To be able to make turns while sitting on a scooter		
To stop while moving on a scooter		
To link different actions on a scooter		
To move with mini-hoops or stilts		
To jump on a jumping ball.		
<b>3,4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
To move safely on somewhat uneven terrain using various pieces of equipment		
ex: skiing on cross-country skis, walking with snow shoes, skates		
To propel using pieces of equipment		
To stop using pieces of equipment		
To maintain balance while going up somewhat inclined slopes on cross-country skis and snowshoes		

<b>3,5</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
To move in different ways in water while controlling his breathing		
To exhale under water		
To stay under water for a period of time		
To float on the surface of the water		
To bring himself to the surface of the water in a variety of ways, from one point to another		
To travel under water		
<b>MANIPULATION - Primary Level 1</b>		
<b>4,1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>To manipulate, with or without the use of implements, objects while using different parts of the body</b>		
To hold an object (ball, sand bag) in his hands		
To carry an object (ball, sand bag) from one place to another for a certain distance		
To hold a rope tightly with two hands		
To pull an object or a person on wheels with a rope for a certain distance		
To hold a rope and be pulled by somebody for a certain distance		
To push an object or a person on wheels for a certain distance		
To push a ball (large size) with two hands		
To push a ball (large size) with two hands in a given direction		
To catch a rolling ball (medium or large size) with two hands		
To throw a ball in a given direction		
- with two hands		
- with one hand		
To catch an oncoming ball		
To dribble a ball from a standing position with two hands		
To dribble a ball from a standing position with one hand		
To dribble a ball while moving forward with two hands		
To dribble a ball while moving forward with one hand		
To kick a ball in a given direction		
To push a ball into the air with two hands		
To hit a ball into the air with the help of a stick or racquet		

To hit a balloon repeatedly in the air with a racquet		
To use a racquet to carry an object		
To use a stick to give speed and direction to a ball ex. a broomball stick with a sponge ball, t-ball		
To use a stick to move a ball towards a flag		
To stop a ball with the help of a stick		
To carry a weighted ball for a certain distance.		
<b>COOPERATION - Primary Level 1</b>		
<b>5.1 To cooperate</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
To cooperate with a partner in accomplishing a physical task requiring the same action ex: two students who pass a ball to each other		
To cooperate with many partners in accomplishing a physical task requiring the same action ex: four students pulling a rope with the goal of moving a student sitting on a scooter		
To cooperate with a partner in accomplishing a physical task requiring different actions ex: one student pushing another student sitting on a scooter		
To cooperate with many partners in accomplishing a physical task requiring different actions.		
<b>OPPOSITION - Primary Level 1</b>		
<b>6.1 To lead offensive and defensive actions against one or several peers.</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
To keep an opponent at a distance in chasing games (offensive action).		
To catch up with an opponent and to adapt his speed and movements (defensive action)		
To avoid an object thrown in his direction (defensive action)		
To reach an opponent with the help of an object (offensive action)		
<b>COOPERATION AND OPPOSITION - Primary Level 1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>7.1 To execute with one or two partners, individual offensive and defensive actions</b>		
To play an offensive role		
To play a defensive role		
To pass an object to a partner		

<b>EXPRESSION - Primary Level 1</b>		
<b>8,1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
To bring together different gestures and moves to music		
To bring together gestures and moves in respect to the rhythm		
To use rhythmic ribbons to music using different gestures		
<b>HEALTH AND WELL BEING</b>		
<b>9,1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
Practices the activities safely		
Shows an interest in practicing physical activities		
Shows some initiative in physical activities		
Shows a knowledge of nutrition		
<b>ATTITUDE IN CLASS</b>		
<b>10,1</b>		
<b>A = Very Good; B = Good, C = Average, D = Weak</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>
Interest in Physical Activity		
Respect for others		
Self control		
Listening skills		
Responsibility		

Appendix G  
Produced by: Mr.Fournier

**Parents/Guardians Permission Letters to Videotape All Students**

**REACH**

January 13, 2004

Dear Parents/Guardians,

We have a graduate student from Memorial University who is liaising with us to help the student from McGill University acquaint themselves with our students. The Double Challenge program will began on January 21 and end March 31, 2004.

A short videotape of the students will be made in the school, during their physical education class.

Would you please sign and return the form below to the school as soon as possible. Thank you for your understanding.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Yves Fournier  
Physical Education Teacher

I give permission for my child \_\_\_\_\_ to be videotaped for the Double Challenge Program at McGill University.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Parent/ Guardian Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

471 Green Street  
Saint Lambert

450-671-1649  
450-671-4600 (fax)

Appendix H  
Produced by Catherine Lair

**Equipment Order for EDKP 396 winter 2004**

Item description	Code	Quantity	Price	Total
Gymnastic ribbon	GRJ (SI)	5	8.95	44.75
Jingle bell balls	A6136 (FH)	1	41.75	41.75
Blooper bat and ball	A5723 (FH)	1	7.50	7.50
Franklin oversize foam bat	A11612 (FH)	1	17.50	17.50
Bowling set	A7615 (FH)	1	23.00	23.00
Sport time utility racquet	1-26343-901 (ST)	1	7.95/6	7.95
Super katch ball	1-200295-901 (ST)	1	8.95	8.95
Slo Mo Bump ball	1-23233-901 (ST)	1	44.95/6	44.95
Juggling scarves	1-87160-901 (ST)	1	15.95/12	15.95
Sportime Max trainer	1-03088-901 (ST)	4	17.50	70.00
GrabBall	1-8327-901 (ST)	1	19.95	19.95
Bellball	1-68430-901 (ST)	1	52.97	52.97
Volley Allround	C8114 (SI)	1	25.95	25.95
Grip cerceau	ESGR-CE (SI)	2	19.95	39.90
Jump rope 8'	1-20456-901 (ST)	1	15.95/6	15.95
Super crawl tunnel	1-25497-901 (ST)	1	66.95	66.95
Economy scooter board	1-26760-901 (ST)	4	19.95	79.80
Koosh ball 3 1/2''	1-34390-901 (ST)	3	5.95	17.85
Diablo	1-21651-901 (ST)	2	14.50	29.00
Cone hurdle bar	A10162 (FH)	1	35.00/12	32.00
Super catch hand wrap	1-25610-901 (ST)	2	4.95	9.90
Softie ball	1-22625-901 (ST)	1	7.75/3	7.75
Nylytes 8 1/2''	1-09444-901 (ST)	1	25.95	25.95
Spin Master devil stick	A9452 (FH)	2	43.75	87.50
Grip start chute 12'	1-23745-901 (ST)	1	71.95	71.95
Juggling balls	JB-3P (SI)	2	18.95	37.90
Visualiser	1-67300-901 (ST)	1	47.95	47.95
Football Polyurethane balls	FF23 (SI)	3	9.95	29.85
Baseball foam	1-65310-901 (ST)	4	4.95	19.80

Total: \$ 1004.17

Item available through Flag House (FH), Sport Inter(SI) or Sport Time(ST)

Appendix I  
Produced by: Catherine Lair

**Summary Report Card**



# McGill

Project Double Challenge  
Winter 2004



**recognizes the efforts of**

---





### Student Outline for the Summary Report Card

*Actions:* are your simplified TPOs.

\*For example if the TPO is: Billy will walk forward on a low balance beam in the gymnasium room while the instructor waits for him at the other end of the beam giving him verbal cues. The action will be: Walking forward by himself on a low balance beam without falling.

\*Keep it simple and easy to understand. **Do not write down your full TPOs**

*1-2*

\*If student has achieved the TPO (Action) write a check mark underneath # 2

\*If student has not achieved the TPO (Action) write a check mark underneath # 1

#### *Comments*

1) This part is a bit more tricky because you need to make sure that your comments are **constructive** and not destructive. There are many ways to say something; you have to find the right way. For example it is better to write: Billy can throw small balls at large targets rather than Billy has an immature throwing pattern.

2) When you are writing, remember that the audience is composed of teachers, **parents**, caregivers and student. Do not state the obvious; do not tell them what they already know.

3) Your comments must be of a **physical** nature unless you have a behavioral TPO. What has the individual achieved? In which activities could the student participate over the summer?

4) If the student is "working toward" the achievement of one or many TPOs, state what he/she can do (task sequences if applicable). Also give suggestions or propose activities on how to help improve a specific skill.

5) You can include a positive personal comment at the end of the project if you really mean it.

If you need help please ask us!

Appendix K  
Produced by: Catherine Lair



Dear parents/caregivers and teachers,

I have the pleasure of working with \_\_\_\_\_ for the semester at McGill. I would like to share with you the contents of the individual physical activity program that I have developed.

Physical Activities

1. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

At the end of the semester you will receive a summary of their achievement. Thank you for your cooperation.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Instructor

Appendix L  
Produced by: Catherine Lair

**Questionnaire for REACH Teachers**

**Purpose of questionnaire:**

To gain your impression of Project Double Challenge, the Wednesday at McGill. The summary of responses will be used by Dr. Greg Reid and Catherine Lair in order to improve it.

1) What would you like to see **change** in Project Double Challenge?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

2) What would you like to see **remain** the same in Project Double Challenge?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

3) What do you think about the student Report Card as a way of communication between McGill students/parents-caregivers and REACH teachers?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

4) Do you have any other comment in regard to Project Double Challenge?

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

Thank you for your help!

Appendix M  
Produced by: Catherine Lair

**Questionnaire for McGill Students**

**Purpose of the questionnaire**

To gain student feedback with regard to Project Double Challenge and some aspects of Adapted Physical Activity 396. The summary of responses will be used by Dr. Greg Reid and Catherine Lair to improve Project Double Challenge in particular. All responses will be kept confidential

**General Direction**

The first part of the questionnaire contains a series of seven statements. There are no right or wrong answers. Circle the response that best describes your position on each statement. Do not skip any questions.

1. The "Student Information" sheet gave me information to help prepare myself for the first meeting with my student.

N/A   Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Undecided/Neutral   Agree   Strongly Agree

2. The short video of REACH students reduced my anxiety about the first day with my partner.

N/A   Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Undecided/Neutral   Agree   Strongly Agree

3. The early course content prepared me effectively to teach in Project Double Challenge

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Undecided/Neutral   Agree   Strongly Agree

4. Project Double Challenge improved my attitudes toward teaching people with disabilities.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Undecided/Neutral   Agree   Strongly Agree

5. As a future physical education teacher or kinesiologist, I need more course work and training before I will feel comfortable interacting with people with disabilities.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Undecided/Neutral   Agree   Strongly Agree

6. The weekly reflexions helped me to identify and address problems as well as think critically about best practices.

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Undecided/Neutral   Agree   Strongly Agree

7. Overall, Project Double Challenge have been a positive experience for me

Strongly Disagree   Disagree   Undecided/Neutral   Agree   Strongly Agree

if Strongly Disagree or Disagree circle why:

lack of support from professor      lack of support from teacher assistant

severity of the disabilities      insufficient course preparation

lack of interest      other: \_\_\_\_\_

8. What should **remain** the same in Project Double Challenge?

---

---

---

---

---

---

9. What would you like to see **change** in Project Double Challenge?

---

---

---

---

---

---

10. What have you gained from this experience?

---

---

---

---

---

11. How could EDKP 396 prepare you more effectively for your future career?

---

---

---

---

---

12. Do you have any other comment with regard to EDKP 396 or Project Double Challenge?

---

---

---

---

**Questions about yourself (Circle the answer)**

Gender                      *Female*                      *Male*

Program                      *Physical Education*                      *Kinesiology*

Indicate your experience interacting with individuals with disabilities before Project Double Challenge?

None		Some		Much experience
<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>



In general my partner for Project Double Challenge would likely be described as

Low functioning

High functioning

1

2

3

4

5

My partner's age was

0-6

7-12

13-18

18+

Thank you for your help!

## **Executive Summary**

This report is the result of a four month internship that took place during the 2004 winter semester from January to the end of April. Throughout the semester time was spent between McGill University in Montreal and REACH, a school in Saint-Lambert, for individuals with disabilities. The main goal of this internship was to evaluate a component of the professional preparation program run by McGill University for the physical education and kinesiology students. The component evaluated, Project Double Challenge (PDC), was an on-campus requirement of McGill's adapted physical activity course EDKP 396 in which university students worked with individuals with disabilities. These individuals were adults that came from l'Atelier le Fil D'Ariane, a tapestry workshop, and children and teenagers from REACH and Chambly Academy. The project is called Project Double Challenge because it is a challenge for both the student and the individuals with disabilities.

### *Purpose of the Internship*

In order to have a clear picture of PDC, a direct participation and investigation of all aspects of PDC was necessary. Therefore, I assumed the role of a student by attending every lecture, I acted as a teacher assistant to understand the real experience and issues of McGill students, and I spent some time at REACH interacting with the students and staff either during their physical education classes or during special school activities.

I also acted as a liaison between the different persons involved in PDC including Dr. Greg Reid of McGill, Mr. Yves Fournier of REACH, and the students from both REACH and McGill. In PDC, McGill students were referred to as "Coaches" and the REACH students and other participants were referred to as "Partners".

### *Evaluation of PDC*

The evaluation process occurred in three main phases; the introductory investigation, the ongoing investigation and the final investigation. The introductory investigation took place before the start of PDC in January. This first investigation was based on a literature review and meetings with the different persons knowledgeable of PDC. The ongoing investigation consisted of four follow-up interviews with six McGill students, my personal observations as a teaching assistant in the program and my experience at REACH. The introductory and progressive investigation gave me some insights about what could be improved in PDC. As a result, some tools were created and some actions taken throughout the winter semester 2004.

### *Personal Contribution to Project Double Challenge*

Before the beginning of PDC the Student Information sheet was modified and the information on each student was verified with REACH homeroom teachers. An introductory video of REACH students was created and presented to the McGill students prior to their first meeting with their partners. During PDC I spend some time gathering equipment, reviewing what was available, and making a list of equipment needs for next year. I also did a short presentation on adapted equipment and equipment choice. Halfway

through the semester a Summary Report Card was created to replace the present summary. These new tools and their application were then evaluated and modified for the future years.

The final investigation took place following the last day of PDC; this investigation was done by questionnaires given to REACH teachers and McGill students. Following the final investigation of PDC a McGill Personal Program sheet was created for use next year.

#### *Recommendations for the Future Development of PDC*

1. Information sheet: I recommend keeping the new format of the information sheet (See Appendix E). The school secretary needs to ensure that all information in the sheet is correct every year by showing it to the homeroom teacher. It is also necessary to have the REACH physical education teacher complete the section Défi Sportif and program suggestions for all students before it is sent to McGill. The information sheet needs to be sent to the EDKP 396 instructor in January at less two weeks before the beginning of PDC.
2. Summary Report Card: I recommend keeping the new Summary Report Card (See Appendix I). It is necessary to have either a McGill student, a teacher assistant or a teacher from REACH take care of the pictures of the pairs coach/partner. The person responsible should also be in charge of printing the Summary Report Card on 90 pounds white paper to ensure consistency. The coaches should then fill them out and pass them to their partner teacher's on the last day of PDC.

3. McGill Personal Program Sheet: I recommend that the coaches use the McGill Personal Program Sheet (See Appendix K) to communicate the TPO's to the teachers and parents at week four of PDC. This tool would also increase communication between the different parties.
4. During the preparation weeks in January, the EDKP 396 instructor should ask coaches to focus on sport, facilities and activities not available at REACH e.g. squash, weight room, swimming, track and field.
5. During the preparation weeks in January, the EDKP 396 instructor should organize a visit to REACH so that coaches could meet with their partner, teacher and technician in their own environment.
6. I recommend that during the REACH visit a workshop on communication tools, use of PICTOS and signs be presented. This communication workshop could be organized and conducted by one of the REACH teachers.
7. I recommend that the coaches organize team sports to be done at the beginning of each session as a warm-up activity. This would be for the more agile partners and there could be two categories of abilities. The adults from Le Fil d'Ariane could also join in.
8. At week four into the program, a self-evaluation process could be used by the coaches of the more functional partners. The partner would reflect on their progress in the program. This will empower them; they will become more knowledgeable about their participation, and learn the self-regulation process.
9. For every Wednesday session the organization of the gymnastic room should remain the same; set up by a teacher assistant, in a circuit fashion, where partners can move from one activity to the other. At the beginning of PDC, coaches must be notified that they are

only allowed to do minimal changes, to ensure the safety of their partners. For example, a minimal change would be to modify the height of a bench. It would not be acceptable to remove a mattress under apparatus or to move apparatus without assuring proper safety conditions. If the coaches want a specific circuit, they would only have to come early that morning and set it up with the teacher assistant.

10. During two lectures the EDKP 396 instructor should engage groups of four or five coaches in a structured discussion about their Wednesday's experience. One lecture could occur after the first week of PDC and the other one at week five. These discussions could take many forms; for example the coaches could share their challenges, best moment, and teaching strategies. This exercise could also be conducted in the form of a case study where they present their personal Wednesday challenges and the group brainstorm and propose possible solutions to the problem. The groups could either be formed of coaches with partners of similar levels of functioning or similar ages. This exercise could make them realize that everybody has different experiences and they may also gain new tips, activities and ideas from each others.

11. The EDKP 396 instructor should give the lecture on autism and intellectual disabilities at the beginning of the semester instead of at the end; in doing so, the coaches will have the basic information they need to understand their partner a little better.

12. The EDKP 396 instructor should make sure that the sand pit is available to practice the standing broad jump and the long jump for the partner participating in this event at the Défi Sportif.

13. The EDKP 396 instructor should organize the swimming pool facilities so that there would be either a section of the pool or a different time slot reserved for the beginner swimmer or for a partner who works better when there is less noise and distractions.
14. During the next PDC in 2005, the EDKP 396 instructor should evaluate the relevancy of PDC in its current form for the Kinesiology students starting in the new program.
15. The EDKP 396 instructor should look at the possibility of modifying the practicum experience for the kinesiology students. For example, propose to some McGill students with disabilities that they participate in a special on-campus program. This program could either focus on rehabilitation, research or fitness, depending on the needs and interests of the participating students.
16. On Wednesday morning, before the beginning of each session, the equipment men should gather, outside of the equipment room in the gymnasium, all the equipment relevant to younger children and all the equipment needed to work with partners presenting lower physical abilities. This will give a better visibility of the available equipment.
17. During the preparation weeks in January the EDKP 396 instructor should present a slide show of participants in action from the previous year and mention their names so the coaches can identify their partner. This will decrease the level of anxiety prior to the first meeting and will be easier and faster to construct than the video presented this year.
18. The EDKP 396 instructor should propose that each coach finds articles on their partner disabilities. These articles could be put on reserve at the education library in order to share information with classmates and to build a file for each disability.

19. Have a graduate student develop a web site with information about different disabilities and contraindication and program suggestions, like the NCPAD web site:

WWW.ncpad.org

20. Give the previous year's report on the partner to the McGill students for a period of two weeks only, with a mention of "not for reproduction" on the cover page.

### *Conclusion*

My direct participation in all aspects of PDC put me in the best possible position to investigate. I had a direct contact with coaches, partners and their teachers. The investigations performed during this practicum demonstrated that PDC is a well run program. Therefore, my personal contribution to the improvement of the program consisted of small tools that were meant to improve the communication between REACH and McGill. Another contribution was a series of twenty recommendations that emerged from the different investigations and personal experiences. The decision to follow or reject these recommendations and to keep the communication tools is in the hands of Dr.Reid.

Much of the supporting documentation from this internship is available in electronic form on a compact disk wich should be found at the back of this inrenship report. In the event of a CD missing please contact the School of Human Kinetic and Recreation of Memorial University of Newfoundland Canada.











