

REFLECTIONS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF TPSR PROGRAMMING WITH AT-RISK-YOUTH IN THE CITY OF OTTAWA, CANADA

REFLEXIONES SOBRE LA IMPLEMENTACIÓN DE UN PROGRAMA TPSR CON JÓVENES EN RIESGO EN LA CIUDAD DE OTTAWA, CANADÁ

Bryce **Barker** ► University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada

Tanya **Forneris**⁷ ► University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada

ABSTRACT

The decline in youth physical activity levels has been a topic of increasing interest in the media and research in recent years (World Health Organization, 2004; Salmon, Booth, Phongsavan, Murphy, & Timpiero, 2007). As a result there has been a call for increased programming, particularly after-school and community-based programming (Active Healthy Kids Canada, 2011; World Health Organization, 2004). The Teaching Personal Social Responsibility (TPSR) program framework developed by Don Hellison has become influential in the development of programs designed to facilitate youth development through sport and physical activity, particularly for vulnerable or at-risk youth (Hellison, 1995; Hellison & Walsh, 2002). This article will discuss the opportunities and challenges in implementing TPSR-based physical activity programming with the express intention of developing socially responsible and physically active youth. More specifically, we will explain how the program evolved over time and the experience of implementing the program in various contexts.

RESUMEN

La disminución en la actividad física de los jóvenes ha sido un tema de creciente interés en los medios de comunicación y en la investigación de los últimos años (Organización Mundial de la Salud, 2004; Salmon, Booth, Phongsavan, Murphy, y Timpiero, 2007). Como resultado, ha habido una creciente demanda de programas, en especial programas extra-escolares y comunitarios (Active Healthy Kids Canada, 2011; Organización Mundial de la Salud, 2004). El marco del programa Enseñando Responsabilidad Personal Social (Teaching Personal Social Responsibility (TPSR)) elaborado por Don Hellison, se ha convertido en una influencia en la elaboración de

⁷ tforneri@uottawa.ca

programas diseñados para facilitar el desarrollo de la juventud a través del deporte y la actividad física, especialmente para los jóvenes vulnerables o en situación de riesgo (Hellison, 1995; Hellison y Walsh, 2002). En este artículo, se discutirán las oportunidades y los desafíos en la implementación de programas de actividad física basado en TPSR con el objetivo explícito de desarrollar una juventud socialmente responsable y físicamente activa. En concreto, vamos a discutir el proceso de desarrollo e implementación de estos programas; desde el establecimiento de una relación con una organización comunitaria juvenil a la obtención de fondos y los desafíos en la implementación, mientras se garantiza el marco de los programas y la realización de la investigación comunitaria.

KEYWORDS. TPSR, at-risk.youth, PULSE program, community-based after-school programming, Physical activity and fitness levels.

PALABRAS CLAVE. TPSR, juventud en riesgo, programa PULSE, actividades extra escolares comunitarias, niveles de actividad física.

1. Positive Youth Development

Positive Youth Development (PYD) is a field of study that examines how youth thrive and recognizes that youth should be given opportunities to develop as healthy, functioning adults through involvement in youth programming as opposed to simply avoiding or remediating negative behaviours (Lerner & Benson, 2002; Pittman, Irby, & Ferber, 2000). As a result, a number of programs have been developed to encourage PYD across a number of geographical areas, age groups, levels of policy, infrastructure, and areas of intervention (e.g., education, social work, extracurricular programming, and religious groups) (Ma, Phelps, Lerner & Lerner, 2009; Pertegal, Oliva, & Hernando, 2010; Phelps et al., 2009; Riggs, Bohnert, Guzman, & Davidson, 2010; Romeo & Kelley, 2009; Sun & Shek, 2010; Vo & Park, 2009). Moreover, in recent years a number of PYD based program frameworks designed to engage youth using sport as a vehicle to enhance development have been developed. The Teaching Personal and Responsibility framework (TPSR) and life skills programming are two very prominent youth program frameworks which combine an explicit focus on helping youth apply life skills in and outside of sport. It has been suggested that these two PYD perspectives are complimentary and that future PYD programs work to integrate both of these approaches (Holt & Jones, 2008).

TPSR has utilized sport, martial arts, and career exploration in a number of community program settings (e.g., alternative schools, secondary schools, after-

school programming, and summer programming) to deliver PYD programming (Hellison & Walsh, 2002; Holt & Jones, 2008; Martinek, McLaughlin, & Schilling, 1999; Walsh, 2007; Wright & Burton, 2008). Although not tested to specifically increase physical activity (PA) and fitness levels of youth, these studies and others indicate that TPSR is a valid program framework for increasing such outcomes as it focuses on developing self-control, effort, self-coaching, leadership and transference. Therefore, apart from being a preferred avenue for enhancing youth development the TPSR framework may also have the potential to increase the effectiveness of interventions designed to increase youth PA and fitness. In addition, integrating TPSR into community-based PA programming aligns well with the values and goals of many community organizations. These organizations aim to enhance the overall health and well-being of youth through programming which addresses identified participant needs. Therefore, PA interventions for youth may be best served to adopt a shift in focus similar to PYD in general and TPSR specifically, where researchers and practitioners are not only attempting to avoid the negative consequences of an inactive lifestyle (obesity, diabetes, later-developed cancers, etc.), but attempting to create contexts in which youth have the opportunity to form relationships with caring adults and intentionally teach and practice healthy living skills. Teaching youth healthy living skills within a positive context will not only help in changing health behaviour in the short-term but will enable youth to engage in healthy behaviours for a lifetime so that they develop into healthy, functioning adults.

2. Community-Based Youth Physical Activity Interventions

There is a growing need to address the PA levels of youth, particularly in North America. In fact, research has shown that in Canada “fitness levels of children and youth have declined significantly and meaningfully since 1981, regardless of age or sex” (Tremblay, Shields, Craig, Janssen, & Gorber, 2010, p. 1). In addition, research from Active Healthy Kids Canada shows that only 7% of youth are meeting Canada's guidelines for physical activity which is 60 minutes per day of moderate-vigorous physical activity (Active Healthy Kids Canada, 2011) and that youth from families living on low incomes are more likely to be inactive (Shields, 2006). In 2011, Active Healthy Kids Canada specifically identified after-school settings as essential to increasing the PA levels of Canadian youth. Therefore, this may be an optimal time to augment community-based after-school programming to help increase PA levels among youth. However, research has shown that a

number of barriers exist with regards to participation in community-based afterschool programs and include transportation to and from existing after-school programs and a lack of interest among school staff and administrators to implement after-school opportunities focused on PA (Active Healthy Kids Canada, 2009). One potential solution identified by Active Healthy Kids Canada (2009) was to initiate integrated school and community-based programs where recreation leaders come into schools and lead after-school programs in the school or help to increase access to community PA centres.

In sum, researchers and practitioners have recognized that there is a need for community-based PA interventions for youth (World Health Organization, 2004; Salmon, Booth, Phongsavan, Murphy, & Timpiero, 2007). TPSR represents a viable program framework for after-school community-based programming aimed at improving both the physical health (PA and fitness levels) and psychosocial development (personal and social responsibility) of youth. The remainder of this article will discuss the evolution of the PULSE program which was developed using the TPSR framework, yet explicitly focuses on increasing physical activity and fitness along with positive youth development outcomes. More specifically, this article will discuss the development and early applications of the PULSE program, profiling the context in Ottawa, Ontario, challenges in working in an alternative and after-school setting, and successes of this program in using the TPSR framework to increase PA and fitness levels.

3. The Development of the PULSE Program

A summer program that Barker developed and implemented in 2009 in the city of Cornwall, a small city located in Eastern, Ontario was what inspired the development of the PULSE program. While completing a Masters program in Intervention and Consultation in Sport, Physical Activity and Health, I (lead author) observed that while sport and physical activity are posited to increase youth development there are few programs that explicitly focus on developing both life skills and healthy living skills such as sport and physical activity competencies. I also observed that this was particularly true for at-risk youth in many communities. Upon further investigation and study of PYD, I recognized that program frameworks such as TPSR and life skills have great potential in addressing youth development through physical activity and health by providing opportunities to allow youth to learn and further enhance skills as opposed to only discussing the negative implications of physical inactivity (e.g., obesity, diabetes).

As a result, I proposed an idea for a summer program to two colleagues, one from a youth serving organization in the area and another colleague who had previously worked for a youth serving organization but was now working as a certified fitness trainer. As a team, we collaborated and implemented a program that introduced at-risk youth to different types of PA with the intention of fostering the ability and motivation to engage in PA independently following the summer program. The program also integrated a number of life skills. These life skills were intentionally taught through weekly sessions and were based on the SUPER program developed by Danish (2002) (see below for more details).

The outcomes of this summer program included implementing a PYD program to explicitly address life skills and PA levels in at-risk youth, removing barriers to community resources for at-risk youth, and offering participants a guided introduction to consistent PA in a community fitness facility. While there was particular interest in continuing this program by all stakeholders, the feasibility of ongoing programming was limited by geographical restrictions, scheduling (participants returning to school), and logistical concerns (youth transportation to and from the community facility). Following the program I was exposed to new PYD approaches including the TPSR framework. As I began my doctoral studies with professor Tanya Forneris (second author), whose areas of expertise include PYD and developing, implementing and evaluating youth programs, I learned more about the TPSR framework and was motivated to continue my work with at-risk youth in the community using TPSR. Subsequently I participated in a week long TPSR training course at Adelphi University with Dr. Don Hellison and Dr. Sarah Doolittle. This week-long training course was pivotal in the development and refinement of the PULSE program.

4. The PULSE Program in Action

To get the PULSE program off the ground and running, we collaborated with a community youth serving organization that specialized in working with at-risk youth in the city of Ottawa to conduct a pilot implementation of the program. More specifically, this non-profit youth serving organization works primarily with at-risk youth in various stages of care (foster children, open and closed custody youth, youth in short term care) and runs an alternative school for these youth. After discussing the program with all involved it was decided that this alternative school would be a good location for the pilot of the PULSE program.

The foci of the PULSE program were: (1) to use the TPSR framework to help youth in their psychosocial development; and (2) to offer the youth a developmentally appropriate experience with physical activity. More specifically, the program introduced the youth to the rudiments of resistance training and gave youth the opportunity to try different types of physical activity, taking advantage of developmentally appropriate resources in the community. The PULSE pilot program consisted of two program sessions per week. One session took place during the physical education period at the alternative school and the second session took place at a nearby community fitness centre that catered to athletes and team sports. The rationale for introducing the community fitness centre sessions were to normalize physical activity for the youth and help them feel comfortable in a community setting while removing the financial barriers associated with community fitness facilities.

Each program session began with relational time which consisted of informal conversations with individuals following up with youth regarding their everyday lives and building a positive rapport. The relational talk was followed by the awareness talk which focused on the different TPSR levels and a variety of life skills including goal setting, overcoming barriers, seeking support and avoiding those who detract from goals. At the start of the awareness talk the youth each rated themselves on how well they believed they would do with regards to the different TPSR levels (self-control, effort, self-coaching, leadership, and truly strong person). We modified the term for the fifth level from 'transference' to 'truly strong person' in order to fit the program context. In other words, the program sought to assist youth to develop into a physically, emotionally and socially strong individual both inside and outside of the program. All levels were presented and explained in detail at the beginning of the program and were continually revisited as the sessions progressed. This self-rating component served to help focus participants and to help program leaders observe how the youth were progressing through the various levels and to tailor the sessions accordingly. For instance, if a participant rates their expectation for leadership high for that session then it is an opportunity for the program staff to try to give this participant a chance to take on a greater leadership role (Hellison, 1995; Hellison, Cutforth, Kallusky, Martinek, Parker & Stiehl, 2000; Hellison & Walsh, 2002). In addition, the teaching of life skills was incorporated into each of the awareness talks. These life skills were drawn from the SUPER program (Danish, 2002), and focused on increasing self-regulation through explicitly addressing life skills necessary to successfully

engage in regular physical activity (e.g., goal setting, problem solving, overcoming barriers). Previous research has shown that TPSR programming can lead to increased self-efficacy for self-regulated learning (Escartí, Gutiérrez, Pascual, & Marín Suelves, 2010) and therefore supports the integration of life skills with the goal of increasing self-regulation.

Following the awareness talk was the activity time which consisted of introducing youth to the fundamentals of resistance and cardiovascular training, informed by national recommendations, with progression to independent practice of resistance and cardiovascular training on a regular basis (Kraemer & Fleck, 2005; Tremblay et al., 2011). Supervised PA was tailored towards the interests of each youth by focusing on their PA interests and sport goals. In each session the youth had the opportunity to try different types of PA and each session featured instruction from qualified community coaches and PA leaders. To conclude each session the participants engaged in reflection time. The program leaders asked participants to think about how they, and others, did in that day's lesson compared to their initial ratings on the five TPSR level discussed and recording at the beginning of the lesson. Having the youth rate themselves at the beginning and end of the program not only indicated progress from session to session but these ratings also offered material to discuss during one-on-one conversations with program staff. If, for instance, a participant always seemed to struggle with leadership, the program staff would take the time to discuss strategies and appropriate opportunities for engaging in leadership during the lesson. It should be noted that this situation highlights the importance of having program staff facilitate various ways in which participants have the opportunity to demonstrate leadership, self-coaching, and how they can transfer being a "truly strong person" outside of the program.

The lead author led the program along with a colleague who had completed the Intervention in Sport, Physical Activity, and Health Masters' degree at the University of Ottawa. In addition, both program leaders had experience in personal fitness training and Barker had many years of experience working with at-risk youth as a youth support worker. As the program progressed, a number of guest speakers were incorporated who specialized in various types of physical activity and overall health and well-being (e.g., community health nurse, yoga instructor, hip hop dance instructor, rugby coach, soccer coach, and kickboxing coach) to expose the youth to new physical activities in a supportive TPSR program context.

Although the initial plan for the pilot program was to progress through all of the TPSR levels using the TPSR program session format (e.g., relational time,

awareness talk, activity time, reflection time); a number of challenges prevented a progression through all of the levels. First, the nature of the alternative school was such that youth were in constant flux, as they were in different stages and types of care, ranging from community youth in need of an alternative school setting, to foster youth, to youth in closed custody in relation to under-age criminal activity, to transfers to different agencies and in distant parts of the province (up to 1500 km away). Often, the most committed youth in the program were also the youth who were integrated back into the regular school system because of their behavioural and/or academic improvement. Although integration back into the community and regular school system was a positive outcome and a goal of the alternative school, the constant movement of youth in and out of the school resulted in having to continuously integrate new youth in to the ongoing programming. This constant flux of participants made it difficult to really progress through all of the various TPSR levels for each participant, especially to leadership and transference out of the program since consistent attendance in the program over time is often necessary to develop leadership skills and to adequately address the concept of transfer outside of the program. To deal with this issue, the program leaders re-introduced the basic TPSR guidelines of respect for others and instructors to the new youth joining the program. However, the program leaders recognized that it was difficult to maintain a cohesive group due to relational and trust difficulties that occur between youth when there is instability present. This constant flux also affected the ability of the program leaders to establish long-term relationships with many of the youth as they would often leave the program abruptly. In addition, new youth would enter the program at various stages and, at times, lead to a shorter time period to establish relationships with the youth. As a result, the program leaders felt that they did not have as strong an impact as would have been possible with a more stable and consistent group of participants.

Another distinct challenge in this alternative school setting was related to staffing within the school environment. While the direct school staff (e.g., teachers) were receptive to the program and helpful in reinforcing the program concepts there was a constant influx of new staff whose main functions were to standby and observe youth in case of violent conflicts or breaks in parole/plans of care (e.g., case workers). While this precaution did not prove necessary in the majority of situations there were two violent incidences in which additional staff was needed. On the other hand, it was a distinct disadvantage dealing with staff who were not familiar with the program concepts and at times made the youth feel self-conscious, as they were being 'watched' and detracted from the program atmo-

sphere. In hindsight, it would have been beneficial to involve these additional staff somehow into the program.

We obtained feedback for the pilot program by conducting a focus group with the participants who had remained at the school. This proved to be effective in understanding the youth's experience in the PULSE program. Through this process it was discovered that although the students had varying levels of understanding regarding the program goals, they were satisfied with the level of support provided by the program leaders, and enjoyed the program enough to wish to continue the program if the opportunity arose. Furthermore, the youth reported enjoying the visits to the community fitness facility and suggested that visits such as these and ones to other areas in the city where they could participate in different types of PA would be beneficial. Therefore, although the youth appear to have enjoyed the program and felt supported it was also recognized by the program leaders that the constant flux of youth negatively impacted the program and that in the future, steps would need to be taken to ensure that the group remained stable. It was also recognized that group stability would be important for program evaluation since pre-post testing regarding PYD outcomes, PA and fitness indicators would be hindered by a rotating student roster at the school.

In sum, despite significant challenges, the PULSE pilot implementation was effective in establishing a program atmosphere based on the TPSR program framework. Each program session integrated relational time, an awareness talk, activity time and reflection time to consistently draw the students back to an understanding and incorporation of the TPSR levels, particularly self-control, effort and self-coaching, within each program session. In addition, the leaders observed that the participants who had consistently attended the program often demonstrated levels 1 to 3 (self-control, effort and self-coaching) by the end of the program. More specifically, the youth were able to control their conduct, engaged more in the activities within each session and worked on improving both their physical activity and sport skills and the life skills taught in the program.

A potential strategy while working in an alternative school setting or any setting in which there will be movement of program participants is to start with a smaller group who will remain in the program for its entirety and work to help them progress through the various TPSR levels before integrating newer students into the program. This may mean limiting the program to a small number of students but may alleviate the potential for youth to constantly have to adjust to new group dynamics. In addition, it is crucial to work with program staff as well as occasional

staff to ensure that everyone understands the program structure and necessity for actively supporting youth in working through a TPSR program.

While there are potential drawbacks in engaging an alternative school context, there are considerable opportunities to positively impact the lives of at-risk youth, and improve their experience of PA by using the TPSR program framework. Unfortunately, the diversity of alternative school contexts limits the preparedness of practitioners and researchers from successfully preparing for these intervention settings, yet it is important to recognize that adaptation of interventions is a necessary and potential source of strength for programs intervening to increase PYD and PA with youth in diverse settings (Anderson et al., 2009).

Through our experiences in collaborating at the alternative school the authors continued to work with the same large youth serving organization and applied for a provincial grant to implement the PULSE program in other contexts in the city of Ottawa. The funding application was successful and permitted the implementation of PULSE for two years. Below we describe the program that was implemented in a new context in 2010-2011 and will be implemented within the same context in 2011-2012.

5. PULSE Phase II

In our initial planning of the second phase we hoped to offer similar programming to a larger, more diverse group of at risk youth. The plan was to work with a variety of youth serving organizations and have them refer youth to the PULSE program. This way, PULSE would still be implemented in an after-school context but we could actively recruit a larger more diverse group of youth from the community. Preliminary inquiries with youth serving organizations that worked with at-risk youth across the city revealed a high level of interest in enrolling participants in the program. However, in practice the organizations could not overcome the barriers (travel, conflicting engagements, need for constant supervision were the most common impediments) to having their youth participate. A complete lack of referrals (N=0) led to an insufficient number of potential youth for the program and we had to re-evaluate our initial plan.

After discussing a number of options with the stakeholders such as police youth services, smaller non-profit youth serving organizations, social services, and high school guidance departments involved, it was decided to shift the focus and work directly with secondary schools designated under the Ontario Ministry of

Education as Urban and Priority High Schools. These schools receive funding to help accommodate more community presence within schools and to help youth work through the challenges of increased bullying, crime, and higher dropout rates within their schools. We made contact with two high schools and two community fitness centres located near the high schools and all parties were open to collaboration on this project. In 2010-2011 the program was implemented in collaboration with one of the two urban and priority schools, as logistics and the timeline of the intervention only allowed time to intervene in one high school.

As in the first year of programming at the alternative school, the foci of program were: (1) to use the TPSR framework to help youth in their psychosocial development; and (2) to offer the youth a developmentally appropriate experience with physical activity. The program followed the same format as outlined above but the leaders were able to work with a consistent group of youth. We initially recruited eighteen participants though a number of youth dropped out within the first two weeks due to conflicts with high school sport practices and co-op programs offered through the school. In addition, a group of friends who entered the program together believed they should be able to split from the group and do as they pleased within the JCC facilities. They would try to enter the community fitness facility outside of program hours and caused disruptions at the facility. The program staff explained that the group was a guest group using the facilities that they were not individual members, and therefore their behaviour was not in keeping with the community centre's policy or the expectations of the PULSE program. However, despite being welcomed back to the program after discussing that disrespecting the rules of the community centre and program were not acceptable a number of the youth withdrew from the program. Despite the dropout, programming continued with a stable group of eight youth participants and followed the structure of TPSR as outlined above.

Therefore, compared to the implementation of the PULSE program at the alternative school we were able to work consistently with the same group of youth for the majority of the program. We observed that having a consistent group of youth provided the opportunity to progress through the TPSR levels more effectively, particularly for leadership and transference. For example, there were more opportunities for youth to take on leadership roles. Once the youth had learned the fundamentals of resistance and cardiovascular training they could then take turns leading or co-leading the activity sessions. Moreover, due to the consistent attendance the youth had increased opportunities to practice self-

control, put forth effort, coach themselves and develop into leaders. This process enabled us to discuss the concept of transference and how to be a truly strong person both inside and outside of the program.

6. The Future of the PULSE Program

In 2011-2012 we will be working with the two urban and priority schools mentioned above. We will start with implementation of the program in one school in October of 2011 while the second school will serve as wait-list control group. The rationale for this approach is twofold. First, this approach will allow for a comprehensive evaluation of the impact of PULSE on PYD, PA and fitness levels. Second, due to limited human resources, implementing the program one school at a time will allow for a more effective implementation, especially with regard to implementation fidelity.

To decrease the potential of the dropout problem we will be inviting those youth who are not participating in school sports or co-op programs that may conflict with the program schedule. In addition, we will have a discussion with the youth prior to the start of the program to discuss the importance of committing to the program and the benefits of making such a commitment. In addition, for 2011-2012, a number of senior (fourth year) students from the School of Human Kinetics will be trained to assist in the delivery and evaluation of the program. We believe that incorporating these students will foster more effective relationships between leaders and students as the ratio of leaders to students will be reduced. These students will meet the participants after school and accompany them to the community fitness centre where the program sessions will take place. In addition, each of the students will track attendance and work with a sub-group of participants within the program to help them progress through the TPSR levels, learn different life skills, and to increase their PA and fitness.

With regards to evaluation, we, with the help of the Human Kinetics students will record what occurred in each program session using a program logbook. This logbook will help in determining how many program sessions were implemented and whether these sessions were delivered as planned. In these logbooks staff will make notes regarding their observations of the youths' progression through the TPSR levels which can then be compared to the youths' own self-ratings. In addition, an outcome evaluation consisting of a variety of psychosocial measures and physical activity measures will be conducted. In addition, the participants will complete a semi-structured interview as this will help gain a more in-depth

understanding of the youths' experience in the PULSE program. This evaluation plan will help us to examine both implementation fidelity as well as the impact of participating in the PULSE program. This is an important step in the future development of PULSE and other TPSR-based programs as without such forms of evaluation we are unable to understand what components of the program are working well and how the program can be improved to ensure the youth participants benefit as much as possible from their experiences in the program.

7. Conclusion

Overall, the successes of the PULSE program to date have been in developing a consistent program structure through which youth can progress towards independent PA and the application of TPSR in community-based PA programming for youth. The advantage of using the TPSR framework in a community-based program is that it has been shown through research to be an effective framework when working with at-risk youth and in particular for enhancing PYD. The PULSE program provides the opportunity to assess whether TPSR can also be used in increasing PA and fitness levels. In addition, the PULSE program provides the much needed opportunities for youth to be active during after-school hours (Active Healthy Kids Canada, 2011) and has removed barriers to accessing community resources by collaborating with nearby facilities.

Moreover, this work demonstrates that academics can successfully collaborate with community youth serving organizations to deliver TPSR programming focused on increasing PA and fitness levels of youth. PA in the after-school context has been a major focus for research and intervention yet there are few published program frameworks that are amenable to youth development in the after-school context (Salmon et al., 2007). TPSR is a program framework that has been supported in a number of youth contexts, appears to be well-suited to increasing PA, and can allow researchers to better understand program impact by using tools such as the PSRQ (Li, Wright, Rukavina & Pickering, 2008) and the Multidimensional Scales of Perceived Self-Efficacy (Bandura, 1990). As a result, TPSR has the potential to bridge the gap between policy and research-based advocacy and youth serving organizations by offering a dynamic program framework for increasing the overall health and well-being of youth in an after-school program.

There are considerable challenges to adapting any PYD programming, including TPSR programming, to specific contexts as profiled above. However, while

practitioners and researchers may encounter specific challenges when implementing such programs, strategies such as staff training, collaborating closely with youth serving organizations, school administrators, community fitness centre staff, and certified fitness trainers/exercise scientists will ensure the best possible outcomes regarding program fidelity, participant outcomes and capacity to significantly affect PYD outcomes and PA/fitness levels.

In closing, TPSR represents a potentially valid framework for after-school programs to address PYD and PA simultaneously in a community-based after school program. This represents a necessary step in bridging public health recommendations regarding increasing youth PA and fitness levels using TPSR, a program framework that has been supported by research in various contexts involving at-risk youth (Hellison & Walsh, 2002; Holt & Jones, 2008; Martinek, McLaughlin, & Schilling, 1999; Walsh, 2007; Wright & Burton, 2008).

References

ACTIVE HEALTHY KIDS CANADA (2009) *Report card on physical activity for children and youth*. Toronto, ON: Active Healthy Kids Canada.

ACTIVE HEALTHY KIDS CANADA (2011) Don't let this be the most physical activity our kids get after school. *The Active Healthy Kids Canada report card on physical activity and youth*. Toronto, ON: Active Healthy Kids Canada.

ANDERSON, J., PARKER, W., STEYN, N. P., GRIMSRUD, A., KOBEL-ALEXANDER, T., LAMBERT, E. V., & MCIZA, Z. (2009) *Interventions on diet and physical activity: What works*. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO.

BANDURA, A. (1990) *Multidimensional Scales of Perceived Self-Efficacy*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University.

DANISH, S. (2002) *SUPER (sports united to promote education and recreation) program: Leader manual* (Third ed.). Richmond, VA: Lifeskills Center, Virginia Commonwealth University.

ESCARTÍ, A., GUTIÉRREZ, M., PASCUAL, C., & MARÍN SUELVE, D. (2010) Application of hellison's teaching personal and social responsibility model in physical education to improve self efficacy for adolescents at risk of dropping-out of school. *Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 13(2), 667-676.

HELLISON, D. (1995) *Teaching responsibility through physical activity*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

- HELLISON, D., CUTFORTH, N., KALLUSKY, J., MARTINEK, T., PARKER, M., & STIEHL, J. (2000) *Youth development and physical activity*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- HELLISON, D., & WALSH, D. (2002) Responsibility-based youth programs evaluation: Investigating the investigations. *Quest*, 54, 292-307.
- HOLT, N. L., & JONES, M. I. (2008) Future directions for positive youth development and sport. In N. L. Holt (Ed.), *Positive youth development in sport* (pp. 122-132). London: Routledge.
- KRAEMER, W. J., & FLECK, S. J. (2005) *Strength training for young athletes*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics Publishers.
- LERNER, R. M., & BENSON, P. L. (2002) *Developmental assets and asset-building communities: Implications for research, policy, and practice*. New York, NY: Plenum Publishers.
- LI, W., WRIGHT, P. M., RUKAVINA, P. B., & PICKERING, M. (2008) Measuring students' perceptions of personal and social responsibility and the relationship to intrinsic motivation in urban physical education. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 27 (2), 167.
- MA, L., PHELPS, E., LERNER, J., & LERNER, R. (2009) Academic competence for adolescents who bully and who are bullied findings from the 4-H study of positive youth development. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 29(6), 862-897.
- MARTINEK, T., MCLAUGHLIN, D., & SCHILLING, T. (1999) Project effort: Teaching responsibility beyond the gym. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 70(6), 59-65.
- PERTEGAL, M., OLIVA, A., & HERNANDO, A. (2010) Promoting positive youth development through school-based programmes. *Cultura y Educacion*, 22(1), 53-66.
- PHELPS, E., ZIMMERMAN, S., WARREN, A., JELICIC, H., VON EYE, A., & LERNER, R. (2009). The structure and developmental course of positive youth development (PYD) in early adolescence: Implications for theory and practice. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 30(5;S1), 571-584.
- PITTMAN, K., IRBY, M., & FREBER., T. (2000) Unfinished business: Further reflections on a decade of promoting youth development. In P.P Ventures (Ed.), *Youth Development: Issues, challenges and Directions* (pp. 17-64). Philadelphia: Public Private Ventures.

BRYCE BARKER et al.

Reflections on the implementation TPSR — At-Risk-Youth at the city of Ottawa.

RIGGS, N., BOHNERT, A., GUZMAN, M., & DAVIDSON, D. (2010) Examining the potential of community-based after-school programs for latino youth. *American*