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Abstract

Adventure-based Learning (ABL) is the purposeful use of activities in sequence to improve personal and social development of participants (Cosgriff, 2000). ABL goes beyond instant activities (i.e. ice-breakers, cooperative games) to create an environment in which students enjoy the challenge while developing emotional and social competencies (Panicucci, Faulkingham Hunt, Kohut, Rheingold, & Stratton, 2002). The ABL curriculum model serves as a good fit in schools for the personal and social development of children and as an alternative to the multi-activity curriculum model (Sutherland, Ressler, Stuhr, 2009). The responsibility of successful, meaningful, adventure based programming lies in how the content is facilitated (Panicucci et al., 2002), and a reason for the limited number of P-12 physical education professionals using ABL as a content area is due to a lack of experience and formal training in this curriculum (Sutherland et al., 2009). The purpose of this study is to review the experiences of two novice ABL facilitators (i.e. two in-service physical education teachers) during training in, and facilitation of a completed 10-day ABL instructional unit in their respective classes. Transformative Learning Theory (TLT) (Mezirow, 1997) guided this qualitative case study. TLT is a reconstructive theory that focuses on adult learning and adult educator, grounded on the nature of human communication, and seeking agreement on our own interpretations and beliefs is central to human communication and the learning process (Mezirow, 1991; 1997). Three themes emerged
for each participant. Findings suggest: (a) further training and support of in-service teachers prior to facilitating ABL, (b) development of more in-depth content knowledge in ABL, and (c) an identification of effective and ineffective ABL pedagogies through critical self-reflection.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Adventure Education (AE) has been widely known for over 60 years as a model that utilizes learning experiences in the outdoors and natural environment that emphasizes unique, direct involvement in activity as well as relationships with oneself, others, and the environment. AE has been strongly influenced by the work John Dewey and Experiential Education (Dewey, 1938; Frank, 2004), where direct experience is followed by opportunities for reflection (i.e. discussion, writing, quiet time, etc.) guided by a facilitator. Dewey (1938) considered education to be a conscious, purposive, and informed activity, and that education was a process that involves a continuity of developed experiences. For a more purposeful and conscious approach to learning through experience, processing has become more structured to encourage individuals to plan, reflect, describe, analyze, and communicate about experiences (Luckner & Nadler, 1997).

Adventure Education uses adventurous activities that take place in the natural (or a simulated natural) environment to create unique experiences that provide emotional, physical, and social challenge (Ewert, 1989) that in turn has the potential to impact the interpersonal and intrapersonal development of participants (Priest & Gass, 2005). A principal goal in AE programs is to promote both the personal and social development of participants through positive impacts on self-esteem, self-confidence, self-awareness, communication, cooperation with others, trust, problem solving, and critical thinking (Bisson, 1998; Prouty, 1999). Critical to AE programming is the uniqueness of the
experience and participant contributions and meaning making through processing (Brown, 2006). Bisson (1998) proposed a “hypothetically correct sequence” for AE programming based on the expertise of 25 AE professionals. The sequence moves participants from acquaintance activities, to deinhibitizer activities, to communication activities, to trust activities, to group problem-solving activities, to individual low-ropes-course events, to individual high-ropes-course events, and to outdoor pursuit experience. In recent years claims have been made for educational value of participating in AE programs (Brown, 2006; Brown, 2009). AE research has included mostly outcome-based studies, particularly those that determine if participants’ direct experiences in adventure programming have a positive impact on intrapersonal themes such as self-esteem, self-efficacy, self-confidence (Priest, 1996; Paxton, 1999; McKenzie, 2000) as well as other physical (e.g. personal readiness, etc.), social (e.g. civic responsibility, etc.), and intellectual outcomes (e.g., personal development) (Bailey, 1999; Neill, 1997; Brookes, 2003).

Criticisms of research in AE have included the lack of rigor (Gass, 1993), the use of weak research designs (Brown, 2006), and equivocal findings (Richards, 1997). Early research in AE has been limited to isolated, one-time outcome studies using pre-post questionnaires to report changes and determine if programs “worked” (Warner, 1990). More recently, studies have begun to use pretest-posttest designs and mixed methodologies that involve the implementation of, or direct experience in adventure programming, sandwiched between surveys and semi-structured interviews or focus group interviews (Weilbach, Meyer, & Monyeki, 2010; Gehris, Kress, & Swalm, 2011; Ewert & Yoshino, 2011). More recently research has begun to use more sophisticated
methodologies and examination of participant behaviors in AE programming (Brown, 2006; Zmudy, Curtner-Smith, & Steffen, 2009).

In recent years, Adventure Based Learning (ABL) has emerged as the most appropriate term to describe the PE version of AE. Cosgriff (2000) defined ABL as the deliberate use of sequenced activities for the personal and social development of students. Because ABL focuses specifically on personal and social development it has been promoted as an alternative model to traditional physical education (Chen & Ennis, 1996). ABL curricula emphasize themes of (a) building community, (b) cooperation, (c) emotional and physical trust, and (d) problem solving typically not found in tradition physical education curriculums (Frank, 2004).

ABL is a curriculum and content area not commonly used in school physical education programs (Brown, 2006). One reason may be the uniqueness of the ABL pedagogy. Teaching ABL in physical education is fundamentally different than teaching traditional physical education. In a traditional physical education lesson the pedagogy commonly aligns to that of direct instruction, where the teacher says and the student does (Metzler, 2011). The pedagogy of ABL focuses on student-centered learning and self-discovery as students participate in types of activities in contrast to more traditional methods of physical education instruction where students focus on skillfulness and knowledge by engaging in sport and games, fitness, and dance. Outcomes in an ABL lesson are commonly associated with the affective domain; a domain rarely given priority in traditional skills based approaches to physical education (Metzler, 2011).

Central to the pedagogy of ABL is the use of facilitation and processing (Brown, 2006; Sutherland, Ressler, & Stuhr, 2009). Facilitators help students make meaning of
the experience promoting the discovery of the most essential learning. The primary roles
of a facilitator include setting suitable experiences, posing problems, setting boundaries,
supporting learners, insuring physical and emotional safety, and facilitating the learning
process (Kolb, 1984). Processing is most commonly addressed in ABL by utilizing a
range of debrief strategies, arguably the most important function in ABL programming
(Sutherland et al., 2009a).

Research in ABL has involved the introduction and existence of new curricula
and the perspectives of teachers and students in programs (Dyson & O’Sullivan, 1998;
Dyson, 2001; Dyson; 2002; Brown, 2006). ABL research has utilized a curricular model
(i.e. Project Adventure) as an integral component of substantial curriculum reform, not
excluding the importance of factors such as (a) a shared vision among colleagues, (b)
external support, (c) curricula integration, and decision making (Dyson & O’Sullivan,
1998). Additional ABL studies have investigated students’ perceptions of their PE
classes during ABL programming (Dyson, 1995), teachers experiences of conducting an
ABL approach in their classes (Dyson, 1996), construction of gender identities
(Humberstone, 1990), and the enhancement of gender equity (Humberstone, 1995).
Recently, research has examined the implementation of an ABL curriculum for
incorporating more social objectives into school physical education programs
(McCaughtry & Wojewuczki, 2003a).

ABL is increasingly being taught in pre-service teacher education programs and
researchers have turned their attention to examining how ABL is taught to pre-service
teachers (Sutherland, Stuhr, & Ressler, 2011). Three studies have investigated the
facilitation of ABL during pre-service teaching experiences, such as micro-teaching (i.e.
peer teaching) episodes in an undergraduate ABL course, five-day secondary practicum in a middle school (Sutherland et al., 2009), and in student teaching (Dillon, Tannehill, & O’Sullivan, 2010). The focus of this research was on how the pre-service teachers facilitated ABL, including their experiences conducting a debrief session. Findings from this line of inquiry supports claims that leading an effective student-centered debrief is not an easy process for pre-service physical education teachers to learn and the use of a student-centered debrief within the constraints of physical education is limited (Sutherland et al., 2009). The result of these studies led to the development of a debriefing model for novice teachers/facilitators to conduct student-centered debrief sessions. Sutherland and colleagues (in press) developed a debriefing model for novice teachers/facilitators that utilizes the metaphor of a Sunday Afternoon Drive. The facilitator begins the drive with ideas for the final destination, but without a set route of how to arrive at the destination.

**Purpose of the Study**

To date, research in ABL has provided teachers’ experiences and students of ABL programming. However, we know little beyond anecdotal evidence about the professional development of in-service teachers in ABL. In this study I use Transformative Learning Theory (Mezirow, 1997) as the lens to review experiences of two physical education teachers during their training and facilitation of ABL content within the context of an urban middle school. Transformative Learning Theory has been widely used to examine adult learners (Taylor, 2007; Taylor, 2008). Transformation is represented in a more fully developed frame of reference, where an individual is more inclusive, differentiating, and permeable to new information. Mezirow (1997) specified a
frame of reference as being comprised of a *meaning perspective* dimension and the resulting formation in one’s frame of reference. Meaning perspective is often used synonymously to a frame of reference, and further described as one’s disposition (Taylor, 2007). One’s frame of reference includes a collection of *meaning schemes* (i.e. metaphors, codes, or symbols) that help the learner make sense of their lived world. The theoretical frame allows the study to target transformation on a larger scale, and specifically pursue vignettes of meaning making during the facilitation of ABL instruction in a middle school physical education program. Lastly, transformation at the micro and macro level operates under the assumption of ongoing critical reflection. In this study, the use of the theoretical frame helped identify modes of critical reflection employed by participants and the researcher.

Thus, the purpose of this study is to review the experiences of two novice ABL facilitators (i.e. two in-service physical education teachers) during training in, and facilitation of a completed 10-day ABL instructional unit in their respective classes.

**Research Questions**

1. In what ways do (middle school) physical education teachers demonstrate transformation during the facilitation of an instructional unit in Adventure Based Learning?

2. How do physical education teachers identify and use meaning schemes in their daily physical education instruction?

3. In what ways do physical education teachers transform their frame of reference during a critical self-review of teaching?
Significance of the Inquiry

This study extends the literature in the following ways:

1. Participants in the study are in-service teachers that are being trained to deliver usable content in their existing physical education programs. Currently, related ABL literature has been mostly limited to pre-service teachers working in micro-teaching (peer teaching) episodes or in short-term practicum contexts.

2. Transformative Learning Theory is used as a model to support the direct experiences of two adult learners (participants) as they are trained in ABL content and facilitate an instructional unit. The theory informed all research methods utilized in the study.

3. ABL is presented as a content area in this study for a middle school physical education program. The content area is new for the context.

4. This study informs further research, particularly in the development of more useful pedagogies in physical education teacher education programs, including the development of a debriefing model for novice ABL facilitators

Limitations

The following were considered to be limitations of the study:

1. The number of visits to the school site (20) for two, 10-day instructional units.

2. The two teachers taught different grade levels of students within the same physical education program thus debriefing ABL activities with different aged students.
3. Teachers were not able to be trained together for each of the planned training sessions as training occurred during times that fit each participants’ schedules (i.e. before school, planning periods, lunch time, after school).

4. Video observations occasionally did not capture all students at all times of a lesson, especially during facilitator-lead debriefs.

**Delimitations**

The following were considered to be delimitations of the study:

1. The use of an instructional unit in ABL at an urban middle school.

2. The findings are limited to two teachers and each of their classes being observed.

3. Series of data collection methods, including teacher training, direct observation and video observation of facilitated lessons, life history interview, semi-structured teacher interviews, coaching sessions, and researcher journal).

4. Teachers agreed to facilitate a 10-day instructional unit for this study in contrast to other units within their program that are fewer days.

5. The two participants in the study were female, African American physical education teachers with a combined total of over 30 years of teaching experience that initially accepted ABL as a usable content area within their physical education program.

**Definition of Terms**

This section will define the terms associated with the study to ensure clarity as they are used throughout the report.

*Adventure Based Learning (ABL)* – Name of content area/instructional unit for the study; the deliberate use of sequenced activities for the personal and social
development of participants (Cosgriff, 2000); themes addressed through a series of sequenced activities include (a) community building, (b) establishing full-value norms, (c) communication and cooperation, (d) emotional and physical trust, and (e) problem solving.

*Adventure Education (AE)*- Encountered experiences that provide physical, social, and emotional challenge to its participants in naturally occurring scenarios (or those that replicate natural scenarios) that are motivating and rewarding to participants (Ewert, 1989); a critical part of the leisure experience where engagement is freely chosen, students are intrinsically motivated, and uncertainty in the activity exists (Priest, 1990).

*Facilitation*- The process (art) of leading ABL activities, lessons, programming; often assumed by the physical education professional; the primary content area for leaders of ABL and all related adventure programming (Stanchfield, 2007); responsibilities include setting suitable experiences, posing problems, setting boundaries, supporting learners, insuring physical and emotional safety, and facilitating the learning process (Kolb, 1984)

*Frame of Reference*- The structure of assumptions through which we understand our experiences (Mezirow, 1997); transformed when it is more mature and inclusive; includes the two dimensions of (1) habits of mind and (2) point of view; a more fully developed *frame of reference* is more inclusive, differentiating, permeable, critically reflective, and integrative of experience (Taylor, 2008).

*Meaning Perspective*- The meaning perspective is one of the two dimensions suggested by Mezirow (1997) along with the *resulting formation* in one’s frame of
reference; where one stands; disposition; often used synonymously with frame of reference (Taylor, 2007)

Meaning Scheme - a belief or set of beliefs defined by the learner and their organization of information; symbolic models made by projecting images and symbolic models based on prior learning to our current sensed experience, and using analogies or codes to interpret new experiences (Taylor, 2008).

Processing – Learning activity structured to encourage individuals to plan, reflect, describe, analyze, and communicate about experiences (Luckner & Nadler, 1997); can occur any time before, during, or after an experience.

Transformative Learning Theory (TLT) - Learning theory that seeks to examine how individuals learn and make meaning of their experiences; the theory posits to transform problematic frames of reference and sets of fixed expectations to make them more inclusive, open, reflective, and emotionally able to change (Mezirow, 2000).
Chapter 2: Review of Literature

The purpose of this study is to review the experiences of two novice facilitators (i.e. two in-service physical education teachers) in Adventure Based Learning (ABL) during training in, and facilitation of a completed 10-day ABL instructional unit in their respective classes. This review frames ABL, distinguishes between similar terms mentioned above, and provides additional rationale for its utility in P-12 physical education programs. Lastly, the theoretical frame of Transformative Learning Theory is reviewed and more appropriately outlined for the intentions of the study.

**Experiential Education**

Experiential Education (EE) is a philosophy of education that describes the processes that occurs between a teacher and student that infuses direct experience with the learning environment and content (Itin, 1999). Experiential Education is the umbrella term under which disciplines such as Adventure Education, ABL, and others reside. Bear and Wilson (2007) assert that experience permeates all forms of learning and is how we make sense of situations. When an individual engages in an experience followed by critical reflection, and gains insight from the reflection, change occurs. Learning from experience without reflection is left to chance. The essence of Experiential Learning is a change in understanding and/or behavior (Luckner & Nadler, 1997).

Experiential education is considered to be effective when participants apply what they learned in a previous setting to other situations (Brown, 2006). Additionally, direct experience creates an individual identity with content or context and is more practical,
relevant, meaningful, useful, and authentic (Bell, 1995). Experiential education includes
the processing during or after an experience and often operates in a nonlinear fashion.

**Major Contributors**

The views of learning by John Dewey and Kurt Hahn are the basis of Experiential
Education (Frank, 2004). Dewey, Hahn, and David Kolb offer a philosophical and
theoretical base of experiential education. Dewey and Hahn both felt that learning
occurred in isolation unless the learner took time to reflect upon the experience in order
to gain insight and transfer the insight into one’s life. Experience is a relationship
between the individual and their environment, a replicable interaction in which meanings
are found (Dewey, 1938).

Dewey has been understood to be the father of experiential education and the
primary contributor to reflection in adventure education. Dewey views education as
process oriented, a vehicle for teaching students how to solve problems (Frank, 2004).
His view of education is a continual development of experience, interaction with the
environment, and application of the present to the future through reflection (Brown,
2006). The experience must be useful to the learner. Dewey introduced the link between
experience and learning and *doing with reflection* (i.e. experiential education). He
believed that learning and understanding consists of developmental experiences,
defended education of the whole person, and suggested that growth must be physical and
moral (Kraft, 1999). Dewey considered education to be a purposive activity; a process-
oriented approach that taught students how to solve problems since the solution is
determined by the problem to be solved (Frank, 2004). To Dewey, the process of thinking
through such problems itself was an adventure (Hunt, 1999). Kurt Hahn was devoted to
the teaching of the whole person and the implications on the many individuals that make up the larger community or classroom. Hahn promoted a shared sense in the journey toward an ultimate goal (Richards, 1990). His impact on experiential and adventure education includes his methods: those that teach the whole person, in which individuals are members of a larger community whose experiences are shared on the path to reach a group goal (Brown, 2006). Hahn was best known for his contribution to Outward Bound. He created three schools and a series of programs which were focused on developing honorable, aware, and active persons who held a sense of duty to others. Hahn designed Outward Bound to prepare young sailors in their attitudes and physical abilities in the areas of: (a) fitness, (b) initiative and enterprise, (c) memory and imagination, (d) skill and care, (e) self-discipline, and (f) compassion (Hattie et al., 1997; Miles & Priest, 1990; Richards, 1990). Hahn admittedly claimed that his ideas have been borrowed, copied, and stolen from those before him (Frank, 2004). To combat social issues, Hahn developed educational programs that emphasized character, service, challenge, and physical endeavors. Hahn saw adventure as a unique medium which actually allowed people to experience ideas of courage and compassion.

Kolb (1984) molded Dewey’s idea of reflection into the effective completion of the processing and experiential education and developed the Experiential Learning Cycle (ELC). The model is most commonly used to explain the process of experiential learning and is based on a four phase cyclical model that includes (a) concrete experience, (b) reflective observation, (c) abstract conceptualization, and (d) active experimentation. Several models within experiential learning have been used to explain the learning
process (e.g., Jarvis, 1987; Joplin, 1995; Peifer & Jones, 1980), and each are similar to include phases as those in the ELC.

Kolb explores the cyclical path of all learning from experience through reflection and conceptualizing to action and further experience. His four-stage model represented a keen interest in exploring the processes associated with making sense of concrete experiences and the different styles of learning involved. Kolb (1984) suggests the learning process begins with a person carrying out an action and seeing the effect of the action. His views align with Dewey and emphasize the developmental nature of Experiential Learning. Kolb defined learning as being “where knowledge is created through the transformation of experience” (Kolb, 1984).

**Adventure Education**

Adventure Education programs initially involved the use of the natural environment to create new experiences that provided physical, social, and emotional challenge to its participants (Ewert, 1989). Adventure Education emerged in the 1960’s as a response to social problems, recommending more focus on personal growth and group development. Since then, education with and through adventure has been presented in a range of contexts. Organizations such as Outward Bound and, more recently, Project Adventure intend to harness the liveliness of young people through outdoor pursuits and adventurous activities (Hirsch, 1999).

Miles and Priest (1990) provide the following definition of Adventure Education:

“[A] defining characteristic of adventure education is that a conscious and overt goal of the adventure is to expand the self, to learn and grow and progress toward the realization of human potential. The purpose of adventure education was to bring about change of the interpersonal and intrapersonal.”
Initially, Adventure Education was considered the generic term to include adventure programming, exploration schemes, survival and wilderness courses, and outdoor environmental education among others (Hattie et al., 1997). In response, AE has been better framed (Hattie et al, 1997; Priest and Gass, 1997; Brown, 2006). Priest and Gass (1997) identified eight principles of adventure programming that have been developed by the Association for Experiential Education to reflect ideals of experiential education. Each identify as commonly accepted terms of Adventure Education.

1. Adventure should be based on direct experience and should not be compromised. Placing the participant close to this experience will enhance learning.

2. Change occurs when people are placed in a situation which is challenging and creates a perception of discomfort of currently held practices.

3. Activities must be meaningful, and consequences are a result of actions that should be real and immediate but fall within an appropriate safety framework.

4. Consequences result in changes that are participant-based rather than leader-determined; this allows participants to determine the level and meaning of their experiences.

5. Changes that occur within groups or individuals should have relevance for the present as well as the future.

6. Processing and reflection help to enhance change and learning of the participant (Kolb, 1984; Proudman, 1995).

7. Participants are expected to be responsible for their involvement; participants are given power and control over their learning.
8. Participants have the opportunity to become actively involved in their learning through adventure activities. They deal with new situations by applying what has been previously learned.

Adventure Education has become more familiar under the terms above to better depict the specific activity involved in AE and adventure experiences. As Hattie and colleagues (1997) explained, AE is doing physically active things away from ones normal environment. Hattie et al. (1997) outlined the following as common features of adventure programs:

1. Occurs in wilderness settings
2. Involves a small group of participants
3. Includes assignments in a variety of mentally and/or physically challenging scenarios
4. Frequent and intense interactions that involve problem solving and decision making
5. The presence of a non-intrusive, trained leader (facilitator)
6. Programming that often lasts between two and four weeks

Hirsch (1999) stressed that all teachers, facilitators and leaders are doing adventure education and nothing in the field (i.e. teaching, education, etc.) exists in which we can impose definitive boundaries. However, the further clarification better aids practitioners (i.e. environmental educators, school teachers, etc.) in their conceptualization and utilization of adventure appropriately in their context.
Outcomes of Adventure Education

Adventure Education has been considered an effective instructional unit in physical education for its emphasis for addressing outcomes not commonly pursued within other educational environments. Outcomes of AE have been shared that were based on theory rather than empirical research. Common outcomes include personal growth (Ewert and Garvey, 2007) and increases in participants’ self-concept and interpersonal skills (McKenzie, 2000). Participation in AE programs has claimed outcomes of increases in student learning and student enjoyment, as well as positive impact on self-confidence and self-esteem (Brown, 2006). However, little empirical evidence exists to back up the belief of transfer (Brown, 2010). Despite some skepticism on how the transfer of AE outcomes can be certain within a learning environment, AE has been used to increase social interactions and acceptance between individuals and exhibit positive and appropriate interactions with each other and with oneself (Priest, 1990).

Adventure Education programs attempt to promote both the personal and social development of participants through positive impacts on the self (i.e. self-esteem, self-confidence, self-awareness) (Bisson, 1998; Prouty, 1999). AE research has included mostly outcome-based studies, including participants’ direct experiences in adventure programming have a positive impact on intrapersonal themes such as those listed above as well as physical (e.g. personal readiness, etc.), social (e.g. responsibility), and intellectual (e.g., personal development) outcomes (Bailey, 1999; Neill, 1997; Brookes, 2003).
Adventure Based Learning

In “Adventure Curriculum for Physical Education: Middle School”, Panicucci et al. (2002) described adventure programming within a school-based curriculum:

“A class becomes an adventure for students if there exists an element of surprise, if activities compel them into doing things they have never imagined possible. Adventure exists when there is engagement, and engagement comes from providing students with experiences that are unique and relevant. Adventure includes challenge-moments when students are on the brink of both success and failure, and where they both succeed and fail. Adventure is about taking risks-not necessarily physical risks, but emotional and “apparent” physical risks, where students see the natural consequences before them (p.1).

This definition and implementation of an Adventure Curriculum has occurred within school-based physical education programs. The curriculum is founded on establishing classroom norms and ensuring group readiness for progression within the curriculum when most appropriate. Themes within the curriculum include (but are not limited to) (a) building community in the classroom through intra-personal and interpersonal communication, (b) establishing full value norms, (c) developing cooperative skills, (d) fostering emotional and physical trust, and (e) engaging in a range of problem solving and physically challenging scenarios (Panicucci et al., 2002).

Marg Cosgriff’s (2000) definition of Adventure Based Learning is the most accurate for the intentions of this study and the evolution of ABL as school-based adventure programming to date. Cosgriff (2000) coined the ABL term as “the deliberate use of sequenced activities, particularly games, initiative activities, and problem solving activities for the personal and social development of the participants”. A general outcome for ABL was for personal and social development of participants. Such development is through innovative and sequenced activities, experiential learning, use of
educational goals and curriculum, and students as active members of the school and community. ABL in school-based physical education programs intends to use purposefully planned activities in meeting the outcomes related to interpersonal and intrapersonal development. ABL emphasizes the development of interpersonal and intrapersonal relationships while not assuming or making unrealistic claims of environmental awareness during instruction. Others (Panicucci et al., 2002; Frank, 2004) suggest a sequencing of ABL activities should move individuals (i.e. group members, students) through themes that include but are not limited to: community building, communication, establishing full value norms, cooperation, trust, problem solving, and challenge.

Bisson (1998) discussed the differences in uniqueness or universality, paying attention to activities for their appropriate within specific contexts. Bisson (1998) describes a common storyline with sequencing that includes a beginning, middle, and end of an (a) activity, (b) lesson, and (c) instructional unit while giving the appropriate attention to activities useful for specific contexts. She recommends an initial sequence with an assumption of flexibility as needed. In more recent years, ABL has been further illuminated and described at the lesson and unit level. Brown (2006) addressed keys to ABL more at the unit or program level, while Cosgriff shared ABL lesson components. Cosgriff (2000) identified three key points to successful implementation of adventure based activities including (a) appropriate sequencing (b) facilitation, and (c) processing. Brown (2006) lists three keys to adventure based learning (ABL) as (a) planning of innovative activities, (b) reinforcing the importance of experiential learning, and (c) developing a clear set of educational goals and curriculum alignment for instruction. This
study situates both perspectives (Cosgriff, 2000; Brown, 2006) as central as tenets of ABL, with emphasis on (a) facilitation and (b) processing.

**Research in Adventure Based Learning**

This section highlights related empirical evidence and best practices in adventure literature for practitioners. Many of the assumed benefits of Adventure Programming have been based on anecdotal evidence rather than substantial empirical evidence. Such evidence and recommendations were used to inform two primary functions of ABL: (a) appropriate and effective facilitation and (b) the role of debriefing as the prevailing method of processing in ABL programming.

**Facilitation**

Facilitators help students make meaning of the experience promoting the discovery of learning is most essential. Hammerman (1999) describes an effective leader as “recognizing the value of allowing learners to experience the joy and thrill of learning by themselves” (p.204). The primary concern with adventure activities and programs is to achieve educational outcomes relating to intra- and interpersonal domains (Brown, 2006). However, these measurable outcomes are not always easily defined.

Primary roles of a facilitator include setting suitable experiences, posing problems, setting boundaries, supporting learners, insuring physical and emotional safety, and facilitating the learning process (Kolb, 1984). They recognize and encourage spontaneous opportunities for learning, strive to be aware of their biases, judgments and pre-conceptions, and how these influence the learner. Successful facilitators consciously think about their style and continually develop it through intentional practice, such as reflection, feedback, continued education, and experimentation (Stanchfield, 2007).
Adventure programming is often perceived to be “off the cuff” and “free flowing”, but it is important to understand the time necessary to appropriately sequence and arrange for activities with high utility. As such, an assumption for facilitators is that certain knowledge and understanding is necessary in the delivery of effective adventure programming. Stanchfield (2007) outlined nine aspects of effective facilitation.

1. Take A Risk
2. Welcome The Unexpected
3. Attitude Is Everything
4. Know the Why Behind What You Do
5. Creativity
6. Co-Facilitation
7. Be Culturally Sensitive
8. Allow For Struggle

Each aspect above also serves as a guide to include the primary functions of effective facilitators.

**Role of the Facilitator.** Facilitators must provide students with an experience that is safe and meaningful. Without meaning of the experience, or clear direction, facilitators put participants (students) in a vulnerable and dangerous situation (Priest & Gass, 2005). A main responsibility of the facilitator is to have a clear understanding of what is to be accomplished and how it should be accomplished (Panicucci, 2002). Leaders of adventure experiences serve learners in a variety of ways: as a translator, initiator, trainer, and maintainer (Priest & Gass, 2005). A translator familiarizes students with technical terms and phrases during both experience and reflection. In the roles of initiator, trainer,
and maintainer, it is important for the leader to prepare students for an experience and a self-criterion level of success. As such, the leader will equip students with skills necessary for safe learning throughout the process.

Knowledge of facilitation has been shared over time since the inception of original Adventure based programming. Estes (2004) outlined eight generations of facilitation and student-centered learning. Priest and Gass (1997) discussed the first four generations as one group. The first is “letting the experience speak for itself” and the primary goal is fun. This is considered to be student-centered because the teacher’s role is to organize the appropriate sequence for students. The second is named “speaking on behalf of the experience”. It is teacher-centered and the teacher’s role is to provide students with feedback, such as what a group did well, what they need to work on, what they learned, and how they can apply their knowledge in the future. The third is named “debriefing the experience”. Here, the role is to ask questions and encourage students to answer and take ownership for thinking about what they have learned. This generation is supposed to be student-centered but in practice it often becomes teacher-centered (Priest & Gass, 1997). The fourth is “directly frontloading the experience”. The teacher’s role is to brief the group, covering the key learning points immediately before the experience. In turn, the debrief then becomes “direction with reflection” and will include a re-emphasis of learning points addressed during the brief. Here, the teacher decides what students need to learn, and briefs them. This generation is teacher-centered.

The next three generations are considered teacher-centered, and labeled by Estes (2004) as those that increase the amount of client deception in the name of accomplishing program goals. Additionally, these generations are designed to be used in settings that
have specific individual and group goals that are communicated in advance. The fifth is named “isomorphically framing the experience”. As such, facilitations would maintain similar (or even identical) form and structure. The sixth generation is named “indirectly frontloading the experience” and the seventh is “using hypnotic language” (Itin, 1995). Each of these three is considered advance facilitation techniques best employed by highly trained facilitators.

Priest et al. (1999) popularized the eighth generation, “self-facilitation”. This generation represents a way to keep the focus on the value of experience from generation four (frontloading), and combine it with the benefits of student-centered facilitation. This is accomplished by empowering students to be responsible, at least in part, for determining what needs to be learned and implementing programming that can carry over into other life arenas.

Facilitators thrive when they are open to experimentation and gain knowledge from others. The pursuit of new ideas and methods help to keep the work of facilitation interesting (Stanchfield, 2007). Instructors are so eager to teach about a particular lesson that their eagerness causes them to move too quickly to meet their own goals. This may occur without the instructor having ever determined what the actual effects of the experience were on the needs of the students (Estes, 2004). Stanchfield (2007) uses the phrase “failing forward”, where facilitators are able to recognize mistakes and learn from them – helps individuals handle difficult group situations with confidence and finesse (p.71). Successful educators are always reflecting on their own style and methods and take into consideration the strengths and preferences that exist in every group with the intention of meeting the differing needs of participants (Stanchfield, 2007, p.70).
(1993) observed that when teachers hear someone talk about their experience in ways that do not fit the teacher’s existing theories, they often redirect what was said into something that fits what they know. Luckner and Nadler (1997) suggest that, “processing enhances the richness of the experience, so it stands out and apart…this unique learning could be used again and generalized to other settings” (p.10).

**Debrief.** The debrief is an integral function of learning in ABL and arguably the most important function in ABL programming (Sutherland et al., 2009). The use of specific debrief strategies has popularized in both AE and ABL programming as the most utilized form of processing following direct adventure experiences. ABL programming offers time within each learning experience (i.e. lesson) for processing as facilitators employ strategies to initiate student-driven discussion and the construction of an inclusive group conceptualization of recent individual and shared experiences.

Processing offers the opportunity to transfer and apply the learning from experience to everyday life outside of an adventure education setting or general physical education class. It provides students with an opportunity to reflect on their experiences and facilitate change in attitudes and behaviors (Luckner & Nadler, 1997). Participating in an adventure activity can itself be a powerful experience. However, reflecting on and debriefing about the activity can be enlightening (Panicucci et al., 2002). Debriefing has been intended to be a powerful aspect of the overall experience, encouraging individuals to plan, reflect, describe, analyze, and communicate about their experiences; it can occur any time before, during or after the activities.

The purpose of the debrief is to enhance the experience that an individual just experienced (Frank, 2004). Debriefing allows appropriate time for students to share their
different experiences with peers in an emotionally safe environment of the classroom community. For acceptance and improved social interactions, it is important that students talk about what their experiences meant to them (Frank, 2004). Without the debrief, the experience can be lost and the individuals will not grow from the experience. A reason that transfer is difficult is that it is often misunderstood by facilitators and they are not equipped with the knowledge of processing methods to promote transfer (Gass, 1999).

David Kolb’s (1984) Experiential Learning Cycle has best informed the debrief process as a chance for processing to occur, to include the replay of important moments in the activity, and generalize about behaviors from groups and individuals (Panicucci et al., 2002). To reduce the opportunity of “missing the point” of adventure education and learning through experience, it is necessary for facilitators to allow ample time for the debrief to occur with the completion of the Experiential Learning Cycle (Frank, 2004). However, this model does not provide sufficient guidance for novice teachers in leading a meaningful group processing or debriefing session. Although research has been conducted on student-centered facilitation (Brown, 2004; Estes, 2004; Thomas, 2004), recent research in physical education has shown that leading an effective student-centered debrief is not an easy process for pre-service physical education teachers to learn (Sutherland et al., 2009). The use of a student-centered debrief within the constraints of physical education is limited (e.g. Sutherland et al., 2009; Sutherland et al., in press).

Over the past few years, research has been conducted at multiple universities systematically studying ABL with pre-service teachers. As a result of this work we recognized the need for a model for novice facilitators to lead a student centered debrief
in physical education. You need to review these studies not just mention them here – the same is true for Dillon et al and others that are mentioned in chapter 1

Sutherland and colleagues (in press) developed a debriefing model for novice teachers/facilitators to conduct a student-centered debrief session. The model utilizes the metaphor of a *Sunday Afternoon Drive*, where the facilitator begins the *drive* with ideas for the final destination, but without a set route of how to arrive there. The model is both systematic and cyclical in nature and incorporates the following components: *Facilitator as Co-pilot, Choice of Vehicle, Start the Car, Follow the Road, Nearing Final Destination, GPS Recalculating, Final Destination - Are we there yet?* (Sutherland et al., in press). The *Sunday Afternoon Drive* provides a useful framework and specific strategies to enable students to learn from their experience. More importantly completing the drive to the final destination will ensure that the students transfer their learning to other situations in their lives. Explain this much more – use the paper that we have in press to really explain the model

**Theoretical Frame: Transformative Learning Theory**

The theoretical framework is “a structure that identifies and describes major elements…to hypothesize, understand, or give meaning to the relationship among the elements that influence, affect, or predict the outcomes you specify (Ennis, 1999). There is a more instinctive pursuit for us to make meaning of our daily lives (Taylor, 2008). For this study, using a theory allows the researcher to better understand the relationship among teaching adventure education, perceptions of the teachers and students involved in the process, and initial and continuous training of physical education teachers.
The theoretical framework that situates the study is transformative learning theory (Mezirow, 1997). The theory will be used to develop a better understanding of perceptions of school-based teachers and students before, during, and after an adventure education unit in their physical education class. Transformative learning theory helps to better explain the adult learning process of constructing and appropriating new and revised interpretations of the meaning of an experience (i.e. an activity, a lesson, the instructional unit) (Taylor, 2008). The theory seeks to examine how individuals learn and make meaning of their experiences. Adventure education experiences have been linked to transformative efforts, such as changes in activities, values, and attitude (Brown, 2006).

The major concept of transformational learning theory is an individual's frame of reference, defined by Mezirow (1997) as “the structures of assumptions through which we understand our experiences”. Transformative learning theory is meant to be comprehensive to transform problematic frames of reference. The theory intends to work with sets of fixed expectations and make them more inclusive, open, reflective, and emotionally able to change (Mezirow, 2003). The theory operates on a change in one's frame of reference through critical self-reflection. It is hoped that practices such as critical reflection will provide more insight while examining the influence of adventure education, perceptions of the teachers and students, and the training and support for inservice physical educators.

To transform is to change in composition or structure; the outward form or appearance, in character or condition (Merriam-Webster online, 2009). Transformative learning theory (TLT) is a reconstructive theory that focuses on adult learning and adult educators (Mezirow, 1991; 1997). As a reconstructive theory, it establishes a model that
explains the structure, dimensions, and dynamics of the learning process for adult learners (Mezirow, 1991; 1997). It has been the most often researched and discussed theory in adult education (Taylor, 2007). TLT is grounded in human communication and has captured the meaning making processes of adult learners. In this study, communication in the form of clarifying lesson objectives and delivery of content with colleagues and the researcher will be considered as a primary feature of the transforming schema during the study. The theory will provide a framework to investigate the experiences of in-service physical education teachers as they teach an instructional unit in their physical education class in ABL.

As developed by Mezirow (1997), 12 propositions have been used to best situate transformative learning theory. The propositions of TLT include:

1. The learning theory is grounded on the nature of human communication and seeking agreement on our own interpretations and beliefs is central to human communication and the learning process

2. Learning understood as the process of using a prior interpretation to create a new or revised interpretation of the meaning of experience to guide future action

3. Meaning is made by projecting images and symbolic models (“meaning schemes”) based on prior learning to our current sensed experience, and use analogies or codes to interpret new experiences.

4. Construing meaning may be intentional, incidental or aimless, and presentational without words
5. Our sensed experience is filtered through a frame of reference, which selectively shapes and delimits perception, cognition and feelings by predisposing our intentions, expectations and purposes.

6. A frame of reference has (1) a meaning perspective dimension and (2) a resulting formation dimension. The meaning perspective dimension involves broad, generalized, and orienting dispositions. The resulting formation dimension includes a cluster of specific beliefs, feelings, attitudes and value judgments that accompany and shape an interpretation. Ultimately, a more fully developed frame of reference is one that is more inclusive, differentiating, permeable, critically reflective, and integrative of experience.

7. A belief is a habit that guides action that drives a concept. Meaning schemes are transformed by becoming critically reflective of the assumptions supporting the context and/or processes of problem solving. Transformative learning refers to transforming our frame of reference to become more inclusive, differentiating, permeable, and integrative of experience. Central to the adult learning process is seeking agreement on one’s interpretations and beliefs and the possibility and potential of critical reflection.

8. Learning occurs by elaborating existing meaning schemes, learning new meaning schemes, transforming meaning schemes, and transforming meaning perspectives. It may be substantial or incremental. The most personally significant transformations involve a critique of premises regarding one’s self.

9. Two distinctive domains of learning exist: one that is instrumental involving the learner learning to control or manipulate the environment, and learning what
others mean when they communicate with you. Most learning involves elements of both domains

10. The validity of instrumental learning is tested empirically to determine the truth is as it was intended. In communicative learning, justification of a problematic belief is made through (a) appealing to tradition, authority, or force or (b) rational discourse. Discourse as an informed, objective, rational and intuitive assessment of reasons, evidence, and arguments and leads toward a tentative, consensual, best judgment. Consensus building is an ongoing process, always subject for review by a broader group of participants

11. A transformative learning experience involves a transformation of meaning structures, requires that the learner makes an informed and reflective decision to act. This decision may result in immediate action, delayed action, or reaffirmation of an existing pattern of action. Reflective action may be taken to effect changes in the sociolinguistic, epistemic or psychological areas.

12. Development in adulthood is understood as a learning process. Communicative competence includes coping with the social world and the world of inner subjectivity, refers to the ability of learners to negotiate their own purposes, values, and meanings rather than accepting those of others. This competence can be achieved through becoming more awareness and critically reflective of assumptions, and more able to freely and fully participate in discourse and to overcome constraints to taking reflection action.
Research Using Transformative Learning

Studies have been published in business communication and a range of disciplines in education (medical education, health education, continuing education, educational administration). Berger (2004) identified the edge of student meaning as a “transition zone” of student knowing and meaning making, a possible coming to terms with the limitations of knowing before stretching a once perceived limit. Berger (2004) asked, what does this threshold of knowledge look like? For participants, this is when they have trouble articulating ideas when discussing ontological issues about their personal lives and the way they make sense of their worlds.

Transformative learning has been found to be effective at capturing the meaning making process of adult learners, particularly the learning process of paradigmatic shifts. Much of the research confirmed the necessity of critical reflection, a perplexing dilemma as a catalyst for change, and many of the phases of the transformative process described by Mezirow (1991). In Taylor’s (2007) research revealed a learning process that needs to give greater attention to: the role of context, the varying nature of the catalysts of transformative learning, the increased role of other ways of knowing, the importance of relationships and an overall broadening of the definitional outcome of a perspective transformation. Further, little had been done with investigating the practice of fostering transformative learning. Taylor (1998) questioned to a great extent the relatedness of TLT as a guide for classroom teaching.

Relationships in TLT were catalysts in transformative experiences. Taylor (1998) emphasizes the importance of relationships with others is an essential factor in a transformative encounter. Relationships allow critical discussion and the open sharing of
information. Relational qualities include trust, feedback, voluntary selection and participation, a non-hierarchical relationship, shared goals, and authenticity. In a study of peer-based professional development, Eisen (2001) identifies this dynamic as effectively providing support in a non-confrontational, parallel system. An equal possession of power is perceived, allowing for trust and autonomy between colleagues (Eisen, 2001).

Baumgartner (2002) targets the relationship between transformation and action through the study of individuals identified as HIV positive as they engaged in service projects for other individuals. The learning experiences offered a reciprocal benefit for participants, and a perspective transformation that included self-worth, community value, and collegiality (Baumgartner, 2002).

The mechanism of self-control is when contradictory perspectives are witnessed in order for survival, as in Kilgore and Bloom (2002) who worked with women in crisis who experienced a disorienting dilemma. These women had contradictory perspectives that were found to be a mechanism for survival. The regular fragmentation of perspective did not align to a transformative pedagogy that assumes a more unified conceptualization of self-perspective (Kilgore and Bloom, 2002). International visitors developed cultural awareness through the engagement of adults in an English as a Second Language (ESL) (King, 2000) and women educators who worked outside of the United States (Lyon, 2001). In studying romantic fiction, students developed an awareness of inequitable power in romance relationships (Jarvis, 1999) through discourse and document analysis, small group discussion, and guiding critical questions.

A certain level of autonomy exists in the interpretation of transformative learning theory where context can be influential at personal and social levels (Mezirow, 1991).
This conceptualization lacks the contextual detail of the mentioned studies. These studies are products of the unique context by which the transformative experience was manifested. The context highlighted the role in shaping such an experience. Context and transformation is shown through the investigation of power and social change in a study of individuals identifying as vegan for ethical purposes (McDonald, Cervero, & Courtenay, 1999). Power is central to the shaping of the transformative experience of those individuals who become ethical-vegans (McDonald et al., 1999). Transformative learning does not account for the interpersonal and socio-cultural challenges of confronting power. With issues of power, the individual may not completely free themselves of the dominant ideology (Mezirow, 2000). Within this theory includes attention to the individual and not necessarily the individual within his or her socio-cultural context.

Scott (2003) displays a further level of context when studying national community organizers and how they go about organizing their organizations. Scott (2003) used a social constructivist view of transformative learning theory by way of exploring social action through storytelling. This demonstrates the interplay between personal and social in making meaning in transformative learning. Scott (2003) found that transformation occurred with the change of individual structures, or psyches, as well as societal structures.

Taylor (2007) suggests a more committed effort to use action research in transformative learning, providing more detail and clarity of context across disciplines. Action research is accompanied with a critical perspective that challenges neutrality. Action research seeks full, collaborative inquiry by participants that is often intended for
sustained change in organizations, communities, or institutions (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). Action research creates a more democratic inquiry process and blurring the distinction between researcher and participant.

Most of the longitudinal studies in transformative learning have taken place over a time period of 2-5 years. Challenges to this is separating out what is related to transformative learning and what is not a product of normal development of the individual and/ or socio-cultural change with society. In addition, TLT has been critiqued for being de-contextualized (Taylor, 2007). More attention to context and research in a range of contexts offers insight on rationale for transformation. More recent understandings of research using transformative learning include the use of critical reflection as a catalyst of change (Taylor, 2008). The learning process needs to give more attention to context and the varying nature of the catalysts of change (i.e. the cause to make change), importance of relationships in the learning context(s), and broadening the definitional outcome of a perspective transformation. Context has been identified as an overlooked area of transformative learning. Included in the context is persona and socio-cultural experiences, such as prior life experiences and historical events that hold potential significant in transformative learning. More empirical studies will offer a clearer understanding of context. Looking at varying characteristics of transformative outcomes allow us to understand that participants in each study were products of the context.

Questions to be asked include: (a) what are ways to effectively recognize the influence of context? How do educators use context when fostering transformative learning? How do historical events in societies shape transformative experiences?
Limited attention has been given to the processes of fostering transformative learning across all contexts. Transformation occurs in and among different contexts, and is both intentional and aimless (Mezirow, 1997). To foster transformative learning, Taylor (2007) includes (1) providing direct and active learning experiences, (2) the availability of varied medium, and (3) the nature and importance of support for the adult learner. A primary factor for transformation is providing participants with learning experiences that are direct and personally engaging to stimulate reflection upon the experience. The other factor is how to recognize when the participant is susceptible to or desiring a transformative experience (Taylor, 2007). Fostering transformative learning includes paying close attention to responses to personal questions. When these questions are asked, the researcher must be able to identify if the participant has reached a crossroads in their perspective. If working with teachers, they should be aware of these dilemmas as a potentially transformative experience (Taylor, 2007). Fostering transformative learning has happened in a variety of disciplines that help to explain the change in perspective. Most of these studies have been done in formal settings. There is a need to explore other settings, particularly where teaching contexts are more informal, less controlled by the instructor, and more susceptible to external influences.

Unfortunately, little is known about the nature or type of support for participants in transformative learning. Constructive support is crucial, with colleagues that are like-minded and stimulate progressive thought. Support for participants is not transformative if in the form or purpose of comfort (Taylor, 2007). Support is necessary for the critique and challenging of existing conditions to best determine the utility of new information. Further, transformation can be inhibited by imposing sanctions on participants, requiring
rigid role assignments, and using a directive form of support. Sanctions include prohibiting natural behaviors of participants without a rationale for change. Rigid role assignments would be a classification of or labeling or persons or attributes to the other. Directive support implies a prescriptive connotation without collaboration. Essential to the transformative process is an independence and liberty to construct new meaning through a presented or naturally occurring experience without classification from an external source. Reflective dialogue among the person or between persons should be a priority rather than a task necessary for completion in order to “transform”.

Missing in transformative learning research is a more critical definition of perspective transformation. The perspective was seen as the development of a more dependable frame of reference that is “more inclusive, differentiating, permeable, critically reflective of assumptions, emotionally capable of change and integrative of experience” (Mezirow, 2000). This definition is more embedded without urgency for action upon change. The role of reflection is present in all functions of transformative learning in formal and informal methods. Reflecting has no merit without relevance. It is a form of self-regulated learning that determines if the reflection leads to valid knowledge (Mezirow, 1985; Schon, 1983). Context has been identified as an overlooked area of transformative learning. Included in the context is persona and socio-cultural experiences, such as prior life experiences and historical events that hold potential significant in transformative learning. More empirical studies will offer a clearer understanding of context. Looking at varying characteristics of transformative outcomes allow us to understand that participants in each study were products of the context.

Questions to be asked include: (a) what are ways to effectively recognize the influence of
context? How do educators use context when fostering transformative learning? How do historical events in societies shape transformative experiences?

**Transformative Learning and Adventure Based Learning**

Transformative learning theory seeks to examine how individuals learn and make meaning of their experiences. ABL experiences have been linked to transformative efforts, such as changes in activities, values, and attitudes. It suggests a comprehensive, transforming problematic frames of reference and sets of fixed expectations to make them more inclusive, open, reflective, and emotionally able to change (Mezirow, 2000). The theory proposes that adults learn through engagement and examination of existing beliefs and perspectives. Transformative learning includes a process of interpreting an experience by judging its effect on the authenticity or truthfulness of our ideas. The theory operates on a change in frame of reference through critical self-reflection (Mezirow, 2000). The theory will frame the examination of teachers as they teach an instructional unit in ABL.

Mezirow (2000) outlines three levels of reflection that include content, process, and premise. In relationship to teaching knowledge, Kreber (2004) found that premise reflection was the least common among any of the domains and motivation (or lack thereof) plays a factor in the reflective process. Kreber (2004) concludes that teachers need to begin with premise reflection in order to be more meaningful. This premise reflection includes elements related to reasons of “why” they teach than with or how or what to teach. Included in the conception of transformative learning is the enduring nature and irreversibility of a transformation. The transformation of meaning schemes involves participants retaining a larger world view where immediate beliefs begin to
change. Experience involves a level of transformation (Mezirow, 1990). Experiential education was presented earlier as “doing with reflection”. In comparison is the notion of naturally occurring transformation with experience. In this study, the nature of the reflection is organized as informal conversations, coaching sessions, and semi-structured interviews. Articulating critical reflection is a primary skill in reflecting. It is necessary for individuals to be able to recall critical thought. Researchers must develop more comprehensive study schemes to better approach the idea of reflecting critically.

Transformative learning is more than a prescription or plan, and more than an implementation of a series of instructional strategies. It involves an awareness of perspectives over a course of time. Transformative learning means developing a sense of trust in the process, allowing for participants to live with some comfort while on the edge of knowing, in the process of gaining new insight and understanding (Taylor, 2008). It is the role of the researcher to help the participants find their “edge” of meaning. The researcher must be able to determine the readiness for transformative learning through the engagement in the various data collection methods aside from the planning and instruction of the ABL unit.

The theory is grounded in the nature of human communication and is considered developmental (Taylor, 2007). Learning takes place through the use of a prior interpretation to develop a new or revised interpretation of the meaning that informs future action. The relational nature of transformative learning is significant. This includes creating special friendships, professional intimacy, trust, and empathy toward a transformative learning experience. TLT is intended for the mature adult learner. Information and knowledge is shared through a range of communicative practice. The
developmental nature is an understanding of what is known, what is new, and what has been accepted as usable, new knowledge.

The perspective transformation is a paradigm shift, where one’s framework of ideas and thinking about teaching is public and made available for discussion and critique. This study uses the pre-existing frames of reference as the accepted truth of the two teachers. New meanings are being constructed through training, teaching of ABL, and reflection of all previous teaching. The influence of reflection, whether it is formal or informal, will also be recognized as a functional layer that is likely more developed in this study than the current practice of the participants in their school context. TLT moves from identifying transformative experiences in settings and stages of transformation to later making sense of factors that contribute and shape the transformative experience, ultimately fostered into practice. TLT is affirmed through its ability over time, the relationship to expanding one’s frame of reference, the pursuit of autonomy, and the seamless application for informing classroom practice (Taylor, 2008).

There are three key concepts in fostering transformative learning: (1) promoting inclusion, (2) promoting empowerment, and (3) learning to negotiate effectively between and across cultures (Taylor, 2008) that drew initial comparison for me with Adventure Based Learning. Additionally, the fostering transformative learning is seen as deliberate and conscious strategy, and the greater interest that exists in discovering the factors that shape the transformative learning experience (critical reflection, holistic approaches, and relationships) are often functions of well-delivered, prepared ABL lessons. A key concern from Brown (2009) in his review of outdoor adventure education (OAE) programming was an often made assumption (from practitioners and researchers) that
change is progressive. Some care must be taken in terms of meaning making at the individual level as it should not be considered as the universal approach to all learning or the default pedagogy (Brown, 2009).
Chapter 3: Methodology

This study documented the lived experiences of physical education teachers as they facilitated a unit of instruction in Adventure Based Learning (ABL). Specifically, this study begins to understand participants as they learn to teach new content, display the role of meaning schemes in their daily teaching, and demonstrate a more mature frame of reference as a result of direct experiences associated with acquiring new knowledge of ABL content and facilitating an instructional unit in physical education classes. This chapter first offers a position statement on the perspective that informs how the study was conducted. Research questions are presented followed by a description of methods used to answer each research question. The chapter concludes with the researcher perspective through which the data was interpreted.

Position Statement

For a better understanding of the researcher perspective in exploring the transformation of two physical education teachers, my epistemological and ontological positions are presented. Four paradigms (positivist, interpretive, critical theorist, deconstructive) represent the range of qualitative research that best represent knowledge. Despite the linear presentation of these four paradigms, these methods have a multi-dimensional, non-linear scope ranging from more concrete (positivist) to abstract (deconstructive) concepts. Positioning oneself in a paradigm is often temporary; the best fit is one that allows you to most appropriately answer the questions you seek as a researcher (Lather, 1996).
Epistemological and Ontological Representation

Qualitative methods were used in this study with an attempt to make better meaning of the research questions. An assumption within qualitative inquiry prevails that multiple realities exist. The realities are generated through a range of human and symbolic interactions that use language, symbols, and codes. This study was positioned within the interpretive paradigm. This perspective is best served with multiple data sources (e.g. direct observation, field notes, interviews, journals, etc.), layers of meaning, and methods (i.e. ethnography, phenomenology, naturalistic inquiry) (Larson, 2005). A reality that exists is only important to the people involved. An interpretive perspective forbids objective pursuits but requires a reflexive methodology (Patton, 1992). Knowledge is socially constructed through a range of interactions and meaning that is made in a non-linear fashion. I attempted to give participants a voice in the matter and represent their perspective as learners and facilitators of ABL content and pedagogy.

Researcher Bias/ Ethical Considerations

A challenge of conducting qualitative research is to demonstrate that personal interest will not bias the study (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). I was considered an “outsider”, not affiliated with the school district or the research site. Both participants (teachers) and researcher were familiar with one another through local workshops and mutual collegial relationships with physical education professionals in the area. Both participants had not worked with me prior to the beginning of the study. The principal investigator was in the research setting (i.e. middle school) for each of the ten days of the ABL instructional unit. I had four years of extensive ABL training, including teaching an undergraduate course in ABL, modifying instructional materials and modeling effective
facilitation, developing ABL instructional units for in-service teachers, hosting a two-day workshop in ABL for pre-service and in-service teachers, and presenting at international, national, state, and local conferences. This experience has led me to be a strong proponent of the power of ABL as a content area in physical education.

All activity during the research process was guided by systematic considerations. Control and influence during the study was shared among researcher and participants in the research process. Despite the researcher holding ultimate control during the report phase of the research process, the intent of the project was to most accurately convey what was happening within each case (physical education teacher and their students) in the respective physical education classes. Member checks and ongoing analysis helped to minimize personal biases prior to the final narrative analysis. Training sessions with participants and the researcher served as an opportunity to share interpretations of the teaching of the ABL unit. The researcher was conscious to share related teaching experiences with participants to establish rapport and create a more comfortable and collaborative environment. Such an environment offered the opportunities to better discuss the practice of teaching and teaching ABL in physical education.

The study began to make meaning of teaching within a particular context (i.e. urban middle school physical education program). Teachers were aware of ABL and its components but had limited to no experience in teaching ABL within their physical education program. The researcher presumed that all skills to teach ABL were not present or not appropriately developed, and that a set of requisite skills are necessary for effective facilitation of ABL content (Panicucci, Faulkingham-Hunt, Kohut, Rheingold, & Stratton, 2002; Frank, 2004; Brown, 2006; Stanchfield, 2007).
To protect the identity and anonymity, the researcher changed the names of the school and other settings and used pseudonyms for the people involved in the narrative analysis. Participants agreed for the researcher to enter their classes and allowed for each class to be video and audio-taped. These teachers trusted that the reported accounts would be accurate and representative of classroom occurrences during the study. An important (and often unrealized) notion is to wrongfully assume that an unchanging world was present in the research setting. It was the role of the researcher to report regularly and best describes changes at the site. Suggesting that the setting (i.e. participants, students, behaviors, events, etc.) was unvarying would have been a direct contrast to the qualitative and interpretive world (Marshall & Rossman, 2006).

**Research Questions**

**Purpose**

The purpose of this study was to understand participants as they learn to teach new content, display the role of meaning schemes in their daily teaching, and demonstrate a more mature frame of reference as a result of direct experiences associated with acquiring new knowledge of ABL content and facilitating an instructional unit in physical education classes. The research questions are presented to identify specific tenets that remain central in the analysis of teacher transformation.

4. In what ways do (middle school) physical education teachers demonstrate transformation during the facilitation of an instructional unit in Adventure Based Learning?

5. How do physical education teachers identify and use meaning schemes in their daily physical education instruction?
6. In what ways do physical education teachers transform their frame of reference during a critical self-review of teaching?

**Theoretical Frame**

Transformative learning theory (TLT) is a reconstructive theory that focuses on adult learning and adult educators (Mezirow, 1991). As a reconstructive theory, it establishes a model that explains the structure, dimensions, and dynamics of the learning process for adult learners (Mezirow, 1991). It is one of the most often researched and discussed theories in adult education (Taylor, 2007). TLT is grounded in human communication and has captured the meaning making processes of adult learners. A meaning scheme has been defined earlier as a belief or set of beliefs defined by the learner that may include images and symbolic models to help interpret new experiences (Taylor, 2008). In this study, new or revised interpretations were fostered through my communication with participants (i.e. clarifying lesson objectives, instructional delivery, pedagogical decision making, etc.). The theory provided a framework to investigate the experiences of in-service physical education teachers as they taught an ABL instructional unit in their physical education class. TLT seeks to examine how individuals learn and make meaning of their experiences and informed the methodological decisions of this study. ABL experiences have been linked to transformative efforts such as changes in activities, values, and attitudes (Taylor, 2007).

In determining the most appropriate methods to collect data and conduct the study, main features of the theory (i.e. perspective transformation, critical reflection) were used to make decisions for methods of data collection. Additionally, the 12 propositions that outline transformative learning (Mezirow, 1990) were referenced to
ensure that this conceptualization (as well as that of the researcher) is presented appropriately. These three conceptions held most influence in the study and guided the development of each research question, respectively:

1. A transformative learning experience involves a transformation of meaning structures and requires the learner to make an informed and reflective decision to act. This decision may result in immediate action, delayed action, or reaffirmation of an existing pattern of action. Reflective action may be taken to effect changes in the sociolinguistic, epistemic or psychological areas.

Teachers are required to act on new conceptualization of their meaning structures, most notably their own perspective. The change may not be visible to others or recognizable to the participant.

2. Meaning is made by projecting images and symbolic models (“meaning schemes”) based on prior learning to our current sensed experience, and use analogies or codes to interpret new experiences.

The two participants (teachers) were asked to position themselves as teachers, asked to share their perspective of their skills and strengths as an educator, and their future aspirations and intentions in their current position during the life history interview. Also, participants were asked to identify areas in which they can improve as teachers, their frustrations in their job or in the field, and barriers to effective teaching and working in schools. The teachers were asked to recall vignettes in their teaching career that hold significance, themes or cues that they use to direct their teaching, and asked how they use this collection of symbols to interpret the daily activity of teaching physical education.
3. Learning occurs by elaborating existing meaning schemes, learning new meaning schemes, transforming meaning schemes, and transforming meaning perspectives. It may be substantial or incremental. The most personally significant transformations involve a critique of premises regarding one’s self.

Elaborating on an existing scheme is developing a more specific model of the scheme. As such, the researcher sought detail from each participant as it related to preparation to teach new content, their knowledge of new content, and their perspectives as physical educators. Specific to the ABL content, formal (semi-structured interviews) and informal (pre-lesson and between lesson feedback/coaching) conversations with participants will help develop the meaning scheme of each participant. New meaning schemes were defined by the learner and their organization of information. New meaning schemes were identified and collected by way of interviews, coaching sessions, informal conversations, and teacher e-journals. Transforming meaning schemes included a critical review of the existing plan to make more it inclusive and efficient. In this study, making meaning schemes more inclusive involved a continued conceptualization of meaning schemes and regularly defining what it includes (i.e. ABL as a content area, knowledge of techniques of instruction, etc.). Transforming the meaning perspective is a critical review of one’s existing orientation to provide the most solid basis for reference. The meaning perspective can be considered where one stands; the meaning scheme as the map or plan. In this study, the meaning scheme was identified as the teacher’s current position: as a teacher facilitating an ABL unit for the first time. The critical review of each participant’s meaning perspective is undertaken with critical reflection: completed independently through e-journals or a reflective journal, or collaboratively with the other
participant (teacher), researcher, or both through formal or informal conversations, and through interviews.

**Pilot Study**

A pilot study was conducted in the autumn of 2008. This pilot study was a smaller scale project that offered the opportunity to:

- Evaluate a prepared unit of instruction in ABL
- Practice preparing and conducting multiple face-to-face interviews with a participant and transcribing these interviews
- Practice preparing semi-structured interview questions and journal prompts based on my prior observations in the research setting
- Gain initial response from an in-service teacher in the utility of ABL and their perceptions of all matters associated with teaching ABL in an urban middle school P.E. program (i.e. needs, successes, frustrations)
- Practice using video and audio equipment independently
- Engage in and learn how to conduct data analysis using line-by-line coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990)

Prior to the start of the unit, the purpose of the study was to explore the journey of an in-service physical education teacher as a facilitator in teaching ABL in an urban middle school P.E. program. Prior to the start of the study, I wanted to gain the teacher’s perception of the following questions:

1. How do you describe your strengths as a physical educator?
2. What are your experiences teaching content related to Adventure Based Learning, Adventure Education, etc.?
3. How do you prepare to teach lessons in your P.E. program? Does this change when you teach a new content area?

4. What concerns do you have in teaching ABL for the first time?

Using these questions I created the following semi-structured interview questions:

- What do you see to be advantages and disadvantages of ABL as a content area in physical education?
- How do feel about the use of the debrief in ABL and in your teaching repertoire?
- What training would have made your facilitation of ABL more comfortable/ successful prior to the start of this unit?
- What differences exist in how you teach this unit relative to other units that you teach in your P.E. program?
- Why did students like some of the activities and the unit? Why did they not like some of the activities and the unit?

Julie (pseudonym) was a white female in her mid-30s who taught physical education and health at an urban middle school. Julie had over 10 years of teaching experience at four different schools within the same large school district in the Midwest United States. Students in her classes had P.E. every day during the semester for 48 minutes. Julie shared indoor gym space with her colleague Kent (pseudonym). Julie and Kent each taught 25-30 students per class period in the same space. Due to the nature of the study, Kent agreed to teach his classes outdoors to prevent interference from students and the class activity during the research process.
Julie was identified as a potential participant through the district’s physical education coordinator and gave written consent following our initial meeting. I visited the school on 14 consecutive days and observed the first-period class each day. For this class (as well as others during the day) Julie facilitated an ABL unit. However, formal data was collected only with the first-period class. This unit took place during the first five weeks and was considered the first unit of instruction in the school year for students in Julie’s class. Data collection included handwritten and computer generated field notes for 14 class sessions, as well as direct and video recorded observations during the 10-day ABL unit. Four semi-structured interviews, daily teacher e-journals, researcher journal, and document analysis of lesson plans and training materials were also collected.

The pilot effectively served its purpose to better inform me to move forward as I continued to explore the processes that assisted in and hindered the ability of in-service teachers to effectively facilitate ABL at the different levels of (a) an activity, (b) a series of activities (i.e. lesson plan), and (c) a unit of instruction (i.e. 10-day unit). Specifically, the study further confirmed my interest to assist in the training of in-service teachers to be better equipped to lead ABL in their P.E. programs. Some of my preliminary analysis of the pilot led me to conclude that:

**Time is an important component in the inquiry of ABL**

“During first period I was able to move the students along, but in the others I was not so successful. The Radioactive River activity took a lot longer that I thought it would...I forgot to modify the Hula Hoop Race task...Getting everyone involved was difficult today” (Researcher Journal 4).

Issues related to time were always noticeable. Significant time was spent in class management, transition, and length of verbal instructions. Three or more activities were present on each lesson plan and affixed a time range that each activity could be
conducted. For future study, participants should be clearly informed that the number of activities suggested per class session usually range from 1-3 per day with no required time for any activity. For any future studies with similar lesson materials, the times listed will be modified or omitted.

**Range of Facilitation Experiences**

Julie was prepared through one-on-one training sessions with the researcher that included theoretical and practical perspectives of ABL and skills required to effectively facilitate a longer instructional unit. The teacher used lesson plans as a guide and used her previous experiences as a teacher or with ABL activities.

The lesson plans have been a guide throughout the unit. I have tried to present the activities as they are developed on the lesson plans...We have discussed my actual interpretations of the activities. I have only used my past experiences with adventure education and the book that I used years ago (Interview 2)

Throughout the unit, Julie found it difficult to give up control during facilitation and admitted to having different levels of energy and attitude when leading the activities to her students. Teacher attitude and energy was often a result of student response to the activities.

Surprisingly, the lessons throughout the day have gone pretty well. We figured with such large combined classes there would be a bit rough, but for the most part students are doing well (Interview 2)

Julie noted difficulty in sustaining the sequence and flow of the entire 10-day instructional unit.

Student responses during the debrief sessions seemed to be a bit more insightful from the beginning of the unit. I am not sure if it is because of the novelty of the adventure program or if they were not making the expected connections between the activities and the concepts until just recently in the unit (Reflective E-Journal, day 9).
Much of the time leading up to the start of the ABL unit with Julie was spent on the theoretical background and the central themes of ABL. Following this form of training, Julie and I reviewed several activities across the entire unit and clarified what the activities were to “look like” and discussed other pertinent issues for successful implementation during P.E. classes. In addition, Julie was using the lesson plan as the map for her classes and trudged through the lesson regardless of student response to the instruction. This study provided more information on the training of participants/facilitators, including theoretical and practical awareness of ABL (i.e. experience the activities, “walk through” the facilitation, anticipate student reactions), be able to identify important tenets of effective ABL facilitation (hook students with the brief, introduce and clarify parameters of the activity, mediate debrief to allow for student perspective taking), and exhibit consistent behaviors when facilitating activities and monitor student response to activities.

**Debriefing the Debriefs**

The debrief was used in only seven of 10 classes of the instructional unit. Julie was able to get student perspectives and categorize/generalize these comments for the class. However, each debrief in the unit was teacher-directed with Julie asking a question and students directing answers only to the facilitator (instead of other students in the class). This study supported more attention to emphasize the debrief as a critical component of ABL and signature event to assist in the processing of what has been experienced.

The planning and delivery of the pilot study provided useful information in preparation for this study, specifically in reference to (a) ABL training with participants
(in-service teachers), and (b) the procedures for directly observing multiple classes with multiple participants. The design of this dissertation study has given much more attention to all training activities and provided more detail in reference to interviews, coaching sessions, and ABL lesson plans.

**Study Design**

In order to more fully explore the experiences and the transformation of two physical education teachers in their first experiences as facilitators of ABL, a qualitative case study design was used (Stake, 2008). Data was collected and analyzed as two separate cases, treating each teacher and their classes as separate units of analysis. Keeping cases separate allowed each case to construct their own meaning of the experiences.

**Case Study**

This study was conducted as an interpretive case study (Stake, 2008; Ary, Jacobs, Razavieh, & Sorensen, 2006; Stark & Torrance, 2006). A case study seeks to engage with and report complex social activity and represent the meanings that individuals bring to the context (Somekh & Lewin, 2005). This approach emphasized in-depth study and understanding is gained through a thick, rich description of each case. A case study is the study of an individual unit, class, or social group that often converge on developmental issues and relationships with the environment (Stake, 1998). Each participant (i.e. two physical education teachers) was treated as a case in this study. The case study method allowed for an exploration of all processes that demonstrated transformation among the two participants during every phase of the study (i.e. teacher training, interviews, direct and video observations, coaching sessions, etc.).
Selection of Participants and Site Entry

Initial contact was made with the physical education coordinator of the school district seeking persons interested in incorporating ABL into their physical education program. The rationale for contacting the district coordinator was two-fold: (1) the researcher had previous experience as a guest instructor of ABL activities at a local elementary school, and (2) the researcher was interested in working with middle school physical educators in an urban school district. The coordinator supplied a list of potential participants and individual communication through e-mail was established with these individuals to determine if the nature of the content and research was feasible. The school site chosen for the study seemed most appropriate for the following reasons: (1) ABL was a novel concept among the physical education teachers and students, and (2) students engaged in daily physical education for an entire semester, (3) the teachers were willing to embrace and teach ABL in their P.E. program, and (4) there were two physical education teachers in the school that taught simultaneously.

The researcher made an initial visit to the research site during the previous school year to invite the two participants to an upcoming workshop that the researcher was conducting in ABL. Following the attendance of both teachers to the workshop (not affiliated with this study), the researcher followed up and inquired if both teachers would be interested in further use of ABL within their physical education program and their respective classes with the support of the researcher.

Setting

The study took place in one middle school located within a large Midwestern city in the United States. Island Terrace Middle School (ITMS) is a public school located in a
community in what could be considered an urban neighborhood. ITMS is comprised of 352 students (75% African American, 20% Caucasian, and 5% other). Ninety-eight (98%) percent of ITMS students qualify under the category as disadvantaged according to median household income, family unit, and property values, above the state average of 47%. The school served students in grades 6-8 with a focus on math, science, and technology due to chronic poor performance on state standardized tests in math, reading, science, and social studies. Nationally, ITMS has not met adequate yearly progress (AYP) in the last six years in both math and reading as recommended by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) through the United States Department of Education.

The school operated under a traditional public school schedule with two, 18-week semesters in an academic year. Students at ITMS had physical education each semester in both sixth and seventh grade, but only one semester in eighth grade to accommodate one semester of health. Within this large district, high school credit hours were earned by passing physical education and health classes while in eighth grade. Physical education instructional units were often short and repeated each semester due to limited resources, specifically instructional equipment. Typical instructional units were team sports and fitness-based games that require little or no equipment; any new equipment at ITMS was usually donated and handed down as a private donation from ITMS teachers, or parents of students at ITMS. Suzanne and Carolyn often taught physical education during the same class period but did not usually teach the same instructional unit simultaneously.

Suzanne and Carolyn (pseudonyms) were physical education teachers at ITMS. Both participants identify as female and African-American. Suzanne is certified to teach physical education and health and taught both at ITMS. She has been teaching for 17
years overall and is in her third year at ITMS. Suzanne teaches only students in grade eight in physical education and health. Carolyn is certified to teach physical education in grades K-12 and teaches only grades 6-7 in physical education at ITMS during the school year. She has been teaching physical education for 18 years and is in her fifth year at ITMS. Carolyn is also the ITMS girls’ volleyball coach and assistant track and field coach.

Both participants had their own indoor gymnasium for physical education class. Suzanne had the larger space that served multiple purposes for the needs of the school, including the competition floor for volleyball and basketball as well as the stage for all school assemblies and large events. Carolyn’s gym space was smaller but mostly utilized for her physical education classes only. They shared a large outdoor space adjacent from the school building for outside physical education activities that is outlined by a 400-yard cinder track.

**Procedures**

The study was conducted during the 2009-2010 school year and included multiple data sources. Field notes from direct observations, video observations, and informal coaching sessions were collected as well as teacher training seminars, semi-structured interviews, researcher journals, and facilitation checklists were used as data sources. Data was organized daily, kept as separate cases, and re-organized daily following the categorization of the case, live observation, interviews, informal conversations, field notes, video notes, and teacher journals.
### Research Questions and Data Collection Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Data Collection Method</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. In what ways do (middle school) physical education teachers demonstrate transformation during the facilitation of an instructional unit in Adventure Based Learning?</td>
<td>Field Notes; Semi-Structured Interviews; Life History Interview; Checklist; Researcher Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. How do physical education teachers identify and use meaning schemes in their daily physical education instruction?</td>
<td>Field Notes; Semi-Structured Interviews; Checklist; Researcher Journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In what ways do physical education teachers transform their frame of reference during a critical self-review of teaching?</td>
<td>Field Notes; Semi-Structured Interviews; Checklist; Researcher Journal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Research Questions and Data Collection Methods

### Research Timeline

Time spent at the research site (including ABL training sessions, direct observation of the ABL unit, post-unit interviews) was four weeks. The researcher conducted life history interviews (Appendix A) with participants prior to the start of ABL training and the delivery of the ABL instructional unit. Following the life history interview, participants were trained together in ABL. These training sessions were conducted by the researcher and originally intended to be five, two-hour sessions with the researcher and both participants involved in each session. The sessions occurred within two weeks of the start of the ABL unit. Appendix F provides an agenda for each of the five training sessions. Following ABL training, both participants facilitated a 10-day ABL unit simultaneously with each of their P.E. classes. During the instructional unit, the researcher observed two classes each day per teacher and provided feedback before, in between, and after classes related to their facilitation and lesson effectiveness. Following
the unit, the researcher conducted post-unit interviews and member checks with each teacher.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRB and Teacher/ School Consent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop ABL Training and Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life History Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observation of ABL Facilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Unit Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Member Checks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 Research Timeline Sequence

**Teacher Training**

A series of training sessions took place prior to the star of the 10-day ABL instructional unit and after the initial life history interview with both participants.

Training sessions were originally intended to occur during an agreed upon time before or after school in 1-2 hour increments. However, due to schedule conflicts and availability, teacher training had to be adjusted with both participants in order to cover the necessary content as well as fit in the two-week time block in order for the ABL unit to begin on time with students. Table 3.3 provides a brief agenda of the topics covered during ABL teacher training before the lesson facilitation.

In the first week the two participants had five training sessions together. The five sessions all occurred in the first week of the two-week training window prior to the start
of the participant-led ABL unit. The block plan below shows the brief content of the five training sessions and Appendix B provides a detailed overview of the content.

During the second week of training the researcher had to personalize the training of the two teachers to accommodate their individual schedules. The researcher met with Carolyn before school each morning for 45 minutes and conducted two additional training sessions after school for 1.5 hours each for a total of 10 hours in pre-unit ABL training. Suzanne’s training sessions in week two occurred during five, 35 minute lunch periods as well as four, 50 minute planning periods for a total of nine hours in pre-unit ABL training.

During training, participants were provided with common barriers faced in the facilitation process verbally as well as through video review. To evaluate participant knowledge, the researcher regularly checked for participant understanding and required participants to complete a modified assessment from an ABL undergraduate course (Appendix H), discuss lessons together, analyze components of each lesson, and discuss their anticipated processes of facilitation.

Teachers were provided with a 10-day ABL instructional unit and supplemental materials such as inserts from teaching manuals, documents on debriefing and new ABL perspectives created by a research team I have been involved with over the last few years to help novice ABL facilitators. I developed the ABL unit plans with assistance from graduate colleagues and undergraduate students in physical education at the university. These materials provided a guide for future independent teaching as well as references to assist in specific components in facilitating an adventure education unit. During the
facilitation of the ABL unit, revisions in the lesson plans with participants were done throughout the 10 days.

The researcher provided each participant with lesson materials to facilitate a 10-day instructional unit in ABL with each of their PE classes. Included in the materials are lesson plans with daily objectives and detailed tasks as well as specific briefs and debriefs during an ABL lesson (Appendix C) and a block plan with daily tasks for the 10-day unit (Appendix D). Each lesson plan included: (a) daily objectives, (b) brief to initiate activity, (c) three activities to use during class, and (d) debrief strategy to initiate the discussion and processing of the experience. Teachers were encouraged to modify lesson plans to meet the needs of their students. For example, the researcher provided three activities per lesson during the 10-day unit (30 total activities). Each of the activities had a recommended time range of 5-25 minutes. In some cases, the researcher expected the participants to use only one or two of the activities per class session. However, in the event that an activity took much less time than expected (or the teacher decides to decline to use an activity), there were options for the participant to move on with the daily instruction. Additionally, the 10-day unit was prepared in sequence, with community building, cooperation, and full-value norms as the primary themes addressed in this unit.

Participants were provided materials as part of a “content packet” that was modified from an undergraduate college course in ABL (Appendix E). Examples of items in the content packet are presentation slides with notes from discussion-based classes, compiled relevant content from recommended textbooks and workbooks used in the university class, including images of the Experiential Learning Cycle, sequence of ABL, and tips for
teachers. Each of the items in the content packet was addressed during the training sessions with participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session # (Format)</th>
<th>Topics</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (Both Participants)</td>
<td>Overview of ABL Content; Check for Understanding (CFU)</td>
<td>Before School; Direct Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Both Participants)</td>
<td>Challenge By Choice/ Full Value Contract; Effective Facilitation; CFU</td>
<td>Lunch Period; Discussion; Question and Answer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (Both Participants)</td>
<td>Building Community in the Classroom; CFU</td>
<td>Lunch Period; Discussion; Examples Shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (Both Participants)</td>
<td>Debriefing Community Building Lessons; CFU</td>
<td>Lunch Period; Examples Provided; Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (Both Participants)</td>
<td>Cooperation; CFU</td>
<td>Lunch Period; Examples Shared; Discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (1on 1 Training)</td>
<td>Debriefing Cooperation Lessons; CFU</td>
<td>Carolyn before school; Suzanne at lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (1on 1 Training)</td>
<td>Debriefing ABL Lessons; CFU</td>
<td>Carolyn before school; Suzanne at lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (1on 1 Training)</td>
<td>Video Analysis of Debrief Sessions</td>
<td>Carolyn before school; Suzanne at lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (1on 1 Training)</td>
<td>Review of the Overview of ABL Content; CFU</td>
<td>Carolyn before school; Suzanne at lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (1on 1 Training)</td>
<td>Video Analysis of Debrief Sessions Part II</td>
<td>Carolyn before school; Suzanne at lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (1on 1 Training)</td>
<td>Carolyn: Lesson Plan Review and Walk Through; Review of Debriefing ABL Lessons; Suzanne: Lesson Plan Review and Walk Through</td>
<td>Carolyn before school; Suzanne at lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (1on 1 Training)</td>
<td>Carolyn: Continued Review of Debriefing ABL Lessons; Evaluation of Facilitation Suzanne: Review of Debriefing ABL Lessons; CFU</td>
<td>Carolyn before school; Carolyn completes training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 (Suzanne only)</td>
<td>Review of Debriefing ABL Lessons; Evaluation of Facilitation</td>
<td>Suzanne’s planning period</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 (Suzanne only)</td>
<td>Final CFU on Overview of ABL Content; Preparation for Lesson 1</td>
<td>Planning period; Training completed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.3 Teacher Training Agenda
A Typical School Day for Participants

The researcher arrived before the start of the school day and consulted with the two participants on the daily lesson plan. The researcher checked for understanding and answered any questions regarding the daily lesson and the planned activities. Suzanne taught periods 1, 3, 4, 5, and 7 and Carolyn taught periods 1, 2, 3, 7, and 8. The researcher observed Suzanne’s period 3 and period 7 classes and observed Carolyn’s period 2 and period 8 classes.

Each of the two observed classes from participants was videotaped and audio-taped using a wireless microphone that was synchronized to the videotape. The wide-angle camera was positioned in the corner of the gymnasium allowing for the teacher and students to be viewed. The researcher took live field notes as each class was recorded. Following the first observed (and recorded) lesson from each teacher in the morning, the researcher provided feedback/coaching with each teacher prior to their teaching the second observed (and recorded) class in the afternoon. The researcher intended to hold a daily meeting during the common lunch period where lesson review from the morning could occur as well as suggestions and reminders could be shared for the remaining afternoon classes. These sessions only occurred during five of the ten days during the unit with both participants due to schedule conflicts and the short time segment in between other duties at ITMS. Common topics of the informal discussions included, (a) the researchers emphasis of the debrief as the most important process in the content area of ABL, (b) analysis of each participants’ morning ABL facilitation, and (c) tips and tools for effective facilitation in the remaining classes for the day.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:15 a.m. –</td>
<td>Arrive at ITMS; Check for participant understanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review/ clarification on daily lesson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:34 a.m. – 8:34 a.m.</td>
<td><strong>Period 1</strong>; Equipment setup in Carolyn’s gym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal interaction with Carolyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:38 a.m. – 9:24 a.m.</td>
<td><strong>Period 2</strong> (Observe Carolyn, Grade 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Researcher transitions to Suzanne’s gym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:28 a.m. – 10:14 a.m.</td>
<td><strong>Period 3</strong> (Observe Suzanne, Grade 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal interaction with Suzanne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:18 a.m. – 11:04 a.m.</td>
<td><strong>Period 4</strong>; Data organization and analysis of Carolyn’s 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; period class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:08 a.m. – 11:54 a.m.</td>
<td><strong>Period 5</strong>; Data organization and analysis of Suzanne’s 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; period class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:58 a.m. – 12:44 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>Period 6</strong>; Further data organization and analysis of Carolyn’s 2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt; period class (if needed); Further data organization and analysis of Suzanne’s 3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt; period class (if needed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:15 p.m. – 12:44 p.m.</td>
<td>Lunch; 3-way conference with Suzanne, Carolyn, and researcher; review of morning observation, feedback and modifications for afternoon facilitation; Equipment setup in Suzanne’s gym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:48 p.m. – 1:34 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>Period 7</strong>; (Observe Suzanne, Grade 8); Researcher transition to Carolyn’s gym</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:38 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.</td>
<td><strong>Period 8</strong>; (Observe Carolyn, Grade 7); Informal interaction with Carolyn; Equipment clean-up; Data organization and analysis of Suzanne’s (7&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; period) and Carolyn’s (8&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; period) second observed facilitation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.4 Daily Schedule at Island Terrace Middle School

**Data Collection**

A range of data collection methods (direct observation, video observation, semi-structure interviews, field notes, researcher journal) were utilized during the course of the study. Each source of data was employed specifically to gather more information to further address the three research questions.

**Observations**

The researcher conducted live observations of both teachers teaching two of their five classes each day during a 10-day ABL instructional unit. During the observed classes...
descriptive and interpretive field notes were taken. Participants were videotaped and audio-taped to assist in the observation of interactions and communication with students during the teaching of each instructional unit. Video and audio archives allowed for a more detailed analysis of what was being communicated to students at different times during class. The use of videotaped lessons allowed for live field notes to be cross-checked for accuracy and provided more detail on notes recorded in the moment that may lack appropriate detail. Field notes were collected in the form of an activity log with coordinating times and described events and offered a better description of class activity and synthesis of what and how information was communicated between teachers and students. The researcher had one wide-angle video camera with wireless microphone connection on the entire class and teacher during each observed class session.

Teacher Interviews

Individual interviews were conducted first with each of the two participants and analyzed across each case. Five individual semi-structured interviews were conducted with the two teachers as follows: a life history interview prior to the start of the ABL training sessions, three semi-structured interviews during the 10-day ABL unit, and a post-unit interview. The first interview lasted between 30 minutes and one hour and was tailored to the life histories of the teachers, including their childhood, schooling, identity, and journey to the career of physical education. It provided a forum to collect and discover, and evaluate the lived experiences of participants to date. The initial interview was an early conceptualization of how each participant made meaning of education, physical education, ABL, and how previous experience informs their current practice. Appendix D provides the interview guide for the life history interview.
The next three semi-structured interviews were tailored to gain initial perceptions and feelings in teaching ABL for the first time in their physical education and to explore the processes of decision making as each teacher facilitates the ABL unit. Each of the three semi-structured interviews completed during the ABL unit discussed emerging themes present with each participant (teacher) and their students as they participate in ABL (i.e. successes and frustrations of facilitating ABL, perceptions of student response to the unit, perspective of ABL and its utility in physical education, experiences leading a debrief, etc.) and referenced critical incidents during their facilitation of lessons. Further, these interviews served as the primary forum to identify meaning schemes (i.e. vignettes, themes, and cues within participant’s facilitation), elaborate meaning schemes, and transforming the meaning perspective of each participant as discussed within the theoretical frame of transformative learning. The final interview (post-unit interview) was longer than the previous interviews and related to the entire experience of teaching and teaching the ABL unit. Concepts discussed in earlier interviews were revisited as well as and the transforming process of teachers through ABL training, collaboration with colleagues and the researcher, and teaching the unit in their classes for the first time to students. The final interviews ranged from one to two hours.

**Researcher Journal**

A research journal was kept by the primary investigator and included a timeline of all research activity during the research process. The journal also served as a reflective exercised following observations, interviews, and analysis of data each day. The journal offered an opportunity to reflect on the daily experiences as a researcher in the school setting and to recall interactions with teachers, students, and staff at the research site. The
journal served as another form of analysis beyond the live field notes and an audit trail for the research process. Additionally, data were collected through the use of informal conversations between teachers, students, and school staff. The nature of these conversations were to put the participant more at ease when talking with the researcher and often allows for a more accurate account of lived experiences (Bogdan & Biklen, 2003). The use of live field notes followed up with the research journal provided a more extensive data corpus.

**ABL Checklist**

During the facilitation of the ABL unit, participants were observed on their effectiveness as facilitators. Effective facilitation was determined by using a modified checklist (Appendix F) previously used by the researcher during an undergraduate course in ABL. The checklist included criteria within the categories of (a) preparation for class, (b) facilitation, (c) debriefing, and (d) class climate. Each observed facilitation by the researcher was assessed using the checklist. Initially, the researcher intended for facilitators to execute six of the 12 components on the checklist. The researcher assumed improvement following repeated teaching of the same lesson (i.e. improvement throughout the school day) and repeated teaching of the same unit and sequenced content (i.e. teaching the same unit throughout the day for 10 consecutive days). Effective facilitation was determined by the researcher as scoring at least nine out of a possible 12 points on the checklist. Not meeting the “effective” range of facilitation would be discussed following the facilitation between the researcher and the participant. Additionally, a running record of tasks observed in each class was noted and compared to the prescribed block plan and lesson plans for the instructional unit. The observation
notes and initial assessment of facilitation was made public between researcher and participant throughout the unit. The above teaching functions were considered to determine the most effective methods for future instruction.

The checklist was used as a fidelity check to ensure participants were following an established protocol for effective facilitation of ABL lessons. During the 20 observed lessons, both Suzanne and Carolyn were evaluated using the ABL Checklist to determine their competence as facilitators. Both participants were generally successful in lesson preparation, including setting up the learning environment prior to class, providing correct verbal instructions, checking for student understanding, and reviewing safety protocols. Common deficiencies in participant’s facilitation identified on the rubric were related to conducting an effective debrief.

**Document Analysis**

Documents were reviewed from both participants and included materials publicly displayed in gymnasiums and classrooms, such as the school newsletter, brochures for recreation programs and sports camps, and the school discipline plan. Materials reviewed from Suzanne included course descriptions, worksheets shared in physical education and health classes, and posters, websites, and textbooks typically used in her classes. For Carolyn, documents reviewed were those posted on her bulletin board and included the school discipline plan, her classroom rules and consequences, and motivational posters that are in the gym. These documents were analyzed using content and thematic analysis. Each teacher was asked to submit all related documents at the beginning of the study in order to help triangulate other data sources and establish research credibility.
Trustworthiness

Techniques used within the study to increase the likelihood of credible findings were prolonged engagement, regular observations, triangulation, peer debriefing, negative case analysis and member checks.

Prolonged Engagement and Regular Observation

Prolonged engagement involves the “investment of sufficient time to achieve certain purposes; learning the culture, testing for misinformation either by self or the participants, and building trust” (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Prior to the start of the unit, the researcher conducted five, two-hour training sessions with participants. The researcher was in the school every day for two weeks (10 days) for data collection at the start of the ABL unit. During the teaching of the ABL unit, the researcher observed two classes (50 minutes per class) of both teachers. For each of the 10 days, the researcher spent most of the entire school day on site. The researcher observed two classes (one from each teacher), engaged in informal conversations with both participants prior to their teaching the second observed class, and observed both teachers as they facilitated another class in an ABL lesson. Each participant facilitated the same content that was presented on the lesson plan and that was facilitated earlier during the school day. Including initial correspondence with participants, teacher ABL training prior to the start of the unit, initial school visits, pre-unit life history interviews, and direct observation of four total lessons for 10 consecutive days, the researcher spent over 100 hours in the research setting. Significant time was spent in collecting and transcribing field notes, engaging in informal conversations with teachers, making interpretive and reflexive notes, and analyzing all of the findings. During these visits, the researcher observed lessons without
interacting with the teachers during their facilitation. The researcher only intervened and interacted with participants after an observed lesson. In addition, these in-service teachers had developed a professional relationship with the researcher through correspondence, teacher training, and follow-up contacts leading up to the ABL unit.

**Triangulation**

Triangulation is the use of multiple perspectives to receive and analyze information. Multiple data sources were used to address the same research questions throughout the study. Multiple perspectives are used not so much about getting truth but to find multiple perspectives for knowing the social world. Primary sources of information in this study were the two in-service physical education teachers. Data collection methods often occurred in sequence of direct observation (with field notes), informal conversations, coaching sessions, video observations (with field notes), and semi-structured interviews that allowed a more thorough review of findings and their accuracy. Each piece of data among the corpus allowed the researcher to make a more accurate judgment of findings.

**Peer Debrief**

The purpose of the peer debrief is to help keep researchers honest by challenging the initial reactions that lead to further interpretations. Colleagues of the researcher with experience in ABL and physical education teacher education (PETE) served as the peer debrief. These persons were responsible in probing the primary researcher for meanings, clarity, and more descriptive information relevant to the study.
Member Checking

Member checking involves placing the research participants in a key role of confirming or negating the researcher’s interpretations and conclusions. In this study, member checks occurred throughout the 10-day unit between the researchers and the participants. The most common items referenced during the study were interview transcripts from the five semi-structured interviews with each participant. Other data pieces used during member checks were the facilitation checklists following lesson facilitation with the researcher’s score of participant’s taught lessons. These checks often coincided with informal coaching sessions between facilitated lessons. The researcher commonly identified strengths and weaknesses of the facilitated lesson and reviewed his interpretations of decisions made by participants with the participants during this time for confirmation or disconfirmation.

Negative Case Analysis

Negative cases are occurrences that contradict existing or developing theory. Negative cases are identified in the findings of Chapter 4 and further reviewed in Chapter 5. These cases were related mostly to the perspectives taken by participants on ABL, the requisite content knowledge, and participant perception of effective facilitation. Negative cases were reported to provide a better perspective of all phenomenon in the study and better situate the findings.

Data Analysis

Qualitative data analysis is a search for general statements about relationships and underlying themes (Strauss & Corbin, 1997). In qualitative studies, data collection and analysis typically go hand in hand to build a coherent interpretation and runs parallel with
the descriptive phase of the research process to allow for a more informed interpretation (Wolcott, 1994; 2008). One of the more fundamental operations in the analysis of qualitative data is that of discovering significance of persons and events and the properties which they are characterized (Marshall & Rossman, 2006).

With a large amount of data in the data corpus, it was essential that I had an organized system during collection and analysis. It is the role of the researcher to bring to light the data in manageble chunks to bring insight into the activity, emotions, and events of the participants. The interpretation took shape as concepts fell into emerging categories and themes. An appropriate analysis occurs when categories are defined and relationships are established and arranged to form an accurate interpretation of persons and events. Categories were generated and patterns established through line-by-line coding and constant comparison.

Conducting continuous and formative analysis allowed the researcher control to adjust observational strategies that identify with the development of the understanding of emerging ideas by regularly checking or testing these ideas (Marshall & Rossman, 2006). Direct observation of facilitated lessons was administered with the use of the ABL checklist and the completion of descriptive and interpretive field notes. Video observation of each lesson was completed during the same day and further field notes were generated. Formative coaching sessions were conducted daily and chronicled in the field notes and the researcher journal. All field notes were word processed and analyzed immediately following the teaching episode for emerging themes. Teacher interviews were transcribed verbatim and analyzed through line by line coding as soon as possible during the 10-day unit. Related course documents, teacher journals, and the researcher
journal were analyzed through thematic analysis in search of confirming or disconfirming data.
Chapter 4: Findings

This chapter reports the findings from the journey of Suzanne and Carolyn as they taught a 10-day instructional unit in Adventure Based Learning (ABL) for the first time in their physical education classes at Island Terrace Middle School (ITMS). A complete list of the provenience used in reporting the data in this chapter is provided in Table 4.1. Data shared in this report were collected through field notes (FN) compiled during teacher training, direct observation, and video observation of lessons. Informal conversations and researcher reflections were compiled in a researcher journal (RJ). A series of semi-structured interviews (I) were conducted in addition to a facilitation checklist (CH) for both participants during their facilitation of each lesson. Findings are organized by each participant (i.e. Suzanne and Carolyn) and focus on their involvement in and reactions to conducting the 10-day unit, including pre-unit training in ABL as a content area for physical education, the facilitation of a 10-day instructional unit to their respective classes, direct observation of facilitation, ongoing coaching sessions, and semi-structured interviews. Italicized words and phrases used in the text are for emphasis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SUZ</td>
<td>Suzanne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR</td>
<td>Carolyn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITMS</td>
<td>Island Terrace Middle School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN1, FN2, FN3, FN4, FN5, FN6, FN7, FN8, FN9, FN10</td>
<td>Field Notes days 1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I1, I2, I3, I4, I5</td>
<td>Semi-Structured Interviews 1-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH1, CH2, CH3, CH4, CH5, CH6, CH7, CH8, CH9, CH10</td>
<td>Facilitation Checklist days 1-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RJ1, RJ2, RJ3, RJ4, RJ5, RJ6, RJ7, RJ8, RJ9, RJ10</td>
<td>Researcher Journal 1-10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1 Provenience of the Data

Suzanne

Three themes emerged for Suzanne and are represented with the following titles: *Stepping Stones, Adventure Wave, and Growth Circles*. *Stepping Stones* represents Suzanne’s upbringing and chronicles her perspective prior to the study as well as her transformation before, during, and after the facilitation of the ABL unit. The theme identifies transformation in the context of research timeline and Suzanne’s participation during ABL teacher training, ABL facilitation, and other activities during the study. *Adventure Wave* outlines the successes and frustrations of Suzanne’s facilitation across the 10-day ABL unit. The theme detects the different strategies and pedagogies used that helped to assemble a more fully-developed frame of reference. *Growth Circles* discusses the paths taken and processes included in the facilitation of ABL content, Suzanne’s knowledge of ABL throughout the facilitation, and the range of experiences as a first-time facilitator of ABL. This theme illustrates the progress and achievement of Suzanne as a first-time facilitator. The sub-themes of (a) comfort zone and (b) growth zone specifically convey the use and transformation of meaning schemes.
Stepping Stones was named after the ABL activity, “Stepping Stones” in which groups of students are asked to transport all group members from one area to another by using “stepping stones” represented as polypots. I named the theme Stepping Stones because I considered some of the implied outcomes of Suzanne’s participation in the study (i.e. acquisition of new knowledge, a more mature frame of reference) to align with the nature of the “Stepping Stones” activity: a step-by-step transport from one area to another with the support of others. The theme provides a clearer context for Suzanne’s upbringing and moments of transformation. Stepping Stones tells the story of Suzanne’s direct experiences, dispositions, and meaning making as a physical educator at ITMS. Subthemes of Upbringing and Moments of Transformation are presented; they emerged from semi-structured interviews, field notes from direct observation of facilitated lessons, and the researcher journal.

Adventure Wave was named after the term “Adventure Wave” used by Panicucci, Faulkingham Hunt, Kohut, Rheingold, & Stratton (2002) in reference to the wave of experiences that are recommended for students to engage in during an adventure lesson, such as the (a) brief, (b) activities, and (c) debrief. The wave refers to the fluctuation in level of activity and types of engagement in each of the three lesson segments. As a theme, Adventure Wave was used to represent the highs (represented in the subtheme Successes), and lows (represented as subtheme Frustrations) of Suzanne’s facilitation during the 10-day unit. Her successes were most commonly identified during facilitation of the ABL unit using data from field notes, informal conversations, and interviews. The theme identifies different moments in her facilitation used to assemble a more fully-developed frame of reference. Included is an identification and description of specific
successes and frustrations during ABL facilitation accompanied by data from outlets listed above.

*Growth Circles* emerged through Suzanne’s facilitation of the ABL unit with her students. *Growth Circles* was named after the activity “Growth Circles” from Laurie Frank’s *Journey Toward the Caring Classroom: Using Adventure to Create Community in the Classroom* (2004). In the activity, the facilitator asks students to move into one of three areas designated with cones or lines on the floor, either (a) the *comfort zone* if the presented scenario is one that makes them feel safe and secure, (b) a *growth zone* in which the learner is open to the scenario, new ideas and experiences, and (c) a *panic zone* if the scenario goes beyond the growth zone where the student may be extremely uncomfortable, fearful, etc.. The *panic zone* is an area to avoid as facilitators. The data is presented in the order of these themes, excluding *panic zone*. With *Growth Circles* as a metaphor for Suzanne’s experience as a facilitator for ABL activities, she spent her time in the *comfort zone* and *growth zone*. Growth was not necessarily defined or restricted by categorizing the experiences of Suzanne within each of the zones. Instead, the growth of Suzanne occurred on a continuum and in a non-linear fashion. Suzanne’s knowledge of ABL developed through interactions during informal conversations and initial pre-unit training.

**Stepping Stones**

As previously outlined, this theme provides context for Suzanne as a physical educator at ITMS. The theme is represented through two subthemes: Upbringing and moments of transformation.
**Upbringing.** Suzanne grew up poor in an underserved neighborhood where her outlet for activity and engagement occurred at school. She enjoyed school mostly for the opportunities for learning and socialization embedded in the daily structure of activities. Despite her affinity for school, Suzanne was teased and ridiculed by her peers and often felt alone during the school day. She labeled herself as the “loser kid” in school and felt this label and judgment was made by other students of her mostly because of her socio-economic status and its influence on things like her clothes, school supplies, and shoes. This emerged as a significant step in her formative years. Suzanne observed:

Other students had the nice physical education suits with blue bubble shorts and a shirt with this cool design on the back. Everyone wanted one and I did not have one. My mother couldn’t afford the suit. It was a really horrible experience for me as one of two students in class that did not have the suit. I realized at that point that I was the poor kid and the outsider. (SUZ, I1)

Suzanne never felt she fit in with her peers as a middle school student. She was on display in front of other children and felt different. The following passage was taken from field notes following the first interview with Suzanne,

The physical education uniform was the primary status indicator in Suzanne’s world. She was a student that wanted to fit in but was wearing clothes different from her peers, wearing her less-than clothes to help her to not fit in. (SUZ, FN1)

As a result of some of her most vivid memories from middle school, Suzanne planned on making life as an ITMS middle school student more workable. She wanted to provide an environment for her students that may not have always been provided for her. Much of the reason Suzanne enjoyed working with middle school students was due to her
own experiences as a student. Suzanne explained, “I hated my life in middle school. I thought my experiences could help students make sense of middle school and let them know that I have been there and can help” (SUZ, I1). The most consistent message shared by Suzanne throughout the study was that she was at ITMS to make a difference and to be counted on as a positive adult in her students’ lives.

A critical step in Suzanne’s adolescence was her ability to cope with the circumstances in which she existed. For one, Suzanne did not seem to fit in as a middle school and high school student. She felt that her independence and confidence, either false or inflated, kept her shielded from some of the teasing and ridicule she faced as a middle school student. Suzanne explained that, “I learned how to cope with the tormenting and negative people. I ignored it or used it to motivate me in other areas in school” (SUZ, I1). Now as a teacher, Suzanne felt middle school students needed a range of skills (and certainly much more than they currently possess) to navigate the social forces of school. I immediately interpreted this as Suzanne’s mission to teach students how to cope and deflect, rather than an attempt to challenge the range of bullying tactics similar to those she faced as a middle school student. Suzanne’s go-to mechanism for handling jeers and labels from her peers in school was to play along, accept it, and laugh with them. She stated, “I laughed off incidents where I was uncomfortable. I thought it would make me stronger” (SUZ, I1). Whether it was strength, maturity, or other reasons, Suzanne began to better identify as a person and student in her high school classes. Fortunately, Suzanne had good models and mentors as teachers that helped shape her identity and to assist her in making large-scale decisions related to college and her future career.
Suzanne identified two teachers that provoked her curiosity and kept her coming back to their classes for more information and council. Mr. Baker and Miss Novak, Suzanne’s high school teachers, demonstrated *real teaching* in her mind, and remained two models for her in her pursuit of a teaching degree. Suzanne learned from both of them to take her position as a role model seriously. She explained, “You could tell that they were both in it for the right reasons. Even though there were times that I felt isolated and not included, their classes seemed to be the most comfortable” (SUZ, I1). Suzanne admitted that these two teachers’ classes were the first environments in which she felt of equal value with her peers. She shared:

I had a voice in both of their classes. Mr. Baker allowed me to express myself and he showed genuine interest in what I had to say as well as the other students in the class. Miss Novak challenged me to go beyond my own perceived limits that I had of myself. She had high expectations for all of her students. (SUZ, I1)

Suzanne fondly recounted her stories of Mr. Baker and Miss Novak. The environments they created seemed to be the most comfortable for Suzanne as a student in her formative years.

A memorable set of experiences in Suzanne’s development was paying close attention to Mr. Baker and Miss Novak’s teaching behaviors. This grew to become much of the foundation that supported her decision to become a teacher. Suzanne wanted a working career that involved helping others and saw teaching as the best fit. She also saw this as a way to give back, and (to some degree) take on the role that Mr. Baker and Miss Novak did for her. She wanted to be a mentor and resource for her students; to help them balance their obligations at school and home while pursuing their dreams.
Once employed at Indian Trails Middle School, Suzanne asserted herself in the building by taking on additional responsibilities. The following extract from the researcher journal summarized multiple interactions with Suzanne prior to the start of Suzanne’s facilitation of the unit:

Suzanne is the only teacher at ITMS that sees all 8th grade students. She has shared that she has helped develop and serve as master of ceremonies for school-wide assemblies. She keeps an open door policy and is available for students during her lunch time, planning period, and transition time between classes to help students with a range of needs. (SUZ, RJ4)

Suzanne put the needs of her students ahead of her own at ITMS as was evidenced in this excerpt from the field notes, “She would regularly walk into her classroom just in time as she was helping another student in the hallway that needed her guidance” (SUZ, FN5). She reiterated her disposition in helping students. Suzanne restated, “I am telling you that I will do whatever it takes to give them as many tools and as much advice to be in a better position than I was” (SUZ, I2).

Suzanne was aware of her responsibility as a teacher. As she sat down for coaching sessions or chatted in-between classes, she carried herself with an air of confidence and responsibility. Based on her own professional teaching experience, including her years at ITMS, she assumed that she had no choice but to be the person to step up in this role. For one reason or another, she believed people just looked at her to take the lead. She explained, “Maybe it is my strong personality or that I see all of the eighth grade students that has people looking at me when it’s time to do a school program or project” (SUZ, I1; FN2). She believed her upbringing and the modeling of effective
teachers were represented in her own teaching style. To Suzanne, these representations are a subtle demonstration and occur frequently. The following passage came from field notes midway through the facilitation of the 10-day ABL unit:

At this juncture of the unit, Suzanne referenced her professional dress, posture, and body language to be positive examples of modeling for her students. She has also identified basic managerial strategies such as class entry, start/stop signals, and not talking over students as effective practice even though these were all not consistently demonstrated to date. (SUZ, FN5)

As a part of being a role model, Suzanne saw her role as a guide or consultant for all of her students; to share with them what to expect and how to be successful in school. She recalled having trouble finding her own identity and feeling ill-equipped for her teenage years and navigating all that being a high school student presented. She stated, “I didn’t have the strategies to succeed as a student, like time management, self-esteem, and a limited peer group. That’s why I want to help students” (SUZ, I2). Suzanne’s intent as a teacher has been to give students the skills to succeed regardless of the in-class content. Suzanne considered her K-12 experiences as a student to be unique and novel in comparison to other teachers at ITMS. She felt that she used her experiences to her advantage when communicating with students. Suzanne stated,

I try to orient them for what is ahead. I am the only one in the building [ITMS] with high school teaching experience. Other teachers don’t always give them (students) the most accurate depiction of what is ahead in high school. In turn, they (students) don’t believe me because other teachers don’t paint the clearest
picture of what high school is like and I feel like I was put here (at ITMS) to fill that gap. (SUZ, I2)

Suzanne did not lack confidence in *how* and *what* she taught her students, particularly in terms of what she felt they needed to be successful. In most cases, this necessary content was skills to be successful that transcended anything traditionally covered in physical education.

Another step in her journey is in the role of a tenured teacher at ITMS. Over time, Suzanne considered herself as having developed over time effective classroom management skills. The context of ITMS, where many students come from underserved environments (e.g. resources, family support), was one Suzanne gravitated to as a teacher and inspired her to be a positive role model. Suzanne felt the context presented additional burdens that were reflected in her daily actions. She explained, “As soon as I step out of my car I feel like I am always *on* – that every move I make is being watched” (SUZ, I1).

The notion of always being *on* was in reference to diagnosing and redirecting students from the moment she entered the building each day. Suzanne added, “I have always had high expectations but also pick my battles. I am critical of how students walk and talk in the hallway but I don’t stop every kid to correct them” (SUZ FN2). Suzanne set the bar high in her classes and refused to give-in to unmotivated, lazy students. The following passage was my reflection following an initial visit of Suzanne’s classes during ABL training:

Suzanne was unyielding with her students in her 8th grade health class today with regard to their in class assignment. She only accepted student work that she felt was the students’ most credible representation of their effort. She emphatically
addressed the issue of turning in pedestrian work and how it would not be tolerated in her class. (SUZ, RJ2)

The direct observation of Suzanne’s emphatic stand on turning in sub-par work prompted further discussion. She explained, “I do not accept bootleg work. I have a stamp on my desk that says ‘bootleg work is not accepted’. Sometimes they forget my expectations and I have to clarify” (SUZ, I2). Suzanne’s follow through on quality work sent a strong message to her students. Specific examples of *bootleg work* that she would enforce included, (a) papers completed with sloppy handwriting, (b) frayed paper edges, (c) incomplete assignments, and (d) crumpled paper (SUZ, FN5; CH5).

Despite being an advocate for her students, Suzanne unintentionally promoted gender stereotypes in her teaching that I discovered during some informal observations held concurrently with initial ABL training. In one of the preliminary visits, the following situation occurred:

Suzanne is teaching a touch football lesson and organized the activity as a whole-class task. Students would pass soft footballs with partners in a line formation.

The initial task is given and practiced for 3-4 minutes. Following the practice session, Suzanne divided those that wanted to play a game (i.e. athletic boys) and those students that wanted to practice skills. (SUZ, FN1)

Students appeared comfortable with this arrangement and responded as if this were the norm of the class. In addition, the following was observed: “No formal arrangement of content was provided in the lesson. Instead, the management of the class was masked with an (a) unstructured and unguided competitive game and (b) an uninspiring practice bout of throwing and catching a football” (SUZ, FN1). This particular physical education
class did not include much in terms of content other than 2-3 critical elements of throwing. The rest of the session was student activity that was casually monitored. Suzanne justified the situation by explaining that she made her curricular decisions based on what she thought students needed.

Suzanne provided an example from another lesson during her flag football unit. She explained, “I had the boys play football and gave them basic ground rules for the playing of the game; the rest of the class learned how to punt a football” (SUZ, I1). The rest of the class, made up mostly of girls, was expected to participate in this segment of the lesson rather than the modified football game unless they were comfortable in a game with the boys. Suzanne thought that the boys needed to play the game and the girls needed basic skills. Suzanne explained that in teaching the punt, she tried to teach it in a way that the girls would identify with. She stated:

I taught them to kick the ball like they were giving a guy the business. I said, “Today I am going to teach you how to make it physical”. I broke down the skill as (a) hold up the ball, (b) bring the ball down here (pointing at her foot), and (c) kick the ball like you are kicking them in the testicles. Based on that, every girl began punting and did it well. This (punting) was a skill that I wanted to cover and the girls got to do something because it was not all that physical. (SUZ, I1)

Suzanne separated the boys from the girls and presented limited content to each group. The daily activities were presented in a manner that held low expectations for both groups. Allowing the context to determine how she taught her classes, rather than expecting (and maintaining) high expectations for instruction contributed to ineffective instruction. The above example promoted a gendered version of physical education that
appeared to be unintentional from Suzanne. In fact, following a couple of days facilitating within the lesson, the state of physical education was discussed during an informal conversation. Much of the discussion dealt with the difficulty Suzanne perceived females had as leaders in the field. She explained,

Others think that females are inferior managers without knowledge of sports and games. Males have a traditional advantage. They have the natural tendency to be the power source. I don’t know how to explain it but they have the advantage.

(SUZ, I2)

During follow-up conversations about this question and response, Suzanne identified others as male physical educators, administrators, students, and parents. Her response was informed with previous experience working with male colleagues and how these men embodied the role of physical educator in their school and the school district. Suzanne had some sense that she had to prove herself every day. She continued, “The students assumed the male teachers have more knowledge because they probably played more sports than us” (SUZ, I2). This matches the way she was teaching by segregating based on gender and served as a fruitful backdrop into learning more of Suzanne’s disposition and readiness for transformation.

**Moments of Transformation.** This sub-theme identifies significant vignettes that identify as, or support the notion of transformation. Before the start of the ABL unit but during ABL training, Suzanne recognized that substantial effort was needed for an improved PE program at ITMS. She acknowledged an interest in changing the present state of ITMS physical education. Her willingness to embark on some change, with my help, stood out as an instrumental step in the process of introducing new content and
training a teacher who was considered to be *effective* by her superiors. At the time of the study, Suzanne’s primary outcome for her students was for them to be physically active. These were her minimal expectations. Beyond students regularly participating in physical activity, Suzanne agreed with me that more content would promote more meaningful interactions and more learning. Her PE classes did not operate how she would ultimately like. Suzanne would like students to leave with more skills such as those present in the different domains present in quality physical education programs (i.e. psychomotor, cognitive, affective, physical activity and fitness). Her participation in this study provided a more focused attempt to make her program better at a manageable level and initiate the pursuit of a more effective program. Suzanne wrestled with articulating exactly what she considered to be an effective PE program, but gave the district’s perspective:

> Physical education is viewed differently across all schools in our district.
> Effectiveness is based on the expectations of each school. If a district’s leadership is willing to accept a new curriculum and willing to support the changes with financial support, then the program on its way to become great (SUZ, I1).

Suzanne had the professional freedom to deliver what she saw as the best fit for her students and her program because the district did not hold teachers accountable for implementing the curriculum. Of course, any change and implementation would be additional work self-imposed on the teacher/school that was done voluntarily. However, Suzanne’s involvement in the study suggested that ITMS physical education was on its way to better PE programming. As we were discussing the possibilities for her classes and her PE program, Suzanne shared cautiously, “We have a long way to go” (SUZ, I1).
Suzanne stood out as the participant who immediately saw the utility of ABL in her classes. As a content area, I spoke informally with her during a scheduled visit at ITMS. I introduced myself and expressed my primary research interests and shared my perspective of ABL in holding value in a number of contexts: The first being the building of community in the classroom to establish a foundation from which much greater outcomes can occur. I had arranged a content packet of ABL materials, including tips for facilitators that I would help clarify and lead in a systematic fashion. Our first meeting lasted 25 minutes in Suzanne’s health classroom as she was eating her lunch and supervising students completing makeup work for other classes. Despite the other tasks taking place, our brief meeting served as plenty of time to establish ITMS and Suzanne as a suitable context and participant, respectively for the study. She saw ABL as a useful content area at ITMS. Suzanne’s buy-in was instantaneous and frankly, motivating to me as a researcher that ABL would be taught at ITMS.

Before the study, Suzanne’s reflection on her previous lessons most often meant asking herself what worked and what did not work, as well as making notes on specific learning activities for future classes. If a particular class went well and the activities worked, Suzanne considered the lesson successful. After multiple observations of Suzanne teaching, it was clear that effective teaching and effective management were synonymous at ITMS. Suzanne confirmed and stated, “Most issues in PE are management. These skills are huge factors for your lessons. This is cleaned up only after you have built a rapport with the students” (SUZ, I2). Even though Suzanne referenced management primarily as the most important or only component of effective teaching, she criticized former colleagues who only managed students by rolling out the ball. She
referred to those teachers that, “effectively observed students doing nothing” (SUZ, FN2; CH2). Suzanne added,

If other colleagues are not on board with your expectations it can be a disaster.

There were two years at ITMS when we had a third P.E. teacher and his classes played either speedball or basketball the entire year. I had to bargain hard with him to do more activities in his classes. He didn’t want to go outside when the weather was nice. He didn’t want to do anything other than read the paper and watch them play basketball. (SUZ, I2)

Suzanne’s perspective expressed the limitations of teaching at ITMS with limited resources, limited curriculum, and limited expectations from co-workers. The offerings at ITMS were based on equipment and the limited scope, knowledge, or expectations from other colleagues.

As a means to expand her content knowledge in physical education, Suzanne agreed to participate in the study even though it would push her pedagogical skills beyond that which she was currently using. Even with limited resources at ITMS, Suzanne would be trained on a teaching style with content/activities that required limited equipment that could be easily accessed. Suzanne’s ABL training was dedicated to considering a new perspective on teaching PE and maintaining a pursuit of achieving the intended outcomes of a lesson, assuming those outcomes were appropriate and meaningful. As the study progressed, I remarked on Suzanne’s reflection after a lesson:

Suzanne sees success in her classes based on student interest and the overall receptiveness and flow of each planned activity. Before the study, Suzanne’s
reflection responses would consider an effective lesson one that was well managed and not necessarily one with quality content. (SUZ, FN5)

Before the study, Suzanne felt that a PE program where students were physically active, well behaved, and exposed to a range of physical activities would be exceptional for the district. Suzanne and I eventually agreed that these qualities were a good foundation for any program. The following passage came from field notes following the fourth day of Suzanne’s facilitation:

Suzanne reflected in a negative tone on the quality of most physical education programs in the district. Most have large numbers and classes involved large-sided sports and games with little or no instruction, and exceedingly high amount of student inactivity (i.e. students sitting out, modifying/ negotiating tasks). (SUZ FN4)

The large disconnect between what she believed and what existed provided additional perspective on Suzanne’s immediate acceptance to participate in the study, and embrace the new content and approach to teaching physical education.

Before the start of the study, Suzanne felt the view of PE at ITMS was one where students and other faculty members held a stereotype that men knew more about sport and physical education and physical activity than women and women PE teachers. In her last three years at ITMS, Suzanne experienced a PE faculty that had changed to become female-only. Since becoming a female-only faculty in PE, Suzanne, and her colleague Carolyn assumed authority in making curricular decisions for students in PE and health at ITMS. Activities offered were based on what Suzanne felt students needed and what the district wanted her to cover. Suzanne stated, “The district re-worked our physical
education curriculum a few years ago and they gave us copies of the new materials” (SUZ, I2). Suzanne’s comments and direct observations did not indicate that the curriculum was being used in her instruction at ITMS. The following excerpt was taken from the researcher’s journal prior to the start of the ABL unit:

Suzanne’s attitude on an effective curriculum appeared to be heavily weighted on the context. At ITMS Suzanne felt it was based on student survival and equipping students to be successful in high school. In theory, Suzanne would provide instruction and assessments based on what they needed. (SUZ, RJ2)

Before the study, Suzanne’s teaching practices in health and physical education were a bit unclear. I was not entirely sure what students were experiencing and what the expectations were in her classes. The lack of clarity suggests a misaligned curriculum between teachers within the same program. It was evident in talking with Suzanne that her content knowledge in PE was not well developed or that she was not able to spend much time with students on PE specific content because most of her effort was spent managing students and getting them into initial activity.

In addition to providing a curriculum based on what she thought the students needed, Suzanne did not articulate a clear understanding or awareness of the expected student outcomes in her courses. She was teaching material she considered to be important or what had worked for her in the past. However, there was no indication that Suzanne’s craft knowledge and the district-approved curriculum were linked. She explained her knowledge of the district-approved curriculum:

I have a pretty good idea of the curriculum. I think it is good and they really want us to push it but I want to make it work for the context. It is not really geared for
high school kids; I don’t think it will work unless we modify it to meet the needs of our kids. I have used what has worked and what has not worked and change activities as needed (SUZ, I1).

Suzanne taught all eighth grade students in PE and health at ITMS. For each class, the district allowed eighth grade PE to count as a unit of high school credit. Throughout the study, the following issues were discussed with Suzanne regarding the PE content at ITMS, the lack of accountability by the district on what was taught and how well it was taught, student readiness for content, and the appropriateness for high school equivalence.

In PE, students most often played sports and games that would normally be played in these middle school PE classes. In health, the district adopted a curriculum that includes components of health and physical activity. Suzanne referenced the curriculum, particularly the health class, as not being appropriate for high school students even though she only taught students in eighth grade. The following excerpt was pulled from my journal following the initial semi-structured interview, “These students receive high school credit for taking health and physical education in eighth grade. Teachers were asked to adopt a curriculum geared for high school students, and deliver instruction for eighth-grade students that were reading below grade level” (SUZ, RJ1). The high school qualification appeared to be a fiscally-driven decision. Suzanne felt that student readiness was a primary concern and her hands were tied in terms of following the recommended curriculum while having different thoughts on what her students needed.

Another moment of transformation for Suzanne in her teaching career was being an effective instructional leader. In order words, her ability to lead a class. Before the study, Suzanne admitted having difficulty maintaining order in leading a class, and a
main reason to become a more skilled teacher. She accomplished this through professional development sessions through the school district. Suzanne added some perspective on her ineffective practice early in her career:

In my first few years, I didn’t include how I would transition between activities on my lesson plans. It showed in my teaching. I really didn’t understand until several experiences of trial and error. It began to click for me after four or five days when students would take too long to get out of the locker-room for my classes on time. I knew I needed to clarify my expectations and follow through on it. (SUZ, I1)

Most of her improvements in her teaching were made independently or during the rare occasion that a colleague would watch her teaching. Suzanne identified a variety of methods that were not systematic when she reflected independently. She stated:

I usually ask myself if the kids liked it and if it worked well. If it didn’t work then I try to figure out why and how I can make it work next time. One time my class played a foosball-soccer game and the kids really liked it but the pace of play was slow because we were limited to using one ball for the entire class. It would have worked better if we had another soccer ball (SUZ, I3).

Suzanne’s reflective practices appear to be similar to other practicing teachers to consider what worked, what didn’t work, and what could be the most practical functions of a PE lesson.

During the ABL unit, Suzanne’s direct involvement as a facilitator in an instructional unit allowed for a critical review of all of the processes by me. Methods utilized prior to the start of the ABL unit (i.e. life history interview, ABL training)
offered the participants and myself to establish a foundation of content and pedagogy that was expected to be delivered and demonstrated during the ABL unit with students. ABL training provided time to discuss the content, provide examples, and discuss participants’ and my direct experience that helped support the constructed materials utilized for the study. I believed the ABL content shared in the study provided an effective example of a content packet that could be used as a template for the development of additional content areas within the ITMS physical education program. Other benefits included the systematic approach to teacher training, developing an aligned curriculum with purposeful content, the sharing of ABL materials as an instructional unit but still adaptable for use in a semester-long course or entire PE program.

Transformation was represented throughout Suzanne’s 10-day ABL unit in (a) demonstrated behaviors as a facilitator (b) situations where she was able to teach-reteach the same lessons, and (c) her overall performance through each of the 20 observed lessons. These moments of transformation are further elaborated on in the subsequent themes. Suzanne demonstrated a pursuit of transformation following informal coaching sessions with the researcher. She noticed her students beginning to share their meaningful perspectives in each of her classes. In turn, Suzanne became more cognizant to these perspectives and admittedly different than her typical physical education classes.

After the ABL unit, transformation was most present in the final semi-structured interviews and her reflection of the last two days of ABL lessons. After a 10-day unit, the researcher was curious to gain Suzanne’s view of the unit and the more crucial components of ABL for students in physical education. Initially, I viewed transformation after the ABL unit as transfer of learned skills/characteristics into other applicable
functions of participant’s lives (i.e. teaching, etc.). Further, transformation of ABL pedagogy and content was looked at in terms of retention beyond formative coaching, interviews, field notes, and member checks. These are further elaborated on in subsequent themes. After the unit, Suzanne acknowledged ABL as a valuable content area in which student engagement looked much different than in any other PE class at ITMS. Students had not been put in these types of situations/ scenarios before. I hoped that ABL would serve as the start of a foundation in PE classes that could be embedded in Suzanne’s PE courses.

**Adventure Wave**

This theme outlines successes and frustrations of Suzanne’s facilitation across the 10-day ABL unit. Specifically, it detects the different strategies and pedagogies used that helped to assemble a more fully-developed frame of reference.

**Successes.** Suzanne demonstrated awareness of student readiness related to the specific activities and associated themes of ABL that we discussed prior to the start of the unit. Readiness was a topic informally addressed in ABL training prior to the unit but often mentioned in different terms (e.g. timeliness, appropriateness, necessary). Suzanne appropriately looked to make the lessons work best for her students on a daily basis, and our meetings/ coaching sessions between my direct observations of her lessons occasionally discussed the next day’s lesson plan and the activities. Readiness was present through her openness to revise activities per my suggestions that aligned to the sequence and themes within the unit. The modifications later in the unit were done in a fashion that demonstrated Suzanne’s competency in adjusting rules or playing conditions
to make the game either (a) more meaningful in terms of expected student behaviors or 
(b) appropriate, such as changing the rules for added safety or added risk (SUZ, CH9-10).

Suzanne demonstrated her own readiness as a facilitator in her behaviors as a learner in training and continuously/formatively through our range of communications while in the ABL unit. She shared her perspective later in the unit on the lesson plans, stating:

I have pretty much followed what you have done. Sometimes I just want to try something a little different. *Have You Ever* did not strike me as being conducive to an emotionally safe environment, so I changed it to *fit* my kids. (SUZ, I4)

Suzanne was consistently competent and asked good questions if there was any doubt on the instructions of activities or how she intended to facilitate. Initially, she kept lesson plans and the specific activities intact. The research methods, specifically the intentional use of the reflection sessions allowed for a directed conversation/coaching session that explicitly identified effective and ineffective facilitation supported with video of the lesson and my descriptive and interpretive field notes. Suzanne’s teaching and re-teaching of activities to all of her classes provided numerous opportunities to test the utility of her facilitation and the supporting activities, and subsequently develop her initial comfort as a facilitator.

Suzanne embraced the ABL structure, particularly when it became a norm in her classes. In my direct observations, this occurred around day four of the unit. Specifically, Suzanne most often utilized the ABL structure as presented in training, of (a) the brief to engage the class for the day, (b) multiple activities aligned to the brief or deliberately put in sequence, and (c) the debrief to process the recent experiences to generalize and apply
outside of their direct experiences. Suzanne shared some reactions to using a brief in each of her classes: “I like that I always have something to share with them as they enter the class and it is meaningful. I feel like it helps us to get off to a strong start” (SUZ, I2). She was convinced that even this slight change (adding a brief) was a significant step to foster a more effective class.

To her credit, Suzanne used the initial debrief strategies early in the unit as they were presented on the lesson plans. Each strategy was selected based on appropriateness for both the facilitator and students and the progression of the unit. Suzanne recognized these considerations from me that allowed her to feel more collaborative in the employed methods of the research study.

As students approached the completion of the unit, Suzanne was more reflective in our formal and informal conversations on the benefits of the ABL unit for her students. She stated, “I can think of many students who have emerged as leaders in the class. Students have made efforts to engage in new activities and include others” (SUZ, I4). She felt a connection to the content and the outcomes ABL promoted for students, and saw an opportunity for her class to experience these themes through physical activity. Suzanne continued, “These activities put my kids in situations that they normally don’t have in physical education. It was a shock to their system at first but they grew to know the format and structure” (SUZ, FN9). Some of the novel experiences in physical education for her students included group discussion, active listening, perspective taking, as well as standards-based instruction with a central theme (e.g. cooperation, establishing classroom norms, communication, etc.) shared each day.
From the beginning of the study, Suzanne keenly recognized positive differences in the ABL unit to other instructional units she led at ITMS: “this unit allowed my students to have a voice in my class and they were pretty good at sharing their opinions” (SUZ, I3). To her credit, Suzanne asked the appropriate types of questions: open-ended that required students to consider a more thoughtful response. Fortunately, if students did not answer her initial prompt, Suzanne followed through and allowed students’ discussion to develop and (often) go beyond the question or away from the question. During the initial lessons of the unit, Suzanne recognized the importance of the community and asked questions during the debrief sessions that emphasized the importance accordingly. For example as noted in the facilitation checklists, for the first three days of the unit, her follow-up questions to the employed debrief strategy (i.e. thumbs up – thumbs down, one word) were related to the community. As the unit progressed, she continued to ask questions that provoked further processing from students.

Suzanne knew the difference in the debrief strategies used and the related sequence of each tool (i.e. thumbs up/thumbs down, facial expressions, crumpled paper). Still, she was surprised by the paths taken by students and the perspectives that emerged from the use of different debrief strategies. When sufficient time was dedicated at the end of the class for processing, Suzanne was able to elicit responses that had depth and authenticity. The following excerpt came from field notes supporting the facilitation checklist:

During the debrief after the first lesson, Suzanne asked, “Do you talk to adults differently than you do to your peers?” in reference to students’ participation in
Laughing Matters. Several students immediately volunteered to provide examples that generally included giving respect to adult family members because they deserve it and talking more loosely to their classmates. (SUZ, CH1)

When offering the appropriate amount of time for her students to process, Suzanne was impressed with the openness and free-flowing nature of the debrief process. The following passage was taken from my field notes following her last facilitation during the ABL unit: “Suzanne was most effective when she appeared to be most comfortable and off-book. Students were sharing perspectives and Suzanne was not trying to unpack a set of 30 responses from four students as she did earlier in the unit” (SUZ, FN10). During her very best debriefs, Suzanne took time for the perspectives to be heard and meaning to be made. An example of this occurred on day three of the unit and the lesson was focused on building community in the classroom. During the debrief Suzanne began by using the Thumbs Up Thumbs Down initial debrief strategy which allowed all students to provide their initial perspective on the lesson. The following excerpt came from direct observation field notes:

After the initial strategy provided a quick perspective of all group members,

Suzanne began talking specifically about the Growth Circles activity and used the questions on the lesson plan in an effective sequence. The questions asked were, “What did you learn about someone that you didn’t know before this class” and “What characteristics are important in this activity”. (SUZ, FN3)

Suzanne’s used of pre-planned questions in sequence, and in good timing, allowed for an effective segment of the debrief.
At times, Suzanne asked good questions during her debriefs to several student responses. During the debrief on day four, Suzanne asked, “What were some norms that we demonstrated in this activity (“Growth Circles”) today?” (SUZ, FN4). Expected from Suzanne’s debriefs was the sharing of student perspectives to their peers in pairs or to the whole group that would allow the group to process together. This process, facilitated by Suzanne, assumed student responses would shape the meaning making taken from the group based on the day’s activities and the future directions of the individual and group. During most debriefs, Suzanne rarely followed the line of probing questions as recommended on the lesson plans. Instead, she would ask one of the questions and followed the direction of her students, even if it was not directly aligned to the objectives of the lesson. Suzanne stated, “I like the scenarios I included in the I Like My Friends and the debriefs because we are talking about things that are more important to them and it helped me to have a more relevant discussion at the end” (SUZ, FN3; CH3). Even though it may not have been the most focused debrief for the purpose of the ABL lesson as originally planned, Suzanne justified the value as students were sharing at a rate unique to their level of engagement in her PE class.

During a debrief using an initial strategy (i.e. One Word, Thumbs Up/Thumbs Down, etc.), Suzanne effectively asked open-ended questions to get more information from her students. She clarified her decisions in between classes on the second day of the unit:

During this class the students did not like the activities, so I wanted to know why they didn’t like them. I was committed to finding out why things weren’t
working. They don’t always share their opinions and this seemed like a good opportunity. (SUZ, FN2)

Suzanne appropriately initiated student conversation with a recommended debrief strategy as discussed in training and followed through with effective questions to continue the conversation intended to address themes identified in the activities or themes demonstrated by students in the activities.

Even though Suzanne did not always allocate the 8-12 minutes for the debrief that was recommended and modeled during the ABL training, she was happy with the overall quality and quantity of the debriefs that she facilitated. She recognized, however, that the time spent on debriefing was short and stated, “I wish I had more time to get through this stuff” (SUZ, FN8; CH8). Despite my encouragement through ABL training, informal conversations, and coaching sessions, Suzanne was ultimately responsible for allocating the amount of time to conduct each debrief session as well as other lesson components.

**Frustrations.** Many of these vignettes identified were in contrast to behaviors I encouraged during ABL training prior to the start of Suzanne’s facilitation. A primary selling point for ABL programming is its easy integration into existing PE programs assuming that the teacher/facilitator possesses sufficient content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge of the corresponding teaching style(s) and has a clear vision of reasonable outcomes in such a unit. Initially there was some student resistance to ABL, particularly during the first lesson and in preparation of the second lesson. For example, Suzanne had trouble getting all students to engage in each of the three activities, partially due to her lesson pace, lack of enthusiasm, and appropriate framing of the first lesson and its fit in a larger ABL unit. Based on our training and conversations leading up
to the start of the unit, I expected her to be more engaging with her students and make a better sell of the unit from the beginning. In her view, Suzanne felt the (student) resistance was largely due to their disinterest in childish games. The following exchange occurred from Suzanne to the researcher after the first class on the first day: “It is not working today. We need to make a change. We need to do something different” (SUZ, FN1; SUZ, CH1). Suzanne’s reaction after day one served as a good reference point for the necessity of ongoing coaching sessions and conversations steered around effective ABL facilitation in her classes.

In an informal conversation on day two I asked Suzanne to reflect on the first day of the unit: “I expected students to have their system shocked as this was their first day in an instructional unit that was so different than anything they have done in physical education” (SUZ, CH 2; FN2). Our daily checks allowed activities to be more clearly understood for Suzanne and more relevant for the students. Suzanne felt the day one activities resembled activities more appropriate for day one of a school year and not day one of the instructional unit. The initial re-working of lessons early in the unit helped develop further conversations during the unit, changing the focus of informal conversations to what activities would look like during the facilitation and what could be expected from students during the activities. These conversations helped to consider adaptations that could be made throughout the unit for consistent, meaningful student experiences. For example, Suzanne created a nonsensical word in advance for the activity “Laughing Matters” on day one to prohibit any inappropriate student comments or interactions. In the second lesson during Marketplace Relay, Suzanne modified the
playing space and the format of students receiving the word to describe in front of their peers.

Suzanne encountered some resistance from students and some that may have been self-imposed. Activities provided in the ABL content packet were prepared in the attempt to fit the needs of students in Suzanne’s physical education classes. The lesson materials aligned with themes of building community, establishing full value norms, and cooperation. Early in the unit, Suzanne spoke to the newness and challenges in teaching a new content area with limited experience and stated,

Beginning and teaching instructional units that are new to everyone is really tough. I knew the activities and thought that they would go better than I thought. The whole first day of the unit was like pulling healthy teeth. Still, I didn’t know what to expect from them. (SUZ, I2).

Early on in the ABL unit, Suzanne made rules of simple games more complex and unnecessary. Rules were clearly presented on the lesson plan for each activity: at times some rules were intentionally vague to elicit a range of student responses. This is a deliberate approach and one that I shared with both participants during training. To a fault, Suzanne occasionally gave too much information and steered students in some activities (i.e. Warp Speed, Group Juggle) to engage in an activity how she clearly articulated (SUZ, FN3-4).

The primary content area of ABL, as presented during training with both participants, and described in previous chapters, was the “art of facilitation”. Suzanne was giving too many instructions to students per activity. She would occasionally share her affinity to the activities before facilitating them to students, possibly creating student
biases. Under these terms, Suzanne was steering her groups rather than letting them experience and learn for themselves.

Suzanne struggled with managing student behaviors and maintaining student accountability during the ABL activities. She was transparent in sharing lesson and unit outcomes and regularly talked about the rationale of the content and the affiliated activities. For example, on day two she shared with her second class, “I want you to understand the purpose of these activities as working together and communicating” (SUZ, FN2; CH 2). However, she fell short on following through and holding students accountable for their behaviors. In the game (Everybody’s It) Suzanne made the rules more complex, causing some student confusion and student misbehavior in the form of physical contact. The following description came from her facilitation checklist following the class:

Suzanne provided the instructions as they were written on the lesson plan but began to answer follow-up questions from the group. In most cases, answering follow-up questions for clarity is appropriate, but in this activity she was expected to leave her students in question to allow them to make their own decisions whether or not they were still in the game. (SUZ, CH3)

In a game where the facilitator is expected to leave students with some doubt, Suzanne was inappropriately leading students on a path that would not stimulate the outcomes that were expected on the lesson plan.

Suzanne explicitly addressed ABL concepts (e.g. communication, cooperation, honesty, classroom norms, etc.) to her class. However, during Asteroids, a game that invokes student behaviors related to accountability and honesty, Suzanne was not holding
students accountable. The following passage was taken from the facilitation checklist and field notes following Suzanne’s facilitation:

She failed to address the most prominent behaviors exhibited during this game. Honesty, accountability, and forming alliances were all present but were not being corrected in the moment. Instead, Suzanne led a debrief based on effective communication and working together; only four students in the class shared a perspective before the themes were told by Suzanne (SUZ, FN3; CH 3).

In this example, Suzanne did not reinforce rules or redirect students that were not abiding by rules. More importantly, the observed student behaviors were not addressed during the debrief. The failure to recognize behavior can negatively influence the health of the community of learners within the class. A large portion of the class was not playing Asteroids how it was intended or how it was initially presented from Suzanne. During the activity, Suzanne played more of a passive role and should have intervened or re-directed play when issues of safety were compromised, or when most students were not playing according to her expectations.

One of the more prominent missteps in Suzanne’s facilitation of the ABL unit was her initial framing (or lack thereof) to students on what they would experience in the name of ABL. First, she had inappropriate expectations for her students’ engagement in the ABL lessons. For example, Suzanne independently decided that she wanted students to share just 2-3 times during debriefs in the 10-day unit. This number was clearly unacceptable and refuted the ABL training and the amount of time spent discussing the role of the debrief in ABL lessons as the critical feature at the end of lessons to help students make meaning of their recent direct experiences. After the third day, just eight of
27 students in a class provided a response to Suzanne’s initial prompt during the debrief and provided some necessary experiences for review in our coaching sessions. Suzanne shared some of her frustrations and thoughts as she led early debrief sessions:

The students did not seem to be comfortable. My thing is that I need them to share at least once during the unit. If I don’t do that then I think we have lost. If it comes to a point where I force them to share then emotional safety will be an issue. (SUZ, I2)

Suzanne’s above comments on her perspective of the frequency of student contributions in the ABL unit were not consistent with the information shared in training, which was that each lesson she should gain initial perspective from as many students as possible.

The most common breakdown for Suzanne’s debriefs was a failure to support all phases of the Experiential Learning Cycle. Some of the blame for not completing debriefs as recommended was the misappropriation of time remaining in a lesson, nurturing the debrief session with her students, and inability to stay in the moment with the specific needs in each of her classes. With limited time left in certain classes, Suzanne made decisions not to hear all student perspectives and generalize those comments shared to the group as a consensus for all student perspectives. The following was taken from my researcher journal:

Suzanne’s incomplete debriefs are a sign of poor time management. The time is limited, her questions are rushed, and she is not allowing all students to share. She is forcing her own hand of direct questioning and limited student responses. This is leaning more toward a closure from a traditional PE class (SUZ, FN5).
Immediate steps taken during our coaching sessions were geared toward guaranteeing the necessary time at the end of the unit for an effective debrief and how to foster the sharing of all student perspectives beyond the initial debrief strategies.

Even when enough time was earmarked for effective debriefs, effective questions were necessary to support what students would share after their daily activities. On day three, Suzanne offered appropriate questions during the debrief to limited student response. This occurred in part because she progressed in this phase too quickly, “Today’s first debrief allowed only a few students to respond before generalizing to the whole group” (SUZ, FN3; CH 3). Suzanne failed to use follow-up questions or allow students to maintain control of the conversation to keep students on the same theme. The following situation was observed during lesson three:

When asked by Suzanne what some of the main themes of the activity were, one boy raised his hand and said that trust was a big issue in their class’s game of Asteroids. Suzanne failed to foster the development of this student-generated theme by cutting off the conversation. Cutting off the comment from a participant allowed Suzanne to get to her agenda but did not provide an environment for her perspective to be fully shared (SUZ, CH3).

She progressed too quickly, asked questions that may not have fit, and cut off students from fully sharing about their direct experiences. As in the above excerpt, Suzanne fostered a climate for students to share detailed, authentic responses but did not always know how to proceed with her group in addressing such themes.

Throughout the unit, Suzanne used some of the processing questions that supported the specific debrief strategy as well as added her own. This does not infer
Suzanne’s questions were inappropriate, but the recommended questions on the lesson plan aligned with the suggested outcomes for the lesson and were validated by me. In turn, the themes addressed in her debriefs varied greatly. These debriefs were disjointed or unaligned, and did not identify the observed student behaviors that could have supported more meaningful individual and group processing. The following came from field notes based off the facilitation checklist:

The debrief after the third lesson was primed to discuss honesty and accountability based on numerous student displays of not knowing rules and breaking rules. Instead, Suzanne gained some initial perspectives using the Statue strategy and students described their statue. (SUZ, CH3)

Her debriefs went away from the original outcomes of the daily lesson. Suzanne shared her view on this during our third interview: “Each class is different; many of the conversations and themes happen off the cuff and in the moment. I would just let them talk and step in when needed and see where the discussion went” (SUZ, I3). The structure provided in the ABL lessons allowed Suzanne’s students to share their perspectives on activities in their physical education class for the first time. Even if the nature of the discussion was not entirely on-topic students were communicating and actively listening to others. However, the primary issue during any off-topic discussion during Suzanne’s debriefs was an inability and unwillingness to re-direct the conversation with the prepared questions from the lesson plans, or prompts to help them adjust back to the recently experienced activities and related concepts (e.g. honesty, accountability, etc.).
Growth Circles

This theme discusses the paths processes in Suzanne’s facilitation of ABL content, her knowledge of ABL throughout the facilitation, and her range of experiences. This theme illustrates the progress and achievement of Suzanne as a first-time facilitator.

Comfort. Suzanne’s overall comfort was visible in her ongoing comfort and flexibility as a participant to work with me on starting and ending dates of the study. She was very flexible in allowing the study to take place with her students scheduled to be in health class for this part of the academic year. Suzanne was expected to teach health during the time of the study but adjusted her schedule to allow the ABL unit to be delivered to her students.

Suzanne was more comfortable leading her classes under a direct instruction (DI) format. Suzanne spent more time telling rather than asking their individual perspective. Based on my previous observations of Suzanne’s teaching, using DI was more comfortable for Suzanne but not the most effective strategy to utilize for the ABL content. The following passage describes her first three days of facilitation in the unit:

After three days, Suzanne’s direct instruction style has trumped the training and strategies used in ABL training. Most noticeable is the pacing of the lessons, where she has leaned toward getting to all activities on the lesson plan instead of letting the students dictate when it would be appropriate to move on. It was all driven by Suzanne (SUZ, FN3).

In order for the class to operate in the form it did during the unit, Suzanne felt that her DI style was necessary for the success of the activity and the flow of the class. Suzanne’s
teacher behaviors promoted the DI climate in which teacher says and the student does.

After her second class, she spoke with me about her instructional style and stated,

   I feel like I am taking more of a step back but maybe it is not enough. The biggest challenge for me is giving them the instructions for the activity but not giving them the answers or solutions. I know I need to let them figure it out. (SUZ, FN2; CH2)

Above, Suzanne recognized her lessons were less effective in ABL if she were to continue to use a more directive approach to leading the lessons. Not until the fifth day in the unit was Suzanne able to better detect the advantages (over time) of using more student-centered approaches to delivering instruction. Suzanne’s lesson pace, early in the unit, was a bit disjointed because of inconsistencies in providing instructions for activities and allowing too little time for students to experience the activities.

Suzanne was comfortable but inconsistent in her acquisition and demonstration of providing clear instructions of activities as well as her effective facilitation of the activities according to the needs of the group. Based on the type of training and time spent reviewing lesson materials, Suzanne still did not seem fully prepared as a facilitator. ABL training encouraged both participants to appear spontaneous during their facilitation from the beginning of the unit. However, the appearance of spontaneity should be coupled with appropriate preparation in facilitating an effective lesson. This excerpt from field notes on day six identified common behaviors for Suzanne through the ABL unit:

   Much of the instruction after the first day was being delivered as it was presented on the lesson plan without any modifications to the content packet as developed
by the researcher. The classes had a stale or pre-packaged feel during the fourth and fifth day of the unit. (SUZ, FN6)

These lessons were delivered verbatim, and used the same briefs and debrief without any modifications. Her question order during the debrief had the same order but not the intended flow or pace as she had difficulty generalizing initial perspectives. Students were on good behavior and managed as well as they have been during any of my visits prior to the ABL unit, but not appropriately engaged in the activities. The following passage was taken from field notes midway through the ABL unit:

Suzanne is mostly prepared in terms of managing students and delivering appropriate prompts during activity within the ABL lesson. The organization was effective but her monitoring of student behaviors was not strong, as in Asteroids and Group Juggle when students were not following the expectations for the activity. Her lack of monitoring on these activities was further supported when these student behaviors were ignored during the debrief. (SUZ, FN5)

Suzanne was not aware of these oversights until our informal conversations after each class. To her it was a surprise that these were issues because students were getting along and having fun in the games. As a result, her debriefs lacked their necessary meaning. This included asking the staged questions and giving less consideration to what was actually happening in her classes. Suzanne was simply not effectively monitoring student performance while delivering the lesson according to the plan.

Suzanne appeared to have some false comfort early in the ABL unit. Students were participating in these new activities and demonstrating an attempt to participate or “play along”. Her false comfort was observed first in her not carrying the lesson plan
with her during her lesson facilitations but still forgetting some of the instructions for activities. Also, Suzanne’s transitions between activities were lengthy and did not align with my recommendations for her to appear spontaneous in lessons. Appearing spontaneous but being unprepared only reduced her credibility as a facilitator and instructional leader. Suzanne facilitated most of her lessons without the lesson plan in her hands. This was her decision although I encouraged her to appear spontaneous if she was comfortable with all of the content.

There were a couple of lessons early in the unit when Suzanne made note cards to give her reminders on activities or went completely off book. Suzanne explained her rationale, “I knew some of the activities before we started and reviewed the others. I had some written notes because I always wasn’t familiar and had to have a plan B if something didn’t work” (SUZ, I3). For her preparation, Suzanne was used to the unknown and unpredictability of being an educator. She was able to make adaptations easily during classes, using carpet squares and flat weights instead of polyspots. Suzanne responded to the utility of the lesson plans for her needs stating, “The lesson plans (and planning) were very helpful, but a good teacher will make it work. Overall I felt the support and materials were great” (SUZ, I5). The lesson plans, when modified by Suzanne, gave them more credibility for use in her classroom.

Suzanne demonstrated comfort at the end of her facilitated ABL lessons and determined lessons where most of the students participated and a debrief was delivered to be effective. Her early debrief sessions were led in a question and answer format and multiple student responses from each question were shared. In her second lesson to a class of 29 students, two or three perspectives were shared from her questions before
Suzanne moved to another question. In short, Suzanne was much more competent in helping students to process their experiences, but (specifically) not in leading an effective debrief session. Early lessons (i.e. days 1-3) did not follow the conventional, recommended pattern that I established in training for an effective debrief, including using the questions provided on lesson plans. The following excerpt was taken from my field notes after day nine of the unit:

In recent lessons, Suzanne has been leading debriefs at a comfortable pace. She has committed to using specific debrief strategies, even if they are not the exact strategy on that lesson plan. More students are sharing and she is more patient to not jump to conclusions or provide solutions for her students. (SUZ, FN9)

Overall, Suzanne improved as a facilitator and, in particular, leading debrief sessions throughout the 10-day unit.

Activities were purposefully sequenced in the ABL unit plan prior to the study to foster the development of specific intra-personal and inter-personal characteristics. In most lessons, three or four activities were planned and given artificial time frames for the reference of the participants. As a result (and to not compromise the integrity of the activity), some individual activities were capable of lasting for an entire lesson. To her credit, Suzanne took the time to carry out activities (i.e. Group Interview) or spent more time with activities (i.e. Growth Circles) that made an immediate impression on students. The following excerpt came from field notes following direct and video observations from the first five lessons in the unit:

Activities like Group Interview and Growth Circles sparked more student interest than I originally thought. Based on Suzanne’s students’ responses, both of these
could have lasted for an entire class period. The nature of both activities called for more student input and relevant scenarios outside of PE at ITMS. (SUZ, FN5). Students seemed to enjoy these types of interactions the most in this unit.

**Growth.** Suzanne grew to lead effective ABL lessons with larger concepts in mind. In lesson plan terms, she became much better at sharing the lesson focus with her students and delivering that focus in the lesson. Further, Suzanne did not always follow the intended structure of ABL as presented in training but addressed the importance of transfer of learned skills beyond the experiences in her PE class as well as their (students’) time at ITMS. The following excerpt identifies multiple instances to support the assertion:

Suzanne posed the question” *Is there a way to make a nonsensical word funny?*” during the debrief of *Laughing Matters*. She also stated, “*When you come to school you bring your matters with you*”. Suzanne then directed the conversation around the theme of communication patterns that each person uses dependent upon context. (SUZ, FN1)

Suzanne’s ability to integrate the daily themes into the specific activities, and highlight these themes continuously was a clear example of effective ABL pedagogy and promoted more student recognition of the new ABL concepts shared in her unit.

Suzanne executed facilitations that gave more attention to student outcomes and the effective arrangement of activities and learning experiences. Following a day when Suzanne was absent from school and students were disruptive and disrespectful with the substitute teacher, she emphasized the larger concept of problem solving when leading the ABL activities. The emerging problem, as Suzanne saw it due to her absence, was the
act of students disrespecting a substitute teacher. Suzanne spent the majority of her next class with this group of students discussing the misbehavior in her absence. During the conversation, Suzanne asked, “Who owns the problem? Why is the problem yours?” (SUZ, FN4). In addition, the following excerpt came from field notes from direct observation in the same lesson:

Each question served as another reminder to students of their behaviors and consequences. Suzanne provided an example of how we (her students) interact and act in front of their mother, grandmother, or aunts compared to how you interact in front of your peers to serve as a more tangible example outside of ITMS. (SUZ, FN4)

Suzanne’s *discussion* was more of a one-sided lecture on the student’s poor behaviors and what was expected of them in her class. After her message was shared, she took her class from the classroom to the gymnasium for some ABL activity. The following describes the rest of the session in the gym:

Suzanne facilitated Growth Circles for the second time in the unit. This time, she asked questions that were directed at the behaviors and outcomes of the previous day’s class with the substitute teacher. Suzanne provided the scenarios for the class session such as, “I don’t lie to myself. I don’t need to show off to my friends. *I have integrity and do the right thing when no one else is looking.*” (SUZ, CH4, FN4)

Suzanne’s decision to intervene following her absence was made on her own to make a point to the class that their behaviors were recognized and had consequences. The following excerpt was taken from my field notes:
She led the group to the gymnasium for a timely activity, prompted them with an integrity quote (Integrity is doing the right thing even if nobody is watching), and maintained a directive style throughout the session to emphasize her sober outlook and behaviors that should be exhibited by everyone. (SUZ, FN4) Suzanne detected a need from her group for more processing of their experiences, especially since she was not present, and used integrity as a tangible characteristic that students were able to better identify as a result of the sequencing of the activity during the class session. I interpreted this as a real issue to address with Suzanne’s group and the progress of her class in the rest of the ABL unit and future units would be influenced by her response upon her return to school. This fourth day of the unit became a critical point because of (a) direct student experience in lieu of Suzanne’s absence, and (b) Suzanne’s set of appropriate responses to her students’ poor performances/behaviors.

As Suzanne continued in the unit, she grew to believe (and see and hear) students were capable of sharing meaningful perspectives in her classes as a result of participating in a set of activities. Most valuable, particularly later in the unit, was her recognition of the benefit to allow more time during debrief sessions for students to share their thoughts, either in pairs or to the whole class. This was in contrast to earlier in the unit where Suzanne was more prone on hearing a couple of student responses, following up with her own interpretations, and generalizing them to the entire class. Despite not allowing sufficient time for the debrief which meant that not all perspectives were heard, Suzanne did ask effective debrief questions that were on the lesson plan or a derivative of the same type of question. The following passage was taken from her facilitation on day four of the unit:
Suzanne asked the “What strategies did we use to be successful?” and the “What happens when not all players are using these strategies?” questions to more effectively draw out the expected responses to meet outcomes. Only three students responded each of these types of questions before Suzanne decided to move on rather than allowing additional students to further clarify their initial perspective. (SUZ, CH4)

The researcher had emphasized the debrief as being the most important, or as important as any other components in facilitating effective ABL lessons. However, Suzanne did not allow her well-crafted and timely questions to run their course in the discussion. A more developed and student-generated response was ideal. Suzanne’s growth in understanding ABL as either (a) a content area or (b) an approach to teaching began with her acknowledgment of the importance of ongoing student identity and regular successful experiences in a PE environment. This was quite a contrast to our initial conversations. As noted in my observation of Suzanne’s day two lesson, “Suzanne felt that a reasonable outcome for the 10-day unit should be at least two comments from each student during the debrief” (SUZ, FN2; CH2). I considered it a healthy mix of recognition, agreement, and acceptance by Suzanne that she began to adopt more student centered pedagogies as identified in training and detected in her daily ABL facilitation. For one, she began to provide more time for students to respond to questions in the debrief. This was a strong move toward more student-centered instruction. However, her discussions during the debrief were hardly inclusive and respectful to all student perspective. Suzanne’s early debriefs resembled questions answered with three or four student responses
Suzanne was willing to consider adopting new, student-centered pedagogies more appropriate for her facilitation of the ABL unit. This was the first time in her career where she was asked to use pedagogies that were more student-centered. The combination of ABL training, her experience as a physical educator, and coaching sessions during the instructional unit were beneficial for her success as a facilitator. In our final interview of the study, Suzanne provided some insight on the most useful information and experiences during the ABL training and facilitating the instructional unit. Suzanne stated:

After some of the initial training, I wanted to hear what my students had to say after our activities. Early on this was difficult because I had so many other things going on and wanted to be clear with students on rules of activities, what and how I should be giving them the information, and conducting a good debrief. (SUZ, I5)

Following coaching sessions and experiences as a facilitator early in the unit, Suzanne was more committed to get all of her students to participate in the activities.

A further area of growth for Suzanne during the unit was her integration of the ABL content as an instructional unit at ITMS. Direct observation, video observation, and informal conversations, helped Suzanne to recognize her shift in class from being a competent (or effective) class manager to a more effective teacher/facilitator. In the ABL unit, the content was shared to both participants as the art of facilitation. Student outcomes were the consistent demonstration of behaviors associated with each of the activities. Using the facilitator checklist as an informal assessment, Suzanne and I were able to discuss her performance as a facilitator on all elements deemed appropriate for
effective facilitation. The following review of her facilitation was described on the last set of checklists on day 10 of the unit:

The most common score during the 10-day unit for Suzanne was 9/12 on the facilitation checklist. Six of the 12 points on the checklist were weighted on the debrief. In each of Suzanne’s 20 facilitations, some components were not present and points were not earned. The facilitations did not include effective representations of the What, So What, and Now What segments of the Experiential Learning Cycle, considered as the standard for effective facilitation. (SUZ, CH10)

Strengths of Suzanne’s facilitation included the use of effective managerial strategies and the public posting of future lessons and important content. Suzanne was cognizant of keeping students notified on the plan for the instructional unit. This summary was provided in the notes of checklists after the last facilitation of the unit:

Suzanne’s most consistently demonstrated (and effective) behaviors fell under the categories of, (a) preparation for class, (b) facilitation, and (c) class climate consistent. Specific behaviors most identified during her daily facilitation were, (1) having the equipment and gym ready for activity, (2) using a brief, (3) clarifying rules and safety procedures, and (4) checking for student understanding. (SUZ, CH10)

Her consistent execution of the above competencies were supported through training but are also considered pedagogical functions that foster an effective lesson.

Suzanne matured as a facilitator and regularly made the activities her own. She extended original activities to fit her students. For example, Have You Ever was now I Like My Friends. Early in the ABL unit, Suzanne was aware of the needs of her students
in terms of readiness and anticipated response to ABL activities. The following passage from field notes describes the modification:

Suzanne re-framed the game to be more relevant to the students. She felt that using the *Have You Ever* phrase during each round of the game promoted an environment that would have students speaking only about life experiences – and Suzanne thought this was limiting and potentially inappropriate. Using the *I Like My Friends* phrase each round encouraged students to identify similarities and differences between one another, such as clothing, shoes, class schedule, favorite foods, music, etc. (SUZ, FN1)

Students created these scenarios, with Suzanne occasionally stepping in and keeping the group on task with a school-related scenario. In this example, *Have You Ever* was framed differently by Suzanne in hopes of a better response from students. She explained, “I felt that if I led the activity as it was in the textbook, it would have fallen apart” (SUZ, I2). She was nervous that the phrasing of the game in its original form would provoke some students to use inappropriate scenarios or comments that would carry a negative tone.

Suzanne modified plans for each specific class to fit the needs of her students and for them to better identify with the lesson and the activities selected to promote the established themes of the unit. The following excerpt was taken from my field notes:

Suzanne modified *Laughing Matters* to have students say the selected word in a voice that is intended to get that person to laugh. She decided the common phrase to use in the game would be “You are my best friend” and that would be what one student would hear from each of the other students that would flank them down the tunnel of students in the gym floor. The single student volunteer would then
reply with *Thank you but I am not allowed to smile*, while trying to keep a straight face. (SUZ, FN5)

This instructional decision by Suzanne promoted more appropriate interactions among students at ITMS. Rather than offering a nonsensical word for students to repeat to the student, Suzanne integrated more useful phrases that could serve as a reference for this debrief or a future debrief. In addition, when Suzanne facilitated “*Group Interview*” she allowed the activity to last over 20 minutes with classes of over 25 students for both classes. She felt the activity was appropriate and useful for her students and stated:

> I thought that “*Group Interview*” was a more intimate activity that would likely cause students to be off-task. To my surprise I thought all but a few were on-task and liking the activity. These students were listening to other students’ responses and the questions that were asked addressed issues that are important in the class (SUZ, I2).

The format of the instructional unit allowed Suzanne to gain more perspective than in another unit in her standard physical education unit. Suzanne provided additional support for the use of the debrief in her teaching. She stated:

> This unit has helped me to better include student perspective in my teaching. The debrief is a good way to tie it all in but hard to maintain the flow of the conversation. But, I like it because students have a lot of useful information to share. (SUZ, I3)

Fortunately, Suzanne and I were able to reflect soon after her facilitations where comments like those above were fresh in her mind and held high utility to Suzanne as she progressed through the rest of the school year.
Suzanne demonstrated continued development of a more effective ABL facilitator as the unit progressed. Signs of her comfort and growth in daily lessons were her transitions into other ABL activities in comparison to my informal observations before the start of the study. Suzanne’s comfort in ABL varied at times during the instructional unit. Over the course of the ten days, Suzanne grew more comfortable in allowing discussion to take place in the ABL unit. When asked about her ideas to continue to allow processing in her classes, Suzanne spoke to the benefit of ABL and its utility across her P.E. program and throughout the school:

ABL has prompted me to move forward in a similar style of processing for students. Also, I wanted to find a way that I could get students to be more talkative about what they needed. In the past I have tried to get them to have discussions and it didn’t work. Here, if you have rules and a set plan and the students become more comfortable at being free thinkers. As much as we teach (and often preach to our kids) we often don’t teach them to be free thinkers. The ABL helped me make a connection between the student’s own thoughts after experiencing the planned activities. (SUZ, I5)

Her gradual acquisition and use of ABL-related teaching styles were resembled in debriefing sessions, student responses to her informal checks for understanding in between each activity, and student comments detected from direct and video observations. The ABL structure was different for Suzanne and her teaching style but over the course of the study she came to appreciate its potential power as an instructional unit.
Summary. Suzanne’s journey through ABL teacher training, facilitation of a new instructional unit in her physical education program, and formative, follow-up interviews identified a caring and capable instructional leader that embraced the methodology of the study. By participating in the study, she demonstrated a willingness to spend time beyond what she normally allocated for lesson planning to gain additional knowledge in ABL; to develop skills requisite of an effective ABL facilitator (SUZ, FN1). Each of the three themes illuminated benchmarks in the continuous pursuit of developing appropriate curriculum and delivering effective instruction.

Carolyn

Three themes surfaced for Carolyn and are represented as The School Steward, ABL Affinity, and Yardstick Continuum. The School Steward denotes Carolyn’s upbringing, influences of training and teaching experiences, and how she has managed and made meaning of these experiences to provide the appropriate care as a physical educator at ITMS. This section also keys on Carolyn’s transformation and her take home message as a first time facilitator of ABL at ITMS. ABL Affinity signifies her constructed perspective of ABL and additional perspectives of teaching physical education, teaching for personal and social responsibility, and her demonstration of caring behaviors as a teacher at ITMS. Carolyn’s courtship with ABL was short as she accepted to participate in the study after attending a professional development workshop. Carolyn saw an opportunity to integrate ABL content in her classes and this study would provide appropriate training to deliver effective instruction while developing additional content knowledge. Yardstick Continuum spotlights the range of Carolyn’s effective and ineffective practice as a facilitator and identifies specific pedagogies on the continuum.
The theme references the successes and frustrations of teaching a content area for the first time.

I chose *The School Steward* as the name of the first theme to best summarize what I discovered from Carolyn in the number of roles she had assumed throughout her life, including those roles at ITMS. A steward is defined as one who manages or oversees, appointed to supervise, and one who actively directs affairs (Merriam-Webster, retrieved May 22, 2011). Throughout her “supervision of affairs”, Carolyn appeared to have continuously demonstrate leadership, responsibility, and commitment worthy of the steward moniker. Sub-themes are represented as *Growing Up, Influences to Teaching,* and *Meaning Making.* Each are provided in sequence to better frame Carolyn’s formative years, how her previous experiences inform current practices, and how her actions connect with her dispositions.

*ABL Affinity* was named to best describe the vast amount of data that supported Carolyn’s desire to utilize ABL at ITMS, starting with a brief introduction of ABL foundations and potential in her PE program prior to the study at a workshop. Carolyn saw an immediate link to the concepts affiliated with the activities and instantly wanted more information for her classes; she was familiar with the activities but not as a direct participant. Sub-themes presented in this section are *Carolyn’s Appeal, What Worked,* and *Struggles and Improvements.*

*Yardstick Continuum* was named in reference to a debrief strategy used (*Yardstick*) where students would pass a yardstick around at the end of the lesson, identifying their “ranking” on the 1-36 scale and provide some rationale for their initial rating. The strategy has also been used to identify both the high and low rating during the
activities with some explanation. As a descriptor for this theme, the *Yardstick Continuum* targets the range of effectiveness in Carolyn’s lessons as well as the specific pedagogies that were used in the instructional unit. Sub-themes are presented as *Range of Effectiveness* and *Specific ABL Pedagogies*.

**The School Steward**

**Growing up.** Carolyn self-identified as being a giver, either to her family and friends or her students. As a child, she helped raise her infant nephew who entered her immediate family when Carolyn was just ten years old. She addressed his arrival as just a matter of circumstance explaining, “He ended up in our house when I was ten. My parents’ work schedules were crazy and I was at the house and responsible enough to take care of his basic needs” (CAR, I2). One her most vivid memories from spending time with her nephew was making him an alphabet book with albums and magnetic pages. Looking back, Carolyn felt it just was the right thing to do. She explained, “When they [parents] were working, I was raising my nephew. I don’t know why but I made it for him. I don’t know why I did it, but I just thought that he needed it” (CAR, I2).

Carolyn was direct by nature, in her communication as a teacher and person. She regularly called upon the influence of her parents, specifically their hardworking nature and consistency as parents. Carolyn shared, “It was my parents that helped me stay grounded. They did a good job of keeping me humble, but also not limiting my possibilities” (CAR, I1). Carolyn was proud of her parents and spoke highly of them and her upbringing. Carolyn shared her thoughts in one of our early interviews: “We didn’t have a lot but we took care of what we had; my dad always made sure we had the best lawn in the neighborhood” (CAR, I3).
Carolyn came from a family where not all graduated high school but they all value a good education. Carolyn shared with me early in the study that it was a general assumption that she was going to college and be successful. She explained how she was encouraged, “It was more of a matter of fact that I was going to college. My family just instilled a train of thought in me that college was the option that I would continue to do well and go to college” (CAR, I3). In high school, Carolyn was always placed in college prep courses. She was driven as much as molded to continue her pursuit of more education. She explained, “My entire family valued education, even though not everyone in my family graduated high school. But in their [parents] mind I had no choice.” (CAR, I1). Carolyn emphasized her drive but also her thirst for improvement through knowledge and education. In regards to her schooling she stated:

I feel like I had a quality education. Like any other student in school I had some examples of good teachers and good teaching, and I had some bad examples, but I genuinely liked school. My experience was positive because I was positive. I followed directions and did my work (CAR, I1).

Carolyn enjoyed school, particularly the structure of the daily schedule and the range of topics covered in her classes. Emerging from our early conversations was her consistent disposition of focusing on the positives and being willing to accept challenges placed in front of her.

Carolyn was committed to what she learned in her teacher training. Early in her career, she saw the connections of the theory in her undergraduate classes to practice. She exclaimed, “It was so true; what I learned applied to the classroom and made sense, and it all worked!”(CAR, I1). Currently, she still recalls moments in her college classes, either
during peer teaching episodes or during clinical experiences, when supervisors helped to shape her into a more successful practitioner. Over her career, Carolyn has become more confident in her teaching and considers herself to be an effective teacher. Later in the study, Carolyn shared, “I am always trying to keep myself in check, imagining what my supervisors would have said. It probably would not always be good, but doing this has helped to improve my future lessons” (CAR, I2). I was impressed with how reflective Carolyn was in our earlier lesson on her positive feelings of her education and teacher training.

Carolyn felt that her pride and satisfaction in her profession came from the pursuit of improvement and excellence in one’s profession. She had a clear sense of where she wanted to go within the physical education profession. Carolyn valued her education and finished her master’s degree, a goal she had set in the last few years. Her thoughts were,

This carrot [advanced degree] had seemed so far out of reach until recently. This was one goal that I could strive for but finally came to fruition. I am always doing so much [or wanting to do so much]. I want to do this, coach that, do that, I want to do 10 things at the same time.

Finally, I got the degree. (CAR, I3)

**Influences to teaching.** One of Carolyn’s main influences in her current teaching was the needs of her students at ITMS. She feels that she regularly takes on the responsibility to help her students and shared her perspective. Carolyn explained:

I want to do the best I can for all kids. I am also not going to compromise my effort to know where my kids are coming from before they get to me and my class. Getting to know my students is important. It does not take a
lot of energy to help a student. To me there is not much difference in writing a kid off or pulling a kid aside to help. (CAR, I2).

Carolyn has assumed a range of responsibilities at ITMS that allows for different types of interactions with students. Her service in multiple capacities was present throughout the ITMS campus. Carolyn felt the need to position herself as a consistent figure in the lives of students who do not have the normalcy that many others may experience (e.g. sleep, meals, family support, coaching, etc.). She often shared with her students that (1) she cared about them and (2) she is watching them (CAR, FN1). As a third year teacher at ITMS, Carolyn settled in as an integral part of the ITMS community. Carolyn was one of a few teachers in the building that saw each student in the sixth and seventh grade each day. Between our ABL training sessions in the mornings and her extra-curricular coaching assignments, Carolyn’s car was one of the first in the lot and one of the last to leave during my observations (CAR, FN8). At ITMS Carolyn served as the grade 6-7 P.E. teacher, grade 7-8 volleyball coach in the fall, grade 7-8 track coach in the spring, co-coordinator of school assemblies, and in-house technology expert for any other faculty member having difficulty during the school day. Between her five classes each day, coaching two sports, supervising breakfast and lunch, and co-coordinating school assemblies, Carolyn had the capability to make significant contributions to a number of students that came through the ITMS doors. The following excerpt came from my field notes following an informal conversation with Carolyn on day two of the unit:
The deeply-rooted caring behaviors Carolyn exhibits help to position her as the teacher she is today. Her follow through and overall performance as a positive adult role model support the reasons she got into teaching and the reason she remains an effective figure in the ITMS building. (CAR, FN2)

In observing and interacting with Carolyn, it is clear that she puts the needs of her students ahead of the needs of the curriculum or content in the school. Carolyn taught to the needs of the students, who have a range of knowledge and proficiency in physical education. Such a disparity and range of experience limit Carolyn’s ability to meet grade level objectives of her class.

During the study, it was evident that Carolyn was always available to help with any student need. A young female student came into Carolyn’s gym wearing tight jeans which had ripped while in another class. Fortunately, Carolyn carried extra clothes that she took home, washed, and brought back to school in the event that students needed them. The following exchange took place during our second interview during Carolyn’s prep period:

Carolyn: Did you rip your pants?
Student: Yes, Miss Carolyn.
Carolyn: You know you didn’t have to be all hoochie-fied?
Student: Can I have a pair of basketball shorts?
Carolyn: Yes, if you can find them in my messy office.
Student: These pants aren’t even tight – I slipped. (CAR, FN3)
After this exchange, Carolyn discussed the range of roles she assumes in a typical day at ITMS. Carolyn felt that her interactions with students were necessary in her position as a positive adult role model. She shared: “We [teachers] are here to help them survive as much as to help them succeed” (CAR, I2; FN2-3). Carolyn recognized the importance of all the positive interactions with students in helping her students and helping herself as a more effective teacher and communicator with students. Looking back on her formal teacher training, Carolyn recalled her former cooperating teacher encouraging her to communicate more with students in the hallway, be visible in-between classes, and volunteer for breakfast duty. Carolyn shared an example recently with a student at ITMS,

If I can make connections with kids in the school but outside of my class
then I feel that I have used this time wisely. For example, the other day I
found out that a boy in my morning class really likes dirt-bikes, and he
and his dad always go to the motorcar speedway. (CAR, I3)

She actively looks to engage in the type of conversations above during her supervisory periods during breakfast, before and after classes, or during down time in coaching sports. Carolyn again recalled the influence of her mentors as an undergraduate education student and their advice. She shared,

They [mentors] reinforced the importance of building relationships in the
classroom. It has always been important to me that I maintain a positive
relationship with my students and am always available when I am at school.
Whether it is right or wrong to think like this, I assume that their interactions with me are the most valuable in their lives. That includes time in my class, in the hallway, or during extra-curricular activities. (CAR, I1)
Carolyn felt that she made a difference with students during the variety of interactions and was thankful to her mentors for pushing her to interact with her students and build stronger relationships.

Carolyn felt her success as a teacher is somewhat a result of her time commitment to the school and her students. She believed it was her willingness to call out students when she saw them misbehaving or making decisions that may lead to other poor decisions. She shared,

I will pull students aside all the time and remind them what I see. Talking to these kids is a reminder for them that I am making them better. I let them know when they are being a mess in class, but I also talk to them about being a better person. (CAR, I2)

The time commitment, coupled with her genuine care for students, helped Carolyn to identify students that needed her support, guidance, and expertise. She reflected on a moment during her first job as an elementary physical education teacher as a primary example. Carolyn stated:

I was watching some students during the lunch break flipping around. I noticed that kids were in the grass and doing flips, so I started to pull these kids at lunchtime and teach them different flips. At the end of the school year we had a talent show. We combined our group with a group of kids at a neighboring school. Then, I took them on a field trip to a gymnastics gym and we had a ball. Just from observing their interest in tumbling, I took it and blew it up. (CAR, I3)

Carolyn initiated theses interactions with her students to increase their engagement. She fostered their involvement and development on their grassroots “gymnastics team”. She
gave them new content, allowed for the content to be applied in a school-wide performance at an end of year assembly. In an informal conversation with Carolyn she elaborated further on this situation:

Carolyn provided the opportunity for students to transfer their interests and skills to a setting (professional gym) outside of their normal environment. Carolyn had big plans for her newly formed group. Her initiative in the “gymnastics club” helped her students make connections and see beyond their school; to make the application to other contexts and transfer their knowledge. (CAR, FN3)

Carolyn enjoyed providing experiences for her students, offering them new opportunities that transcend the walls of the classroom and the gymnasium. All added engagement and interactions were a result of Carolyn’s willingness to take initiative with students and follow through.

Carolyn was reasonable in establishing her expectations of students in her classes. She seemed aware of her students’ needs and her role to in helping students attain those needs in their development at ITMS. Carolyn recognized the difficulties today’s students face by not being connected to the school with high transient rates, re-districting schools, and disjointed curriculum and instruction. Carolyn offered her suggestions and perspective if she were a student under the same conditions at ITMS, “I encourage them (students) to get their education regardless of the surrounding. The way I see it is anyone could have neighbors on the corner of the street that are not bettering themselves” (CAR, I1). Carolyn had the luxury of living with both parents, married in a stable house with family support that followed through and held her accountable. She, in turn, wanted to
share some of these expectations with her students. Carolyn would be serving a clientele with multiple diverse needs.

A significant influence to Carolyn’s teaching was the “mixed bag” of student experiences that came with each class she teaches. She shared, “Teaching in this district provides plenty of surprises. I kind of expect to take a couple of steps back when a new class comes in at the semester” (CAR, I1). Whether it was the variability in class size, experiences in PE classes from elementary school, or basic knowledge and fundamental skills, Carolyn generally agreed that her clientele had little to no experience with quality PE instruction. “I have seen plenty of other schools and know that PE is taught so much differently at each site. Some places it is unfortunate how little they (teachers) do preparing these students with basic skills and understandings (CAR, I1). Carolyn felt that primary barriers were limited frequency (number of days offered per week, semester, etc.), shallow content, and minimal instruction. “Some of the teachers just don’t have the knowledge required or the management skills to effectively teach (CAR, I1). The lack of appropriate experience and overall basic skills provided a difficult context for appropriate and effective instruction to take place. Carolyn felt that students were unfamiliar with games because of limited exposure (CAR, FN2).

Carolyn made curricular decisions based on prior experiences of her students. ITMS students came from several elementary schools in the district that each has their own differences in the physical education program (i.e. frequency, duration, scope, facilities, outcomes, etc.). Carolyn thought that her students’ needs in PE were immense; an overall deficiency within the school with fundamental motor skills, limited knowledge of rules and etiquette of sport and games, minimal experiences in P.E. classes engaged in
activity considered as *moderate* or *vigorous* for an appropriate exercise bout. Carolyn explained:

> Many of our kids do not play outside and do not possess basic skills. I cannot assume that students can perform a cartwheel or know basic rules of sports and games. I still get questions from middle school children for what base to run to after I kick the ball. I have no choice but to pick up from their current understanding. (CAR, I2)

Carolyn acknowledged the challenges she faced teaching at ITMS, with unpredictable class sizes and limited and ineffective support. Carolyn knew the strengths and weaknesses of her students, and specifically the needs of each of her classes. In her smaller class, Carolyn was certain to get them into instant activity. Any verbal information presented was given in short bouts, and the same information was shared multiple times through prompts and cues (CAR, FN1; CAR, FN3). In contrast, Carolyn’s larger classes often followed the pattern of getting information presented verbally (and in larger chunks) at the beginning of the class (CAR, FN2; CAR, FN5). Carolyn effectively differentiated instruction between both classes/contexts seamlessly by way of direct observation and craft knowledge. Carolyn shared, “Each class is so different. It seems like I am always changing how I share information with each class because the number of students varies so much, or there is a large number of students with behavioral needs” (CAR, I2).

The ITMS context influenced Carolyn’s role on assessment in her PE classes. A clear approach to assessment was not visible in Carolyn’s teaching or the physical education program at ITMS and no established assessments were identified during
training and preliminary contacts. However, at one point she said she graded on personal responsibility and may use a rating scale and questioning as checks for understanding. Her responses during any conversations about assessment suggest a loose grading method that may have some serious limitations. Carolyn shared, “I try to assess students on their effort and behavior but would like to move into group projects. I was going to move to a project-based learning approach my classes (CAR, I2). This was unclear and sounded more like an unrealistic endeavor. It may be difficult to differentiate instruction and expect students to create performance assessments like projects when resources are unsatisfactory and when more reasonable assessments to measure knowledge and performance could be administered more efficiently. Carolyn admitted the challenges of assessing in this format. “It’s just way too much to take on” (CAR, I2). As a result, informal assessments have been the most used approach to assessing her students. She often modified her expectations of student knowledge and work if they could communicate their knowledge in some format. Carolyn did not provide a definitive explanation for the modified (and inconsistent) expectations for each of her students, “I accept a student’s response as completed work if they can verbally tell me correct information and don’t write it; I accept it” (CAR, I2). Her expectations have been lowered. All forms of evaluation were unclear and in order to reach Carolyn’s objectives, she lowered her expectations for student work and performance (CAR, FN4-FN8).

Most of her decisions for student grades were made off of student effort and participation. Carolyn was satisfied when students recalled information individually or in choral response with classmates. She always looked for examples of student progress,
some demonstration of student achievement from students in each of her classes. She explained,

When they grasp the concepts I still do the cha-ching motion (gesturing with her fist). I can identify success when students can say the information back to me; when I hear my words from them or I hear them congratulate others. (CAR, I3)

Carolyn considered methods of assessment appropriate and reasonable for the context at ITMS, but not necessarily ideal.

Making it work and being flexible were constant realizations throughout the study that Carolyn had learned to consider as a part of her everyday teaching. It influenced how she rationalized success; she called her “small victories” as evidence of her methods. At one point, Carolyn said jokingly she measured success by not having a student tell her off each day. She shared (with a laugh):

Sometimes it’s a matter of not getting cussed out today. If the kids leave with a sense of okay, that was fun or cool or that was neat. But I also need to know if they grasp the concepts that we cover. (CAR, I3)

She believed that it was necessary for her (and other teachers) to get to understand the kids. Frequent, informal conversations with students throughout the school day were common practice for Carolyn. She felt that these interactions made a difference:

I pull students aside all the time and remind them of (school) the expectations. Talking to these kids is a reminder for them that I am making them better. I let them know when they are being a mess in class, but I also talk to them about being a better person. (CAR, I2)
Effectively managing her students at all times was a significant influence on Carolyn’s daily teaching. She was committed and concerned with managing all of her students’ behaviors. Carolyn often began class in the auditorium for management and order (CAR, FN1; CAR, FN3-FN6). This tactic eliminated students walking to her gym unattended and took away the chance that students would misuse equipment while unsupervised. Carolyn appeared strong, assertive, and task-oriented in her classes. She demonstrated confidence when expressing her expectations of her students (CAR, CH1-CH4). Teaching a group of students with diverse needs (knowledge, behavior, motor skill, etc.) provided challenges each day of her instruction. The following passage came from field notes after observing two classes on day four:

Carolyn has shared multiple times that each day a different student or group of students could be set off and would potentially impact the effectiveness of her lesson. This environment, where multiple students are on individualized behavior plans, the class can be set off with an unreasonable reaction/response in the class. (CAR, FN4)

In one of the early classes, a student did not participate in Group Juggle because they were asked to stand in a circle formation next to another student that was laughing at them. In another activity, students were asked to act out words or phrases during Marketplace Relay and a student refused to participate and said multiple expletives. Carolyn shared after day two of the unit, “Once a student feels threatened they respond back in an unhealthy fashion. This happens all the time with this group (CAR, FN2). Carolyn’s students responded to her direct instruction style. They were regularly in order,
entered the gym, and looked for the instructions on the dry erase board. They knew the routine early on in the term.

**Meaning making.** Carolyn enjoyed the sharing of information during training and was willing to dedicate her limited time during the school day for ABL professional development sessions. Carolyn knew that her behaviors as a facilitator were important to student receptivity of the ABL unit. She explained, “Students have their own class identity but I tried to get them excited by being a little more energetic than usual” (CAR, I1; I3). Carolyn was conscious of her energy when facilitating the lessons. She was aware of the different student responses from training and informal conversations with the researcher, as well as her energy during facilitation.

Carolyn learned of new activities presented during ABL training. Many were not familiar to her as a direct participant. For example, she had been a student in a game similar to *Have You Ever*, but has not directly experienced the role of a student in *Mass Pass*. It was my hope that Carolyn could relate with her students’ experiences in the activities that she would facilitate for them. For her students, the ABL unit was unique and provoked some unexpected, positive experiences. I understood the limitations of Carolyn having limited direct experience as a participant in the activities she would lead to her students. The ABL unit plan was created to address a greater range of themes within the 10-day unit. However, an advantage to Carolyn’s limited experiences as a participant in the activities she would lead was the uniqueness of seeing students engaged in activity according to how she introduced instructions, rules, and purpose(s). ABL training served the function of restating the purpose of the planned sequenced, review the
selected according to the sequence, and discussing recommendations for effective facilitation.

Carolyn realized the importance of the brief in her first facilitated lesson in the ABL unit. Admittedly, she was nervous teaching the first day. She began the class with a discussion of the new content and the differences of the content compared to the normal curriculum at ITMS. The first day of the class wrapped up with the *Thumbs Up* debrief strategy. Carolyn’s preparedness following the training and planning sessions came into question during the first few days of the unit. She often used her lesson plans prior to the start of class, even though she had taught the lesson beforehand and was trained through each of the activities. Carolyn said that she felt safe with the plans near her during the first part of the ABL unit in the first observed class (CAR, CH1). The lesson plans were referenced less during the second observed class during the second half of the unit. The following excerpt from the field notes highlights this change in Carolyn,

> Initially, Carolyn appeared to be prepared and completely comfortable prior to her facilitation in the unit. Identifying her limitations as a facilitator may have been masked by her effective management of each class. Before and during the ABL unit, Carolyn listed the daily activities in advance on the dry-erase board for students to view as they entered the gym. Although easily available and accessible, students were rarely prompted to look at the information on the board as they entered the gym. The board may have served mostly as a reference for Carolyn during her daily instruction. (CAR, FN4)

In short, Carolyn was able to adjust to the ABL structure because she already had basic managerial and instructional systems in place. Her lesson *shell or template* that she
followed could be re-shaped to fit in her classes while benefiting her and her students in the ABL lesson.

Carolyn easily adjusted to the ABL structure during her facilitation of activities. She liked the order, structure of the lessons, and some of the similarities to direct instruction early in the facilitation. Carolyn maintained a consistent structure recommended from the ABL literature and encouraged by the researcher. *Adventure Wave* is a common term in adventure programming where students enter the class to a brief to gain their attention, engage in activities, then process the experiences during the debrief. This was maintained for most of Carolyn’s lessons as she followed the lesson plan format. Carolyn negotiated to have a consistent entry activity that students were comfortable with prior to the ABL brief for the day. She explained her decision to incorporate this activity, “I want students to have instant activity because most of them need it” (CAR, I1). Carolyn modified her original teaching style to accommodate the ABL unit, but she maintained an instant activity warm-up as her students entered the gym.

Carolyn understood the importance of utilizing consistent management strategies. Her warm-up activities provided a common baseline to support other, new activities that would be implemented in the ABL unit. Her warm-ups had simple rules and outcomes in order for students to quickly engage in activity and use the time to assimilate into PE class each day. Carolyn felt that the instant activity would help, “normalize the group and initiate the expectation for the day” (CAR, I2). She held firm on her wishes to keep the instant activity as a function of each class during the ABL unit.
She noticed individual student successes from her classes early in the unit. This was a bit of a surprise to her. Carolyn shared, “For the most part, everyone enjoyed the activities everyone was engaged without being engaged only on their own terms” (CAR, I4). At this point Carolyn felt that her involvement, preparation, and teaching style were beneficial to the success of the group. Her students were surprised and engaged. Carolyn was planned, but not necessarily prepared to facilitate as evidenced by her level of unrest prior to the start of the unit. She shared,

After that first class I had a sense of relief (laughing). Presenting the material was nerve racking – because when one thing goes bad it can quickly spiral out of control. I was really hoping the lesson would work (laughing). I became much more confident when I finished that first class…this is good now, okay, we can do this”. (CAR, I4)

After the fourth interview and near the completion of the study, Carolyn confirmed some of my thoughts that she recognized the importance of sequence and flow, and her behaviors in the moment of all phases of facilitation. Carolyn identified and recalled the critical importance of her interactions and communication with students during the delivery of content unique to her, her students, and the context at ITMS. Her students appeared comfortable with her instructional style and the structure of the classes in the ABL unit; they knew her expectations (CAR, FN9-FN10). This could be explained in part with Carolyn’s deliberate attempt to nurture the development of a stronger community within her PE classes. At the start of the unit, Carolyn has made an effort to be a member of the community. *We are part of the community* was emphasized during training as the foundation and fundamental theme. Carolyn explained that, “The
community is what you make of it. You get out what you put in” (CAR, I3). If Carolyn and her students were willing to actively engage and everyone jumped in with both feet, the community strengthens and benefits everyone committed to group goals (CAR, RJ4).

Carolyn saw the use of ABL and believed she would use some of the activities in her program in the future. She explained,

I will still use some of the activities (*Monarch Tag, Gold Rush, Cardio Rocks*) as instant activities that reinforce some behaviors that I think are important. For other classes, I think I will revert back to the ABL structure, using the brief and the debrief to keep me more organized in my daily lesson but also provide some consistency for my students with the structure. (CAR, I5)

Carolyn still had some difficulty in how to effectively facilitate a full debrief in her classes. She saw it as difficult to deliver due to the time crunch at the end of each lesson. Although, Carolyn was quick to acknowledge her own challenges during the unit and shared: “I felt that some of my debriefs were not as long but still meaningful. I know I will still use those strategies, but it is important that I know how to use these strategies” (CAR, I3). She was initially unsure how the debriefs would be received, but felt satisfied overall with how well she thought the lessons were delivered in her classes. She stated, “The most meaningful thing about the debriefs was getting everyone’s opinion and getting students to have a say in class; the students really value that” (CAR, I5). As a result of the interactions during the unit, Carolyn expressed her confidence and knowledge to hold future debriefs and discussions in her classes.

Carolyn’s gained a level of competence in her ABL facilitation. She was more familiar with the ABL structure, especially during the second half of the unit. She shared,
I really had no idea how the unit would go with my classes. They (students) often have short attention spans and want to move on to different sports or games. I tried to make sure each class had an active warm-up and we got into the new ABL stuff in a timely fashion. (CAR, I4)

The above statement from later in the ABL unit and following training, numerous interactions, and corrective coaching sessions, suggests that Carolyn correctly applied both (a) content learned during training as well as (b) the necessary pedagogies for effective facilitation.

ABL Affinity

Carolyn’s appeal. During our preliminary conversations before ABL training, Carolyn expressed fondness of possibly using non-traditional games in her PE classes to address the themes she learned of from a brief workshop (CAR, FN1). She shared her early perspective during our first interview, “I like the possibilities of going beyond talking about being respectful and responsible. It would be great to see these behaviors in action (CAR, FN1). Problematic to her demonstrated leadership early in the unit was the lack attention given to the true content of ABL; that is the art of facilitation. Her awareness and recognition of some discrepancies with the ABL content were more visible following our daily coaching sessions and informal conversations between my observations of her ABL lessons. Carolyn’s responses to my questions (e.g. *What worked? What didn’t work?*) helped to redirect her attention to her own behaviors during each lesson as a facilitator.

She regularly used appropriate terminology in support of the themes emphasized during initial ABL training and restated during daily coaching sessions. Her use of *ABL*
*Language* helped to compliment the work done in training and the engagement of Carolyn’s students in the ABL unit. The following excerpt was pulled from field notes midway through the unit:

The community as “*always being built*” is a common phrase Carolyn has used in this unit during any discussion time, at the beginning with the brief or in an attempt to tie everything together at the end of each lesson. Her regular recall of ABL terminology further promotes the themes affiliated with the activities in the unit plan (CAR, FN5).

The consistent recall provided an authentic display of appeal and affection toward ABL.

Her fondness of ABL helped her understanding of ABL, which in turn provided a strong foundation to support Carolyn’s efforts in calling out students who did not follow the norms established in her classes. Some of these newly calibrated norms, supported in training, included communication cooperation, honesty, and patience. Carolyn continued to regularly identify those behaviors that were acceptable and unacceptable during activities. Even in a more directive format with her students early in the unit, her tone was positive and helpful, and aligned with effective pedagogies from training, “Overall, Carolyn has been considerate to the terms and themes present in the unit and helped students make connections during the brief at the start of class, in-between activities that highlighted specific behaviors, or at the end of class during the debrief” (CAR, FN8). The combination of Carolyn’s awareness to student needs and her own teaching behaviors, as well as useful methods in the study (i.e. coaching sessions, direct observation, field notes, facilitation checklist) supported more frequent demonstration of effective ABL pedagogies in the lessons. The following came from my researcher journal early in the
unit: “during Laughing Matters, Carolyn maintained students’ attention with high energy and a quick description of the activity (CAR, RJ2).

**What worked.** Carolyn displayed a sense of comfort as an ABL facilitator immediately when the unit in her delivery of instructions and basic use of ABL terminology (CAR, CH1; CAR, FN1-FN2). She appeared to be a competent facilitator from the beginning of the unit.

Most of Carolyn’s communication with her students in ABL lessons was positive despite some unfavorable student behaviors. The student behaviors caused managerial tasks to occasionally prevail over instruction. Following the first two days of ABL instruction, I discussed differences in Carolyn’s facilitation with her compared to what was expected or consistent with effective facilitation of ABL activities. The following excerpt came from field notes after this interaction:

I encouraged Carolyn to allow the ABL training to work, and be cognizant of her role in leading the early activities, but understanding how her role may shift during the unit. First, Carolyn did not allocated sufficient time for the debrief in the first two lessons. Second, her transition time between activities was high. Third, the activities required little equipment but the equipment necessary for some activities (i.e. Marketplace Relay) were not ready to use when moving on to that activity (CAR, FN2).

These types of sessions occurred during the coaching sessions with the support of ongoing direct observation while I used the facilitation checklist to evaluate performance throughout the study.
Carolyn effectively called her students out in a respectful fashion, bringing awareness to the group’s struggle with following directions and active listening (CAR, FN4). Carolyn extended herself to students, stating that she wanted to be flexible with them. But not listening and marginal levels of engagement were not accepted in the class. Carolyn addressed the students stating, “There are rules for a certain reason” (CAR, CH4). She then used the example of a quiet movie theatre to explain why it was important to be respectful and that a certain type of behavior was expected, such as listening and following directions (CAR, FN4). This example identified Carolyn addressing students immediately after she detected inappropriate or unnecessary behaviors that can detract from the lesson and its outcomes.

Carolyn modeled the behaviors she expected of students, such as the importance of building and maintaining community in the classroom. This started with a strong relationships between individuals and small groups, as well as the entire class. I encouraged Carolyn during training to include herself as part of the community. Some simple strategies included (a) being a member of the circle during the debrief, (b) including herself when referring to our group, and (c) talking about her own personal experiences when facilitating the lesson. Early in the unit, Carolyn effectively took more of an active role in phasing in, or coaching her classes through some of the early activities. On day two, she slowly walked students through the instructions of Marketplace Relay and gave students plenty of time to work with their groups to complete the tasks (CAR, CH2; CAR, FN2). She regularly shared that each activity would be helpful to our group, and did so enthusiastically. Carolyn used the phrase “who in our community” as a start to many questions she would ask when checking for
understanding or initiating the debrief. The following excerpt came from field notes during direct observation:

Carolyn started a class on the second day with the daily quote and immediately followed up with a pointed question: “Who in our community helps us to develop our unique gifts?” (CAR, CH2). In responses, her students identified themselves, coaches, cousins, uncles, and aunts.

These demonstrations by Carolyn, of strongly supporting ABL, were recommended in training to help her better blend in with the community of each of her daily classes.

Carolyn recognized the importance of sequence and flow, the value of lesson functions at the beginning (brief) and closing (debrief). She shared, “it makes sense why ABL has a basic structure to keep students and new facilitators on track. I could see these as elements that I could use in my classes for other units” (CAR, I4). She continued by sharing how much she enjoyed the number of opportunities to teach and reteach the same lessons while regularly changing her teaching strategies and communication patterns with students during activity (CAR, FN10).

Struggles and improvements. The most vivid struggle with Carolyn early in the ABL unit was her lesson instruction according to original lesson plans. Breakdowns in providing appropriate and accurate information on rules and instructions occurred multiple times despite having all the specific information on lesson plans (CAR, CH2, CH4, CH6, CH7). Her struggles with aligned delivery, early in the unit, may have been largely due to wanting to appear spontaneous rather than spontaneous and prepared. These struggles occurred despite Carolyn’s eagerness to participate in the study, thirst for more knowledge, and adaptability to fit in the 10-day ABL unit.
In her preparations, her clarification questions about activities were asked during initial ABL training but not continuously in the unit (CAR, FN2; CAR, FN4-5). I immediately hypothesized that she was spending little or no time independent of our time together reviewing the ABL materials. There were days in the unit where Carolyn appeared prepared as well as those where she was using the lesson plans during her instruction to read specific details of activities (CAR, CH1; CAR, FN3-4). Overall, I did not consider her entirely as an unprepared ABL facilitator but she certainly displayed some doubt in leading effective lessons from start to finish.

Carolyn improved in her role as instructional leader/facilitator throughout the timeline of the study and the ABL unit. During some of the early ABL lessons, Carolyn spent substantial time in monitoring student behavior and transitioning into other activities on the lesson plan. In fact, nearly 50% of lesson time was absorbed into management time with disruptive students. The following excerpt came from my journal during the unit:

ABL training and the coaching sessions emphasized the role of having a large number of activities designed to foster what Carolyn may need in her class, such as an improved sense of community, cooperative skills, personal and social responsibility. She was encouraged to move on to activities that carried the same themes as previous activities in order to give students more experiences (and more opportunities) to demonstrate more acceptable and useful behavior in Carolyn’s class. (CAR, RJ5)

Carolyn’s improvement as an ABL facilitator was demonstrated by giving more individual attention to good debriefs and better understanding the role of the debrief as a
lead function of ABL lessons. For example, after the fifth lesson, Carolyn’s standard debrief with her first class was done in standing, circle formation with a basketball. Students knew that only the person with the ball could share a perspective (CAR, CH6-CH9; CAR, FN6-9). She became comfortable with the ABL materials and facilitating the lessons. However, I was initially curious why she did not demonstrate preparedness to accompany her comfort following training, informal conversations, and lesson review.

During four of the first six days of the 10-day unit, Carolyn sat at her desk at the beginning of the class in the corner of the gym reviewing the specific instructions for each of the day’s activities as her students began the instant warm-up activity on their own. Once this behavior was bought to her attention and I asked her how she thought students may look at this behavior at the beginning of her class the behavior changed and she became more engaged.

Carolyn eventually demonstrated improvement in detecting the flow of each class, taking in consideration the needs of her students, their receptivity to the current activity, and the role each activity played in addressing intended (or aligned) lesson outcomes. She regularly made the decision to continue with instruction and progress to the next set of activities even if student readiness was still in question. The following passage was pulled from field notes later in the ABL unit:

Carolyn became more aware of the significant items that needed to be addressed in her own facilitation. Within the context of a 10-day instructional unit, she began to address the necessary themes at moments when they were most appropriate and linked to the activities on each lesson plan. (CAR, FN8)
In short, some of these improvements were spurred by our continuous conversations (coaching sessions) between the directly observed lessons in the 10-day unit as well as having ample detail on lessons and supplemental materials to reference and validate my suggestions during our interactions.

**Yardstick Continuum**

This theme provides the range of Carolyn’s effective and ineffective practice as a facilitator and recognizes specific pedagogies on the continuum. The theme chronicles successes and frustrations of teaching a content area for the first time.

**Range of effectiveness.** From the start of the study, Carolyn adopted the ABL structure recommended by the materials as well as strategies discussed and demonstrated during initial training. Quotes were the most common brief used in the unit and worked well for Carolyn’s facilitation; “The researcher included every brief on the lesson plan and most of the early briefs were quotes, or prompt to engage students for the lesson (CAR FN4; CH4). On occasion, Carolyn spent more time than recommended for the briefs, sharing stories at the beginning of the lesson related to the daily theme. She defended her decision to extend the brief because she kept her student’s attention and stated,

I felt that I had more to share with them other than just the quote. Students could have a better connection with the quote and what we would be doing later in the class if they heard a little more at the beginning. (CAR, I2)

These extended anecdotes from Carolyn were not discussed in advance with me. She felt that these stories were timely and appropriate for her students.
Carolyn’s knowledge of context and knowledge of learners was present more regularly as the unit progressed. She was most helpful in determining the readiness for her classes with specific activities. The following passage was taken from field notes following direct and video observation of lessons:

During *Mass Pass*, students on the outside did not make the appropriate adjustment, which would have been to move closer to the selected student to make catching easier. Another class effectively participated individually and put their piece of tape on the tarp for *Turning Over A New Leaf* – but did not work well together in completing the group task of turning over the tarp. In both examples, students did not follow the anticipated outcome of activities. The unexpected results provided more meaningful experiences to draw from during debrief time. (CAR, FN5)

In both, Carolyn and I agreed that each activity was appropriate for the group and their readiness to experience frustration or conflict was present. Still, Carolyn rationalized the observed behaviors of both classes in the activities, stating: “You have got to understand that we have students on different levels here” (CAR, I3). Her comment referred to the difficulties in teaching students at ITMS that had academic and social deficiencies that were on display during some of the presented activities.

Carolyn held an optimistic outlook throughout the unit; she looked for progress and achievement in her lessons as much as possible. Carolyn framed the activity *Screaming Toes* by asking students to make eye contact. At this time, her student Lacy said, “ah no I am not going to do it (make eye contact), you all are ugly” (CAR, CH4). Despite initial resistance, Carolyn pushed through and gave the brief instructions of the
game. Lacy eventually participated in the activity because others fell in line and followed Carolyn’s lead. Another student (Frank) stayed on task but when addressing the student says, “what’s up my n%$%@?” instead of using the standard greeting as established by the class (CAR, FN4). The following excerpt from field notes described the interaction:

The discourse in today’s class was common for Frank but no one else in Carolyn’s class. He was immediately re-directed to little success but again, Carolyn advanced forward in the lesson. Other students engaged in the activities as if Frank were not in the gym. (CAR, FN5)

Carolyn continued to push forward with this class despite obvious disrespectful behavior by her students toward one another. She saw some of these behaviors as norms to her class and (quite often) the school. Her perspective on student behaviors in the ABL unit was to model effective behaviors and allow the content to aid in carrying students along in the unit.

Throughout our time together Carolyn modified activities to better fit her students. It was common for Carolyn to say, “this might work, I may tweak this a little bit”, or “I may change the wording here” (CAR, RJ1, FN1). Devon was a student that regularly challenged Carolyn with his attention span and excitement as he entered her second period class, “Today he was overflowing with energy” (CAR, FN5). To help Devon have a productive day in her class, Carolyn decided to extend the instant activity for the first 15 minutes of class. In such a case where students (or a student) may be a potential distraction, especially in a small class of students with extraordinary needs, maintaining an activity that is engaging or purposeful becomes the primary outcome. Despite the original intentions of a series of 2-3 activities focusing on building
community or cooperative skills, Carolyn made the decision that her students, “must have
needed it (physical activity)” (CAR, I2). She regularly made quick decisions to promote a
successful class each day and positive outcomes.

Carolyn effectively maintained an instant warm-up activity that preceded the brief
at the beginning of each lesson. The instant activity has been a mainstay in Carolyn’s
classes since she has been teaching physical education. Carolyn shared her perspective on
the instant activity within the ABL lesson:

The instant activity is something I strongly believe in to set the tone for the rest of
the class. Students always know my expectations for activity and to take that
away for a new unit that is new for all of us may disrupt the flow of the classes.

(CAR, I2)

Her consistent use of activity did not exclude Carolyn from having difficulty with
students following her intended warm-up. On day 4 of the unit, Carolyn asked students to
begin Simpson Tag, a common warm-up in Carolyn’s class, but students were having
trouble getting into the game mostly due to off-task students. Carolyn commonly used 5-
6 different instant games with each of her classes and would select these at random or
purposefully depending upon the response from students.

A familiar occurrence in Carolyn’s facilitation was her ability to add extending
tasks or lead the activity as originally planned in the lessons. In each example, Carolyn
had been trained on each of the activities and knew the activities well enough to consider
how students would respond. During Group Juggle the original extension, as provided on
the lesson plan, suggested one minute of success before extending the task to make more
difficult for the group to provoke some difficulty for the group. However, Carolyn chose not to follow the original extension based on her knowledge of the group. She explained,

We were getting to know people while working on our throwing and catching.
The group was having success and having fun so I stayed with it. I allowed them to determine when it was time for us to move on. At one point some students did not pay attention and the ball dropped…then the activity and the theme became much more relevant to everyone participating. (CAR, I2)

At that moment in the unit, students had not experienced significant frustration as a result of being in an activity together. After all the activities during this lesson, Carolyn conducted a quick debrief that went smoothly but did not address the components of the debrief in full detail. The following excerpt was taken from the facilitation checklist:

She appropriately asked the most direct questions to the class, “Why did the activity work? or Why or when didn’t it work?” and the group was quick to identify the errors. The errors that students mentioned for Group Juggle were (a) not saying a person’s name, (b) dropping the ball, (c) students not following the established pattern, (d) not paying attention during the activity, and (e) throwing the objects too hard. (CAR, CH4)

After students identified the errors Carolyn followed up with a couple of follow up questions to gain students thoughts and feelings when the errors occurred. The questions were appropriate but were not sufficient for the full debrief. Carolyn was still missing additional questioning to promote the development of the Now What? of the debrief.

Carolyn regularly (and effectively) used ABL language in her classes. She identified each activity by name for student recall and purposefully identified the
important concepts within the unit that she felt students should retain. She referenced the community and the importance of working together and depending on one another to achieve group goals. Carolyn often checked for student understanding with rules to prevent students from beginning without any confusion. For example, Carolyn compared *Cardio Rocks*, a game from the unit plan to *Gold Rush*, a common warm-up her class played that emphasized honesty and fair play (CAR, CH5). She identified the similarities and differences between both before checking for understanding one last time.

Carolyn was concerned that her students would not be competent in demonstrating cooperative behaviors and participating at an appropriate fashion in the activities as they were presented in the unit. She sometimes felt anxious and compared the students’ receptivity and occasional performances as, “banging our heads against the wall” (CAR, FN4). Some barriers in daily lessons were present but managed well by Carolyn, such as taking turns (Laughing Matters, Peek-A-Who, Cooperation Dots), fair play (Marketplace Relay, Asteroids, Group Juggle), and respect for student differences (Turning Over a New Leaf; debrief sessions). Despite the recognition of these barriers, either by me, Carolyn, or both of us during our interactions, she continued to push forward to improve her ability to facilitate effective lessons.

Carolyn was diligent in providing positive feedback to her class. She was regularly congratulating them on being respectful, participating, and appreciating the uniqueness of their classmates (CAR, FN4; CH4). She was adamant that her class left with the message from her that progress was made in the class even if it was not always a student-generated message. Carolyn had stated earlier in the unit during informal conversations that she wanted them to know that, “each day was a day that they achieved
something” (CAR, FN2). For students in Carolyn’s observed classes, appropriate participation and acceptable behavior were exceptions to their norms. Most of Carolyn’s facilitated debriefs addressed main themes intended by the lesson plan that generally fell within the expectations originally set forth during training. Each class debrief elicited initial perspective from students in the class but not all students. In sum, Carolyn was unable to procure depth within the 6-10 minute time segment that was commonly allocated for the debrief at the end of each lesson.

Carolyn’s successes as a facilitator were present following cycles of teaching, informal conversations with the researcher, and personal reflection as was demonstrated through her facilitation checklists. Even after two days of ABL facilitation, Carolyn knew the activities well, provided adequate instruction to her students, and led a debrief that gained student perspective. The following excerpt came from notes on the facilitation checklist: Carolyn followed guidelines from training and used the recommended circle formation; the small class allowed for individual input and perspective and enabled her to identify student behaviors more readily (CAR, CH1). She improved throughout the unit as a facilitator of ABL activities, moving from (a) students only offering initial perspective to (b) gaining more student perspective. Indeed Carolyn’s best lessons involved her asking follow-up questions after students provided initial perspective. This situation was the most comfortable that Carolyn appeared as a facilitator. For example Carolyn had the students in a circle formation and used a 1-5 scale to rate how much they liked the activities. Once the students gave their initial rating and perspective then Carolyn moved on to some question and answer time. She initiated questions by asking “Can you give me an example when” or “Can you give me an example of” (CAR, FN3).
Another strategy Carolyn used effectively were feelings cards/perspective cards, which took the focus off of her speaking and working through content with her students to the intentions of the cards. Carolyn used these cards in an effort, “to make connections with students of the experiences in class to experiences in their lives” (CAR, FN2).

Despite the effective practices demonstrated by Carolyn, a significant amount of time in the 10-day instructional unit supported her ineffective facilitation of ABL activities. Either as isolated instances, segments of a lesson, or the entire lesson altogether, Carolyn’s facilitation was occasionally ineffective. Examples of ineffective facilitation and poor pedagogy include (a) wasted time in managerial tasks, (b) incomplete debriefs, (c) lesson preparation, and (d) limited use of debrief strategies.

Effectiveness often waned in Carolyn’s execution of a complete and meaningful debrief. Time (or lack thereof) played a role in the limitations of her leading an effective debrief. Due to the instant activity and warm-up that Carolyn maintained during the ABL unit, the ABL portion of class commonly started 8-10 minutes later than originally planned. The following was a passage from Carolyn’s facilitation checklist on her third day in the unit:

Carolyn’s activities for the first class did not begin until 13 minutes into the session. Most of this time was absorbed by management and transition time. The brief for was a quote that was not shared with the class until the 15-minute mark.

(CAR, CH3)

Some of Carolyn’s early teacher/facilitator behaviors were not representative of effective facilitation as discussed in training, and the misuse of time was a common point raised in discriminating between effective and ineffective facilitation. I continued to emphasize in
our early coaching sessions the importance of the basic ABL structure and how it could aid in some of her initial management and behavioral struggles.

She was conscious of her facilitation behaviors and consistently (and ineffectively) held a quick debrief. Carolyn initially felt that a more direct approach to processing was the most effective method to deliver the daily themes. Carolyn would share the themes in advance of the activities as a preview for her students. However, most of her debriefs did not permit all student perspectives to be shared on this theme following related activity. This came from day two of the unit: “Carolyn only allocated four minutes to conduct a debrief and asked students to give her a rating from 1-10 how they liked the activities but only heard from five of the students in her class” (CAR, CH2). Even in small groups (e.g. pairs, triads, quads, etc.), Carolyn was not allowing (all) students to share their perspective. Carolyn’s preparation in delivering each lesson came into question early in the unit. The researcher felt that the training was sufficient, with the addition of formative checks with the participants for instructions on the activities and suggestions for leading a successful debrief. Even as students were entering her gym, Carolyn was asking the researcher for clarification of rules for activities that had already been discussed. The following excerpt came from my researcher journal midway through the unit:

At the beginning of these early lessons, Carolyn has continued to ask questions about activities that were already covered in training or recently discussed. She was unsure of the appropriate formations for students during Marketplace Relay and Laughing Matters. She wanted to know how much time I thought was appropriate to facilitate Have You Ever and Chicken Baseball. With the debrief,
she wanted to know which questions I thought were the most important. (CAR, RJ5)

She was still using lesson plans prior to the start of class even though she had taught the same lessons during the day. Carolyn shared that her primary reason for keeping the lesson materials in hand were to ensure accurate information shared with the class and to get it right the first time with her class.

Despite having the lesson plans to hand, Carolyn still had difficulties teaching ABL. In her first observed lesson, students were in line formation ready to exit the class when she asked, “What did you think of the activities today?” (CAR, CH1). Carolyn recognized her rushed attempt at initiating a debrief with her first class. She stated, “Everything seemed so rushed today and my mind was thinking about so many things at one time. The activities were great and I looked at my watch and the class was almost over” (CAR, I2). For both classes on the first day, Carolyn used all three activities on the lesson plan and delivered a short debrief on the second lesson but was still did not meet the expectations of an effective debrief. Carolyn ended the first class with the Thumbs Up debrief strategy but gained limited detail in the processing beyond the initial student responses.

While leading the debrief in her classes, it was common for Carolyn to only address the initial stage of the experiential learning cycle (perspective taking) with her students. On the second day of the unit, Carolyn used a rating scale as the debrief strategy. Although a strategy that I recommended during training, Carolyn did not follow up with an appropriate line of questioning or prompts to support the flow of the session:
Carolyn used rating scale as a strategy and students shared their rating. This could have served dual purposes if she had asked them to voluntarily explain their rating if they felt comfortable doing so in public. It would also shed more light on the additional questions recommended for use that were on the lesson plan, or those questions Carolyn may have generated during the lesson. (CAR, FN2)

She led shallow debrief sessions largely due to using lesson plan debrief materials literally rather than using the materials to inform what she directly observed as the facilitator. In this direct experience, she would likely have had more authentic examples to bring up in conversation with her students at the end of the lesson.

On day three, and similar to the first day of the unit, Carolyn had the students in line before she initiated a closure – just a few of the students participated in the hurried questioning mainly because Carolyn had run out of time and she was trying to fit it all in. Carolyn reflected on this situation during the third interview. She shared,

My first few days kind of all ran together. I was not nearly as comfortable because I still didn’t know what to expect from my students and myself. My lessons don’t’ always feel smooth because it’s all new. I am getting better at slowing things down and watching my class, but it’s tough. (CAR, I3)

The main feedback provided on her performance in leading debriefs was to begin to ensure that more students are sharing a perspective that will allow a facilitator to provide more accurate support during a debrief.

The most common and comfortable debrief for Carolyn was done with her students standing in a circle formation and one ball served as the talking stick. Carolyn
had a prepared set of 3-4 questions to present to the class when this type of debrief was conducted. The following passage was taken from her daily evaluation of facilitation:

After each question in the debrief, Carolyn would pass the ball to a student that volunteered to share their response with the rest of the group. The same students are volunteering first and may be monopolizing the discussion time. The session continues when another student called for the ball and the previous student would pass them the ball. (CAR, CH6)

To modify the debrief, Carolyn asked the ball to be passed around the circle in order, either clockwise or counter-clockwise to gain more student perspectives. The talking stick debrief, or in this case the talking ball, was Carolyn’s most comfortable debrief because she felt comfortable and students felt comfortable sharing under these conditions. The use of a single initial debrief strategy was not what I had recommended in training. Each day, I provided different strategy that was expected to be delivered from Carolyn to her classes. During five of the 10 class sessions, Carolyn used the talking ball strategy. The use of the same strategy would elicit specific outcomes. Any student response was a recall of what happened during the class and their initial thoughts toward the activities. Most of time during the use of the talking ball, Carolyn facilitated the discussion and gained an initial, shallow student responses. Missing was a move toward generalizing student perspectives or applying the comments to issues outside the physical education class or the school building.

Carolyn’s journey uncovered some similarities to the central theme shared during ABL teacher training before the start of the 10-day instructional unit: an emphasis of affective domain outcomes (i.e. building community, effective communication,
cooperation, establishing full value norms, etc.) in a physical education context. The findings detected an ethic of care that often superseded other instructional endeavors in the name of physical education or education and chronicled effective and ineffective pedagogies demonstrated (and directly observed) in the natural setting of Carolyn’s classroom. Carolyn was comfortable and confident in her abilities as a teacher, and felt that she was doing the best for her students. Carolyn was skilled, engaged, and in agreement of doing as much as she could to enable her students to have successful learning experiences in her physical education classes.

**Specific ABL pedagogies.** Carolyn utilized a number of pedagogies supported during training that, over time, were engrained. It could be considered a success that Carolyn took for granted some of her basic pedagogical practices that led to her students’ successes in her lessons. The following passage was taken from my field notes:

She did not deviate from the organization of the class – everyday (1) entering to sit in the auditorium chairs, (2) her greeting and taking attendance while they are grouped in chairs, (3) walking together to her gym, (4) the instant activity as they entered, and (5) the written instructions on the dry erase board. Everything was done with order and timeliness in mind. Anything added in the name of ABL was done after Carolyn’s daily routine with her students. (CAR, FN9)

Carolyn did not consider all of these steps she took with her class. She downplayed and shrugged off the routine because of the constant interruptions by students, colleagues, etc. during the routine that hurts her ability to manage her classes. Carolyn shared in an interview,
In the last couple of years I have been getting better at giving my classes more structure. In this unit I have been more aware (and paid more attention) of student behaviors…it has really helped to give me a better sense of their acquisition of the lesson. (CAR, I2)

The above comment suggested a move by Carolyn toward demonstrating more in the moment behaviors to contribute to a more relevant learning environment.

Carolyn prompted the class when taking attendance in the auditorium prior to their walk into the gym to begin the activity. As a reminder, the activity and instructions were often restated on the dry erase board. “You know what to do” and “we are not set up” were prompting phrases Carolyn used to keep the class on task during the warm-up. Carolyn maintained consistency with the same 5-6 activities as the daily warm-ups. Her tone and encouragement, use of positive feedback, inclusive language (i.e. “we” statements), and recognition of pro-social behaviors contributed to purposeful warm-up in most of her classes during the ABL unit (CAR, FN4; FN10).

Carolyn appropriately allowed frustration to set in rather than stepping in and telling students the solutions or more efficient ways to address tasks within activities (i.e. Mass Pass). Carolyn accurately determined student readiness throughout the instructional unit with her students for the planned activities. Her common response to how she thought her classes would respond to the activities was, “It is hard to tell. Here, we have students on different levels” (CAR, I2; FN4-5). She seamlessly adjusted to the flow of the issues and themes emerging from her individual classes; themes that were not originally intended.
Summary

The findings represent Carolyn and Suzanne as they facilitated an ABL instructional unit in their respective physical education classes. The study tells the story of their individual upbringing, early influences, and all forms of teacher training that has led to their current position at ITMS. The findings from Carolyn were highlighted in her formative years and the role of her family that influenced her pursuit of additional education and to become a teacher. She associated early with ABL content and it’s potential for a regular position within her PE classes at ITMS. Carolyn’s journey was presented first with her upbringing to better inform some of the decisions she made as a PE teacher, including those during the ABL unit. Carolyn identified early with ABL as a (potentially) useful content area in her classes and necessary for the students at ITMS. Despite some struggles in her facilitation, attributed either to insufficient training or preparation, Carolyn delivered daily lessons as best as she saw fit.

Suzanne’s story was shared first by identifying moments in her adolescence that influenced her career path as an educator. Also, her successes and frustrations during facilitation were identified as well as her growth during the study based on the acquisition of new information and the new experiences as an ABL facilitator. Suzanne’s positive school experiences as a student superseded any negative vignettes and led to her pursuit of a career that helped others. She was grateful of mentors that pushed her in this direction. Suzanne acquired knowledge of ABL through training as well as direct experience as a facilitator with her students. Strongly. After the start of the ABL unit, Suzanne’s perspective of ABL was modified through her direct experiences, our informal
conversations and coaching sessions, and more critical reflection of instructional decisions made.

Similarities between the two participants were the influence and importance of their upbringing and its role in making meaning as a professional educator. Both felt comfortable including ABL within their physical education classes and valued the support provided in the form of training, lesson materials, and formative coaching. Differences in each participant’s journey within the timeline of the ABL unit were identified mostly in terms of knowledge, preparation, and facilitation of lessons. Suzanne was much more directive and command-style; most of her discussions involved her as the primary voice. She also appeared to be more comfortable in knowing the activities and debrief strategies, and seemed to be facilitating off book. Carolyn was more comforting and nurturing in her facilitation style, more willing to pass the control off to students in class that were capable of handling it. She allowed others to share more than Suzanne during the debrief. She was also more receptive to the numerous coaching episodes and direct prompts from the researcher to make a change.
Chapter 5: Discussion

The purpose of this study was to review the experiences of two novice ABL facilitators (i.e. two in-service physical education teachers) during training in, and facilitation of a completed 10-day ABL instructional unit in their respective classes. The study chronicled teachers’ learning of a new instructional approach (e.g., ABL facilitation) and new content area (i.e., sequenced ABL activities). In this chapter I explain the findings connected to my research questions using the lens of Transformative Learning Theory (TLT) and situating the findings in the context of research on ABL. Findings are presented by research questions and participants, followed by a cross case analysis and inhibitors to transformation per research question. The chapter concludes with sections addressing the strengths of the study, limitations of the study, my reflexivity and considerations, the implications of the study, future research directions, and concluding remarks.

Summary of the Findings (Transformation)

Research Question 1: In what ways do (middle school) physical education teachers transform during the facilitation of an instructional unit in Adventure Based Learning?

The focus of the first research question was to examine the transformation of physical education teachers during their participation in this study as novice facilitators of an ABL instructional unit. Transformative Learning Theory was utilized because it explains how individuals learn and make meaning of their experiences (Mezirow, 2000). Transformation and ABL have been linked in relation to teacher characteristics (e.g. attitudes, values) and instructional modifications (e.g. extend, refine activities) (Brown, 2006). In this study, data was gathered to inform the perspectives of the two participants
in order to better understand how meaning was made with the initial use of ABL in their PE classes.

**Suzanne**

Findings relative to transformation emerged in two areas: (a) modified activities and (b) ABL identity. Suzanne made modifications to the activities because she thought some sequenced activities on the lesson plan were not a good fit or did not make sense for her group as originally planned. She changed words and phrases used in the activities to be more applicable to her students, or would adjust the time estimates for activities while facilitating in the lesson. These modifications were initially made based on her knowledge of students and her perception of their engagement. A further area of transformation for Suzanne was how she identified with ABL foundations as shared in training, including the structure within each lesson of brief, activities, and debrief. Specifically, Suzanne immediately agreed with the role of the debrief and its part in gaining more student perspective in lessons.

Suzanne modified activities within certain lessons but delivered the ABL lessons according to the structure and sequence as outlined in the training workshop. She followed the sequence of activities on the lesson plans that were provided and modified when she felt that an activity would not work as described on the lesson plan. The modifications Suzanne used were not appropriate in terms of better fitting the needs of her students, but were used instead to fit her own needs as a novice, unprepared facilitator. Lesson plans included 3–4 sequenced activities for the 42 minute ABL lessons, more than enough content for a single ABL lesson. These estimates were made assuming a varied student response and wanting Suzanne to feel comfortable by having more
activities on the plan than were needed. Panicucci, Faulkingham Hunt, Kohut, Rheingold, and Stratton (2002) recommended 1-3 activities per lesson, with estimated times of 15-30 minutes per activity, in case some activities run shorter or longer based on the needs or receptivity of the group. I felt that including 3-4 activities on each lesson plan was appropriate to provide a safety net for the novice facilitator.

Early in the study, Suzanne realized that the ABL lesson plans were comprehensive and contained more information than she could expect to use each lesson. I asked Suzanne to prioritize the activities on each daily lesson as she saw fit. Making decisions on how to prioritize the activities on the lesson plans was covered in the ABL training. Instead, Suzanne followed the order of the activities as specified on the lesson plans. Her modifications of activities were made based on rules, organizational structure, and wording for instructions within the sequenced activities. Most significant in her modifications was her adjusting of the rules, structure, etc. to help her facilitation. In many cases, the modifications were simplifications; she usually reduced rules and extensions to an activity. At no point in the study did she look to enhance a task as originally planned. Unfortunately, this most often resulted in the activities being limited and not achieving the desired outcome of the activity and the lesson.

Suzanne identified with the foundations of ABL and PE as presented early in initial training. Specifically, she agreed with two functions central to ABL: (a) ABL is an approach to teaching for the personal and social development of students (Cosgriff, 2000), and (b) as such it is central to the process to hear student perspectives in her classes during debrief sessions that follow the students’ direct ABL experiences. Training offered a forum to highlight the potential for ABL at Island Terrace Middle School.
(ITMS) with Suzanne’s classes. Gaining student perspectives in ABL lessons is an important function for an effective ABL lesson (Kolb, 1984; Brown, 2006) and I encouraged Suzanne to hear as many student perspectives as possible in her lessons. Suzanne admitted that she has always wanted to hear student perspectives in her classes but did not know how to effectively accomplish this goal.

Suzanne believed in the ABL foundations but did not always deliver instruction that aligned with the lesson plans or instructions shared in training. Her lesson facilitations were more representative of a direct instruction style; Suzanne modified rules for activities and modified student groupings to benefit her role as a new facilitator. When students were in activity, Suzanne moved on to new tasks in lessons based on her pre-determined time intervals rather than student response or performance. She did not consistently extend or refine initial tasks within the ABL lessons and her modifications of rules for specific activities occurred at the beginning of the activity. From observing Suzanne teaching, it was clear that the modifications were made more to help her survive each activity in the unit as opposed to creating a more meaningful lesson for her students. She simplified rules of games and activities to help her communicate these rules accurately to her students.

Suzanne wanted to hear more student perspectives in her debriefs and achieved this during the ABL unit. However, hearing student perspectives was largely due to the nature of the instructional unit and not an overt attempt to re-work her teaching style. The unit plan and coordinating lesson plans arranged activities in sequence with supporting briefs, debrief strategies, and guiding questions. There was no additional work on Suzanne’s part to fully embrace the debrief and make it her own. A few times during the
unit, when Suzanne was at her very best, she followed the instructions of activities on the lesson plans. She was required to conduct a debrief and was provided with recommendations in training and on lesson plans how to execute this component of the ABL lesson. For the majority of the lessons, Suzanne’s debriefs did not follow the recommendations and often involved using an initial strategy or posing a question to 28-30 students per class. Her four or five most socially confident students would share their perspectives and Suzanne would generalize these few comments as representative of the entire group. The purpose of the debrief is to enhance the experience that an individual just had (Frank, 2004) and to help them to make sense of what they learned through the experience. Debriefing allows appropriate time for students to share their different experiences with peers in an emotionally safe environment of the classroom community. During the debriefs, Suzanne heard more perspectives than previously in her teaching but it was not aligned with effective ABL pedagogies. ABL experts recommend providing adequate time and a forum to gain all student perspectives in a student-centered debrief (Brown, 2004; Estes, 2004). Instead, Suzanne did not consistently provide adequate time for the debrief, only gained the perspectives from a handful of students and then reverted back to the comfort of direct instruction through leading a teacher directed debrief. On the whole, Suzanne consistently led ineffective debriefs as a function of her being unprepared because she did not put in the time to acquire the knowledge and skills, and rehearse lesson segments before facilitating the lessons with her classes. Suzanne was unprepared to lead effective debriefs because her acquisition and review of materials only occurred during the time carved out for training before the unit, the within unit coaching sessions, and during our interviews. Future training would better account for acquisition
of ABL foundations with the use of content packets in the content area and more thorough checks of understanding in ABL. Further, training should include participants’ direct facilitation experiences with students to validate confirm competency in ABL facilitation before leading an instructional unit in schools.

Carolyn

Transformation was pursued in Carolyn’s (a) agreement of ABL foundations, (b) use of ABL language, and (c) differences in the nature of facilitation. Carolyn agreed to participate in the study and the procedures expected for data collection. She also seemed to value the nature of the content and ABL as an approach to teaching. An important distinction must be made between Carolyn’s agreement to participate and her ongoing conceptualization (and agreement) of ABL as a useful approach to teaching in her classes. I viewed Carolyn’s agreement to participate in the study as an initial step in transformation. Agreement in participation indicated she could be open to embracing new content and pedagogies.

Carolyn’s use of ABL terminology demonstrated her recognition of the new content and a commitment to promoting ABL as a useful approach in her physical education lessons. Training promoted her use of the appropriate ABL terminology to support a stronger sense of community. Further, she was able to distinguish the difference in the roles required by facilitators of ABL throughout the 10-day unit. These differences helped her see the ABL unit as being dynamic and yet strongly dependent upon student responses.

Carolyn understood the extra time required for training, interviews, coaching sessions, and informal conversations, as well as having me in two of her five daily classes
for two weeks, video recording and directly observing her ABL facilitation. Carolyn’s approach prior to and at the beginning of the study was one of excitement and anticipation. She looked forward to gaining more resources to allow her to teach ABL in her classes. Carolyn expressed her affinity for the personal and social development of her students and saw her participation in the study as a way to develop her expertise in this area. The training was the first step in developing this expertise by clarifying the content of the ABL unit and pedagogies included in the content packet. My direct observation of her lessons and subsequent coaching sessions were intended to facilitate Carolyn’s progress as an ABL facilitator. I felt that training aligned with the content provided in the ABL packet and my coaching supported Carolyn’s growth as a novice ABL facilitator. However, Carolyn’s advancement, both in effectiveness and comfort, were limited by the amount of time she dedicated to prepare for her facilitation.

Carolyn agreed to take part in the study but she did not show signs of planning beyond the time in training, coaching sessions, and informal conversations. There were no indicators she independently planned for her daily ABL facilitation. All procedures prior to the ABL unit, as well as formative ABL interactions (i.e. interviews, coaching sessions, informal conversations), were established for Carolyn’s acquisition and application of ABL in her PE lessons. Her agreement to participate in the study implied an agreement for the effort needed to acquire new information and appropriately use that information in her teaching. I expected Carolyn’s transformation to include making meaning of newly shared content and pedagogies (i.e. ABL content packet) and utilizing the new knowledge and information to facilitate effective lessons in her PE classes.
Carolyn’s transformation also included the deliberate use of pro-ABL language in her classes. Her communication with students in her lessons regularly covered the importance of building community in the classroom, referring to each class as *our class*, and using the stem *who in our community* when asking questions after activities or in the debrief. I interpreted Carolyn’s consistent use of ABL terminology as both a commitment to her students to effectively facilitate the ABL unit, and as a way to encourage her students to demonstrate these behaviors. She consistently verbalized the purpose of ABL, the rationale for the unit at ITMS, and her expectations of the group by the end of the two-week unit. Transformation involves a comprehensive set of fixed expectations that are made more inclusive, open, reflective, and capable of change (Mezirow, 2000). Carolyn’s demonstrated behaviors align with these descriptors of transformation, specifically her openness to new information and willingness to pursue change.

Carolyn was open to the procedures involved in acquiring ABL knowledge prior to the study as well as the continuous interactions (e.g. informal conversations, coaching sessions, and direct observation of lessons) built into the study. Carolyn, by her own admission, was more reflective in the study than in her previous teaching due to some of the employed data collection methods, particularly the coaching sessions between daily observations. I considered Carolyn’s demonstrated ABL facilitation as a significant vignette of transformation.

Carolyn’s use of ABL language was not representative of her knowledge or facilitation of ABL. To her credit, Carolyn effectively represented ABL in her verbal communication with students early in the unit. She regularly addressed the importance of a sense of community in the class and how it can be more rewarding individually when a
group accomplishes their goals. Following her verbal support and commitment for ABL, Carolyn facilitated activities and led debriefs that did not always align with the same ABL principles shared earlier. She simply did not deliver the same product at the lesson and unit level that she was verbally selling during each lesson.

Carolyn recognized the differences in the various roles employed by a facilitator during the unit. For example, Carolyn’s role early in the unit, where she may be more directive in her facilitation, was expected to be different than later in the unit where she may be in the role more of a consultant. Identifying differences in the role of a facilitator was eased by the nature of activities from days 1-3 (i.e. community building, establishing classroom norms) to days 8-10 (i.e. cooperation, trust, problem solving). Early activities required more direct engagement and instruction, while facilitation later in the unit expected Carolyn to settle into a more indirect role, or “guide on the side” (Frank, 2004; Metzler, 2011). Early in the unit, Carolyn provided detailed instructions and later in the unit she provided instructions that offered more student chances to interpret vague instructions for activities. Carolyn could identify and discuss some differences in her own ABL facilitation during the unit but could not demonstrate many recommended strategies of an effective ABL facilitator, such as actively listening to all student perspectives, generalizing student perspectives, and applying generalized themes outside of the physical education context. It seemed as though she was not confident implementing these strategies in her PE program. The coaching sessions encouraged her to employ commonly shared tips for effective facilitators and predict the possible barriers of effective facilitation. In hindsight, the training should have included more direct
experience facilitating students, observing effective and experienced ABL facilitators, and allowing more time in training to construct and process effective ABL pedagogies.

Carolyn led the ABL unit in more of a direct instruction format, sharing instructions for activities, organizing students into the activity, and providing some feedback during their activity. She facilitated the ABL lessons primarily in a direct instruction format because this was the teaching style she was most comfortable and familiar with. Carolyn did not feel comfortable giving up control of the class as she did not fully know what to expect because of her unfamiliarity with ABL. At no point did Carolyn fully shift her role as a facilitator to become a guide or assistant serving as more of a consultant.

**Cross Case Analysis**

There are four common areas that will be discussed in the cross case analysis: (a) modification of activities, (b) adopted ABL structure, (c) facilitation differences, and (d) incomplete debriefs. Participants transformed in individual ways, each of which will be discussed at the end of the cross case analysis.

**Modification of Activities**

Suzanne and Carolyn modified activities as they considered best for their students. Modifications included arranging students differently in a task, phrasing of a rule, or making verbal instructions more concise. Both felt a gap between the pre-planned unit activities and how their students would participate in the unit. Making modifications to activities based on group needs is supported in the literature by Stanchfield (2007) who encourages facilitators to be flexible, welcome change, and expect the unexpected. Suzanne changed the name of *Have You Ever* to *I Like My Friends* to prevent negative
and more mature statements from occurring. Carolyn adjusted detailed instructions and procedures for *Marketplace Relay* that offered a more meaningful student experience. Panicucci et al. (2002) recommended that facilitators over-prepare and use lesson plans as a guide when leading ABL activities. However, both Suzanne and Carolyn demonstrated facilitator behaviors that went strictly off the lesson plans and not always delivered the lessons as accurately as I expected. Their preparation to facilitate the lesson plans lacked sufficient depth to lead effective lessons. It was plausible that Suzanne and Carolyn’s modifications were for the benefit and relevance of students, but each change appeared to have benefited Suzanne and Carolyn’s effort to move on in the lesson. Rules were often modified or altogether eliminated to make it easier for them to lead the lesson. Extensions and layers to games listed in the lesson plans were not included in the delivery of the activities. The changes made to the activities occurred in part because they did not have a strong understanding of the necessary progressions in the activity or the lesson. Both participants’ execution of early ABL lessons was ineffective and somewhat unexpected. They modified virtually every task in a lesson, from a small change in instructions of a single activity to the time and structure of a daily debrief at the end of each lesson. The implications of abundant lesson modifications include the delivery of unaligned or inappropriate instruction that will fail miserably (Metzler, 2011). A disconnect existed between Suzanne’s and Carolyn’s perspectives of being comfortable leading the ABL unit with their students, and my view of their comfort in ABL knowledge and my expectations of them facilitating an ABL effectively.

Coaching sessions and informal conversations between Suzanne, Carolyn, and I addressed their ongoing performance facilitating each lesson and the specific lesson
components. Our interactions during coaching sessions were similar to observing pre-service teachers during practicum experiences, beginning with the stem of *what worked*, and *what did not work* in the lesson. I gained their perspective and provided specific, corrective feedback related to their performance as facilitators. In order to promote change and improvement, I attempted to make the task of facilitating future lessons more simple. For example, my comments regularly included knowing and following instructions of activities when you introduce it in class, having a plan for initiating the debrief, and being comfortable with the open-ended nature and the unknown possibilities of the debrief.

One of the biggest gaps in the ABL training was the lack of an accountability mechanism in the delivery of ABL content, or an ABL unit in Suzanne and Carolyn’s PE classes. I did not have the authority, nor the intent, to intervene during the unit when ABL facilitation did not meet my expectations shared in training. In future ABL training endeavors, I intend to hold higher participant standards/competencies in content knowledge (CK) and pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) before advancing into more difficult tasks (i.e. leading lessons with students, etc.).

Transformation, as described by Mezirow (1997), involved the participants making informed and reflective decisions to act. Their informed and reflective decisions to modify the ABL activities was encouraged in ABL training and supported in TLT (Mezirow, 1997). These decisions included quick decisions to change rules, advance to another activity, or revisit an activity for better understanding. Through participation in the ABL training and the expectation that both teachers would spend additional time reading and understanding the content packet, it was assumed that they would acquire
both content knowledge (CK) and pedagogical content knowledge (PCK) in ABL; this includes rules and instructions for activities, recommended organizational arrangements, and techniques and tactics for an effective debrief. This version of CK aligns best with Ward’s conceptualization of common content knowledge (CCK); the knowledge that one must possess to simply perform the activity that includes rules and techniques (Ward, 2009).

Ward (2009) explained PCK as a focal point, locus, or an event in time where teachers make decisions based on content and pedagogy built on their understandings of a number of knowledge sources. Further, PCK is not a static representation, but both experiential and developmental in nature. It develops with experience in school settings over time (Ward, 2009; Kim, 2011; Lee, 2011). Based on the type of ABL training before the unit and direct experiences facilitating for the first time, Suzanne and Carolyn’s CK and PCK were limited in both maturity and effectiveness. Professional development at the pre-service and in-service contexts should occur to move teachers toward more mature and effective PCK, in which they provide excellent instruction that leads to successful student learning (Ward, 2010), as an improved change in CK supports a change in PCK (Kim, 2011). In the four-week timeline, Suzanne and Carolyn were expected to acquire knowledge of ABL content to a degree that they would feel comfortable leading an instructional unit in that content. In order to promote more mature and effective CK and PCK in future studies, I would implement more specific methods of accountability of participant (i.e. teachers’) CK and PCK, such as an ABL packet that focuses on the complexities of ABL content (e.g. the art of facilitation, related activities).
Also needed are participants’ direct experiences as ABL facilitators with students to ensure competency prior to completing training.

Within the study, Suzanne and Carolyn did not commit to improving their CK or PCK beyond my demands in training and formative interactions (e.g. ABL training, coaching sessions, informal conversations). The participants did not meet my expectations in their ABL unit facilitation; the instructional decisions made often excluded my recommended progressions, and lesson refinements were made out of convenience for the teachers. Suzanne and Carolyn simply did not effectively facilitate complete the ABL lessons because they lacked the level of knowledge to make the appropriate decisions for instruction. They were responsive to the training and interactions during the study but an overall lack of CK and PCK compromised the delivery of content in the instructional unit.

**Adopted ABL Structure**

Both teachers adopted the ABL structure for use in their classes. The ABL structure was defined to Suzanne and Carolyn as the (a) brief, (b) activities, and (c) a debrief session that occurred in each ABL lesson. I demanded that both participants followed the ABL structure in each lesson. I felt the structure would help maintain the integrity of each lesson and provide consistency in lesson delivery from both participants. It also provided some consistency in the delivery of the ABL lessons to help Suzanne and Carolyn make meaning from their experiences when facilitating the unit.

Frank (2004) and Panicucci et al. (2002) term the ABL structure highlighted above as the “Adventure Wave” and recommend its use when facilitating ABL activities. The Adventure Wave, developed by Schoel, Prouty, and Radcliffe (1988), is based on
three stages of the experiential learning cycle (Kolb, 1984) and is widely used in adventure, experiential, and outdoor programs. This structure was introduced for facilitators to consider the differences in participant experiences throughout an ABL lesson. It has also served as a useful template to support novice facilitators implementing ABL (Panicucci et al., 2002). Consistently using the ABL structure allows facilitators to more easily step back and reflect upon lessons. Suzanne and Carolyn recognized a need during planning to develop a specific ABL sequence and make these considerations before the start of the unit. I included three or four activities on each lesson plan in a reasonable sequence, but I encouraged both participants to adjust this sequence as they saw fit based on the needs of their respective classes.

The ABL structure was provided in part for Suzanne and Carolyn to manage and organize ABL content for each 42 minute lesson. Although the ABL structure (brief, activities, debrief) was adopted by Suzanne and Carolyn, there were some noticeable differences and deficiencies in the implementation of the structure. All but four of Suzanne’s ABL lessons began with the brief, such as a quote, story, or poem among others. She facilitated multiple activities in each lesson and held debriefs but did very little beyond that. It seemed as though Suzanne only followed the ABL structure and did not develop any of the segments within each lesson; at times her lessons had a feel of following instructions literally from lesson plans without any further development of lesson themes. Carolyn used the ABL structure in each of her classes but with an added twist. Upon her request, she maintained an instant activity to start each class independent of the ABL content. Unfortunately, Carolyn was not effective at managing student behaviors or getting students quickly into an initial task that was expected to hook
students for the rest of the lesson. Instead, Carolyn’s *instant activity* served the role of delaying the ABL lesson, thus compressing the daily lesson and shortening the overall contact time of the unit. Carolyn was adamant in keeping an instant warm-up prior to starting the ABL lesson. Her rationale for an instant activity was for immediate movement and engagement in a lesson. Rather than conceding to completely adopt ABL for the 10-day unit, or remove a component of the ABL structure to incorporate the instant activity, we agreed for Carolyn’s instant activity to occur at the beginning of each lesson then carry on with the ABL lesson. This decision was contrary to recommendations for an adventure curriculum in physical education (Panicucci et al., 2002). In Carolyn’s lessons, the ABL processes were delayed 10 minutes each day. Rather than arguing over these ideological differences, we agreed for both an instant activity and the ABL structure to co-exist. Both teachers were trying to incorporate ABL into their typical way of doing things as a teacher at ITMS. Suzanne and Carolyn looked to integrate ABL into their daily operations as physical educators rather than the recommended, separate (and comprehensive) ABL unit in their PE programs.

This trade-off by appeasing both Carolyn’s requirement for an instant warm-up and including the ABL components required in the study resulted in a poor representation of both. Future related studies should maintain the integrity of ABL as an established structure without compromise. Carolyn’s perspective of an instant activity opposed some of the main features of ABL, specifically the concept of hooking students with engaging (and often novel) activities or exercises. Moreover, future ABL research should utilize an appropriately developed unit and lesson plans as opposed to allowing participants to modify lessons as they wished.
Facilitation Differences

Suzanne and Carolyn each demonstrated transformation in their daily facilitation of ABL lessons throughout the instructional unit. On the surface, both transformed through facilitation just by participating as facilitators in the new ABL unit. I directly observed two of their daily lessons to formatively identify and better describe their transformation. Suzanne and Carolyn’s use of the ABL structure and their facilitation of ABL lessons were different from their typical PE lessons. Their PE lessons prior to the study included some independent skill practice followed by a large-sided game in a traditional sport. There was no obvious specific instructional format adopted in these PE lessons. In contrast, the ABL lessons included a daily brief such as a quote or short story, a series of 3-4 activities in sequence, and an initial debrief strategy with procedures for supporting the group’s processing of their experiences.

There were obvious initial differences in how Suzanne and Carolyn facilitated the ABL unit. Suzanne facilitated the large majority of her lessons without plans and often appeared spontaneous in front of her classes. She recalled activities either by memory or by notes made on a clipboard that were on the table in the gym. The information she shared with her students was accurate, based on the description on the lesson plan, but often incomplete in that she left out certain rules and/or changed rules. The spontaneous way in which Suzanne changed or left out certain rules often meant that the activities no longer aligned with the focus of the lesson. In contrast, Carolyn showed less comfort and preparation in her facilitations. She often asked me clarification questions about instructions for rules and how certain activities should look. I thought these questions should have been addressed after the previous lesson during informal conversations or
during the initial ABL training. She appeared unprepared in terms of her CK, and this was confirmed in her regular questions before facilitations on days 4-7. As a result of her visible unpreparedness, Carolyn routinely modified instructions to activities to make them easier on her to lead with her students. Beyond these initial differences, there were similarities in how both participants facilitated the ABL unit.

The major similarity was that Suzanne and Carolyn were not prepared to facilitate effective ABL lessons. I made this determination based off the lack of detail presented in their daily facilitation, notably the regular revision of rules and instructions to make the process of facilitation easier. The modifications resulted in less challenging lessons for Suzanne and Carolyn to facilitate and, in turn less meaningful for their students. For example, the game Asteroids is a useful game to promote behaviors related to fair play, honesty, role shifts, decision making, and legitimizing successes and eminent failures. For these behaviors to be appropriately experienced and subsequently discussed in the debrief session, the activity was presented on the lesson plan with multiple extensions. Instead, both Suzanne and Carolyn cut off two of the three extensions to the game. Suzanne made this decision because she did not effectively manage her students in the class, and Carolyn didn’t value the extensions but instead viewed the activity as more of a fun in the gym game.

Suzanne and Carolyn made meaning differently in their facilitations; their differences support their own individual path toward transformation (Taylor, 2007). They made meaning through direct experience as facilitators and through time spent reflecting critically on their experiences. However, transformation is messy and not always intentional (Mezirow 1997). For example, both participants differed in their training
format (e.g. frequency, duration), critical reflection during coaching sessions, and preferences for planning for instruction beyond my requirements in the study.

Suzanne’s and Carolyn’s individual meaning making offered two unique cases that were informed by the same, original lesson plans. Their differences in meaning making served as a reasonable explanation for differences in transformation as ABL facilitators (Mezirow, 1997). Further, transformation is more likely to take place when participant learning experiences are direct, personally engaging, and stimulate reflection upon experience (Pohland & Bova, 2000). Suzanne and Carolyn made meaning and organized each (a) facilitated ABL activity, (b) ABL lesson, and (c) debrief session differently. In order to foster transformation, future steps should be taken to standardize training to emulate best practices in P-12 schools and PETE programs by expert ABL educators and facilitators. Further, requisite competencies for participants in ABL training should be established to determine a hierarchy of ABL pedagogies and demonstrated teaching skills employed by new facilitators. Lastly, ABL trainees would greatly benefit from direct ABL experiences first as participants in a full sequence of programming prior to any field-based ABL facilitation with students.

Incomplete Debriefs

Suzanne and Carolyn consistently led incomplete debriefs in the ABL unit. A common element to the inconsistencies was not allowing the necessary time for an effective debrief to take place. Suzanne conducted more of a token debrief, using an initial debrief strategy (i.e. One Word, Statues, Thumbs Up Thumbs Down, etc.) and her own questions rather than those provided on the daily lesson plans. Her questions were not as effective as the prepared and recommended questions because they were hurried
and misplaced within the lesson. The prepared debrief questions on the lesson plan were made based on expected student behaviors that would be demonstrated in the lesson. The questions included on the lesson plans were deliberately open-ended and structured in a way that promoted further student explanation of the generated themes in a debrief session. The result of using unaligned questions was confused students; some answered the questions but others visibly did not understand the point of Suzanne’s questions or see connections between the activities and the debrief session. As a result, Suzanne’s facilitation of the ABL lesson was ineffective as her students did not have the opportunity to adequately process their direct experiences. The debrief has been consistently presented as being as important as any function in ABL and in each ABL lesson (Sutherland, Ressler, & Stuhr, 2009). As it is often the final component in the daily ABL structure, the debrief served as an important reminder of students’ direct experiences as well as a platform to make clearer meaning of those experiences; more importantly, students would be able to transfer this learning to their lives beyond the gym.

Suzanne appeared content with her classes being in the debrief phase of the lesson as long as they were well behaved. Suzanne accepted the basic ABL structure and the specific, daily activities for her students’ in the unit, but seemed to just play along with the debrief. She was not committed to each phase of the experiential learning cycle (ELC) (Kolb, 1984) and defaulted in this phase of the ABL lesson to asking questions that produced limited student response. Many of Suzanne’s self-generated questions were created off the cuff as opposed to in the moment. Off the cuff questions indicate an unprepared facilitator who does not maximize the potential of the debrief process. In contrast, questions generated in the moment refer to a facilitator’s ability to generalize
individual and group perspectives and immediately generate a question to further enhance the debrief. *In the moment* questions are considered more useful than off the cuff questions because they assume a greater degree of relevance for the group (Sutherland et al., 2009).

In Suzanne’s ABL lessons, more perspectives were shared by students as the unit progressed. Her commitment to the ABL structure, including delivering daily debriefs (albeit largely ineffective) was the primary reason for perspectives to be shared. However, Suzanne still failed to gain an adequate number of student perspectives. In the ABL training and subsequent coaching sessions, the value of gaining perspective from all students was addressed and reinforced. In her most effective debriefs, Suzanne was hearing from 20-25% of students in her classes. Pugh (2002) examined the effectiveness of teaching elements on fostering transformative learning. In Suzanne’s case, these elements were the newness of students sharing perspectives in her classes. Pugh found that individuals undergo transformative experiences when they actively use a concept, find that it allows seeing properties in a new way, and personally valuing this way of seeing. By the end of the unit, Suzanne grew to value the role of hearing student perspective in ABL and her own teaching. However, she still did not fully value all parts of the debrief process, particularly the last two elements of the ELC (e.g. the *So What?* and *Now What?*).

Suzanne’s most effective debriefs were fairly effective at gaining student perspectives but did not go much further. On the other hand, Carolyn’s debriefs were incomplete mainly because they were quick and shallow. First, she did not allocate enough time for a full debrief to be delivered, thus failing to address the entire ELC in
every lesson. Her daily debriefs typically included an initial debrief strategy followed by a series of student responses. Her best debriefs included 2-3 questions followed by a few student responses. Suzanne and Carolyn were both provided with the information to lead an effective debrief but did not know how to implement this information effectively. Typically, facilitators who struggle in leading a full debrief do not take a group through the recommended ELC (Sutherland et al., 2009; Brown, 2009). Further, common deficiencies are related to the specific elements of the ELC, such as not allowing for appropriate perspective taking and sharing, generalizing comments to the group, or applying shared perspectives to larger, related concepts (Sutherland, Stuhr, & Ressler, in press). Each knew of an effective debrief but did not know how to implement it effectively. Carolyn tried to gain perspectives of students in her classes following each ABL lesson but her debriefs were incomplete and ineffective. Gaining perspectives was the limit to her depth in conducting the debrief. It is difficult for novice facilitators to lead a complete, effective debrief (Sutherland et al., in press; Brown, 2009). Carolyn did not perform a good debrief because of her lack of preparation due to not dedicating enough time for an effective to take place.

Carolyn’s debrief practices did not support the recommendations addressed in the ABL training, particularly related to conducting a full, meaningful debrief that fully addressed the three main components of the ELC. The struggles that Carolyn experienced in leading a debrief in her classes supports the findings of Sutherland, Ressler, and Stuhr (2011) in their work with novice facilitators. Their recommendations included providing sample questions prior to facilitating the lesson, making notes as reminders during the
debrief to help generalize common group themes, and personalizing the experience through anecdotes from the facilitator or students (Sutherland et al., 2011).

Carolyn, more so than Suzanne, saw a strong fit with ABL foundations such as building community, developing students’ intrapersonal and interpersonal skills, and others to a vision she had for her classes at ITMS. I sensed her greater commitment to the ABL foundations outlined by Frank (2004), specifically the strategies necessary to building community in her PE classes. Other resources were noted in training and during coaching sessions that related to best practices in sequencing ABL lessons (Bisson, 1998), the importance of perspective taking during the debrief (Frank, 2004), and specific pedagogies (e.g. using an initial debrief strategy, pre-planned questions, etc.) for novice facilitators in the debrief (Sutherland et al., 2009; Sutherland et al., in press).

Informal conversations and interviews between Carolyn and I often addressed the purpose of ABL and how it could be more useful at ITMS. Interestingly, Carolyn initiated and would lead most of these conversations. One of her popular comments was in relation to the timing of the unit in the school year. We both would have preferred the study to have taken place at the beginning of a school year, or at least at the beginning of a semester or grading period. We each shared a perspective consistent with recommendations of effective ABL practice in that ABL is effective in building community in newly formed groups. Kegan (2000) clarified the meaning of a perspective transformation as being an epistemological change, which is central to transformative learning both in meaning and meaning form, where an individual changes the very form by which they make meaning (Kegan, 2000). Carolyn made meaning with ABL as presented in this study; as (a) an approach to teaching and teaching physical education,
and (b) an instructional unit intended to build community in her classes. She shared that her future ABL units, or ABL related activities will be more strategically sequenced at the beginning of the school year or semester to address personal and social themes that transcend the ABL unit.

Carolyn was committed to establishing an ABL foundation through commonly used phrases. Despite leading mostly incomplete debriefs, Carolyn’s sharing during debriefs could include a personal story or anecdote to redirect the group on the related, daily themes. This was an important element recommended by Sutherland et al. (2009) to promote more community in the classroom as well as encouraging students to share similarly to the facilitator.

Carolyn was fostering an improved relationship with students in each of her classes through her interactions supported by the foundations of ABL but also consistent with the tenets of TLT. She was using the new ABL information to her advantage and went beyond playing along with the procedures in the study. Establishing relationships with others was one of the essential factors in a transformative experience. Trustful relationships allow individuals to have questioning discussions, share information openly and achieve mutual and consensual understanding (Taylor, 1998). Our continuous interactions resulted in frequent conversations that supported a more rapid improvement, or demonstration of, effective pedagogies endorsed in training and in coaching sessions.

**Inhibitors to Transformation**

*Planning.* When you put in little or no time in planning for instruction, you get an ineffective lesson (Metzler, 2011). I saw no evidence that Suzanne and Carolyn planned for the ABL lessons beyond our initial training, coaching sessions, and informal
conversations. There was no depth in their daily facilitations that exceeded instructions on the lesson plans or even matched the detail in instructions, task extensions, and debrief strategies. Coaching sessions often involved me asking about the rationale for some decisions they made in the lesson, then providing specific, corrective feedback on their ineffective debriefs. A primary inhibitor to planning was not allocating the time to prepare for their daily facilitation once the unit began; this independent, individual time commitment was not present. Suzanne and Carolyn modified the ABL content to fit their own needs. They took the information presented in the ABL packet and used it in their classes, but did not demonstrate effective ABL facilitation. Both teachers delivered the ABL structure and conducted debrief sessions, but struggled and failed to facilitate effectively. I interpreted their resistance, or lack of planning beyond training, as an unwillingness to plan for effective instruction.

*Training.* Suzanne and Carolyn participated or *played along* in all training sessions. They put in the required time in training and followed my lead. The format in our training was more reflective of *show and tell*, where I would present the ABL content packets, lead the review of materials, and ask related questions to limited response from Suzanne and Carolyn. Depth in review and understanding important concepts was driven by my questioning, allocation of time, and offering more time and review of specific elements of the content. I expected a different pattern of engagement from participants than what occurred in the study. Training also suffered because of a lack of critical reflection. Critical reflection, defined as asking questions in sequence to address dispositions or rationale for decisions made, was led by me in training. Ideally, more critical review would have occurred through participant-led discussion or questions. My
original expectations for the ABL training were both participants together with me as I led the sessions with supporting materials in a roundtable format to include questions and answers, clarification of lesson materials, and continuous integration of ABL as an instructional unit at ITMS. Instead, most training sessions were one-on-one and favored a more direct instruction format. We talked through materials, watched video clips of effective facilitators, and talked through the specific lesson themes, content of ABL, and facilitating a new instructional unit.

The pre-unit ABL training was successful in the introduction and sharing of lesson materials for the first time with each participant. The themes of ABL were covered in depth and the content packet supported (and aligned with) the daily concepts. Lastly, ample time was given to the outcomes of the ABL unit at ITMS and the importance of the ABL unit in building community and stronger intrapersonal and interpersonal skills in each participants’ classes. In contrast, the training was only somewhat successful in providing the necessary CK and PCK to facilitate an effective ABL unit. This was evidenced by the inconsistencies and disconnects between the content shared before during training and what was implemented by Suzanne and Carolyn. Specifically, each participant modified lessons, skimmed verbal instructions of some exercises, and consistently led incomplete debriefs. Training should have included more specific CK and PCK for ABL and held participants accountable for their preparations. Future related research practices should consider offering training to participants that include direct facilitation experiences with students prior to teaching the unit. In addition, more emphasis on the participants’ acquisition of mature and effective CK and PCK will ensure more effective facilitators. Lastly, training under similar terms and theoretical
frame would greatly benefit from more collaborative training. Teachers in the same context could greatly benefit from a collaborative approach of acquiring and making sense of new information.

**Summary**

Transformation is an ongoing, dynamic process (Mezirow, 2000; Taylor, 2008). Suzanne and Carolyn transformed and demonstrated a path toward transformation through four common themes. I expected similar findings among participants based on the procedures in the study as well as differences in individual teaching styles and student receptivity to new ABL content. Through their contact with ABL during training and direct experience facilitating the ABL unit in their PE classes, Suzanne and Carolyn demonstrated behaviors aligned with TLT research, such as being “ready” for a transformative experience (Wenger, 1998).

In a review on transformative learning, Lange (2004) identified the importance of providing direct and active learning experiences (e.g. service learning) and the availability of varied medium for fostering transformative learning. Lange shares that such experiences and varied mediums are driven by *pedagogical entry points*, defined simply as critical moments. In this study *entry points* operated as direct facilitation experiences and the multiple formats of critical reflection to make better meaning of the participants’ direct experiences. An early entry point toward transformation was Suzanne’s and Carolyn’s agreement to participate in the study. As the study progressed and the participants engaged in training, facilitated lessons, and discussed their facilitations, these instances were more frequent. Entry points have been interpreted differently in terms of frequency and duration. More time in the unit as well as direct
facilitation experiences provided further identification of more entry points; there were more experiences to make meaning of as the unit progressed.

Transformative Learning Theory seeks to examine how individuals learn and make meaning of their experiences (Mezirow, 2000), including ABL experiences such as changes in activities, values, and attitudes (Brown, 2006). Suzanne and Carolyn each modified ABL activities, utilized the ABL structure, had unique facilitation experiences, and delivered incomplete debriefs. Transformation is seen as a form of identity development, opening new dimensions for the negotiation of the self (Wenger, 1998). In short, they both accepted new information and used it as they best saw fit for their context at ITMS.

Summary of the Findings (Meaning Schemes)

Research Question 2: In what ways do physical education teachers use meaning schemes in their day-to-day teaching in physical education?

The focus of this research question was to discover meaning schemes and how they were utilized in the study to interpret new experiences (Taylor, 2008). A meaning scheme serves as the organizational structure in which the learner makes meaning. Examples of meaning schemes could include teaching a class, teaching a task in a class, or an interaction with a student during a task in a lesson.

Meaning schemes were presented in this study as the specific demonstrated behaviors in Suzanne and Carolyn’s facilitation that were emphasized in training or delivered by each participant during their facilitation of the unit. Suzanne and Carolyn’s ability to construct meaning was intentionally pursued through critical reflection (Mezirow, 1991; Taylor, 1998), and supported through the procedures involved in data
collection, including training, facilitation, coaching sessions, and informal conversations. Meaning making was encouraged and monitored through a range of reflective practices, most notably semi-structured interviews, informal conversations, and coaching sessions.

**Suzanne**

Findings relative to meaning schemes emerged in the areas of (a) direct ABL facilitation and (b) attendance and participation. Suzanne gained direct experience in facilitating a 10-day instructional unit in a new content area that required specific pedagogies. Her involvement as a learner in initial training, facilitator, and participant in coaching sessions, interviews, and informal conversations offered more occasions in which she could make meaning. Suzanne’s attendance and participation in the affiliated protocols also offered structure to organize her meaning of new content, planning for instruction, and facilitating lessons.

Suzanne’s direct experience as an ABL facilitator in the 10-day instructional unit provided an organizational structure as a meaning scheme in the study. Her representation of meaning was assumed to be visible in other formats such as, the ABL activities, debrief sessions, student interactions, and her ABL knowledge. The ABL unit was common among both participants but noticeably unique to Suzanne because of the nature of conversations between us before the unit started, and during her first attempts at leading ABL lessons with her students. We discussed the significant differences in the preparation, planning, and the length of the ABL unit, which was longer than any other unit Suzanne taught in PE; most units lasted a week (five days) or a few days more based on student interest. The content I shared in training that was used throughout the unit far exceeded any instructional materials used for teaching PE units at ITMS. Prior to the
study, Suzanne used her own direct experiences as the primary resource for leading units in her PE class; any materials used were accessed online and independent of a formal curriculum within the school district. In this study, she was able to make meaning from differences between her training and the unique and novel experiences with new content in her PE classes.

I felt it was part of my responsibility to help Suzanne find what Berger (2004) called an *edge of meaning*. My questions for her during our coaching sessions and informal conversations seemed to be questions she did not often ask herself such as, “why did you make that decision in class today” or, “how and why do you think students liked the lesson today”? Suzanne shared in the life history interview that she always changed her instruction based on students’ interest, but her responses to my questions suggested otherwise. The study provided procedures to help Suzanne discover the necessary detail in planning and delivering good content. The *edge of meaning* (Berger, 2004) for Suzanne operated as the *edge of her willingness to make meaning*. Procedures in the study were in place to uncover how Suzanne made meaning and how willing she was to make meaning during the timeline of the study. Data collected during multiple daily observations, coaching sessions, and semi-structured interviews captured Suzanne’s willingness to pursue the acquisition of ABL content. Unfortunately, her lessons were a modified version of the original lesson plans and her reflection on lessons during the structured coaching sessions were driven solely by my questioning and my motivation to gain more information. Suzanne often thought her lessons went well and was usually very non-specific in addressing questions of how she felt about her lessons. Following several days of similar brief and stale descriptions of her lessons, I detected a significant
disconnect in ABL content provided during training and Suzanne’s facilitation of the content. The novel experiences Suzanne gained through participating in the study offered an extraordinary amount of reference points on which to draw meaning. I did not expect to explain or interpret every interaction between Suzanne and I or Suzanne and her students. I have, much like I expected of Suzanne, attempted to make meaning of what I directly observed and collected from Suzanne in her new pursuit to effectively facilitate ABL in her PE classes as presented in this chapter.

The enduring nature of the irreversibility of transformation (Bennetts, 2003) offers insight into the transformation of meaning schemes, where participants retain their larger world view (frame of reference), but their “immediate beliefs or expectations” (meaning schemes) may continue to change (Baumgartner, 2002). For Suzanne, this was most present in her acceptance of new information, a new perspective, and sharing of ideas (i.e. content, curriculum, and approach to teaching) that she immediately found value in for her students at ITMS. Suzanne’s immediate beliefs or expectations continued to change through our interactions during the coaching sessions and informal conversations. These continuous and immediate efforts promote a modified world-view (Baumgartner, 2002); in this case a larger view of education, physical education, and her students’ needs.

Suzanne accepted ABL as new and useful information for her PE program but her application of the accepted ABL information was lackluster. Her acceptance of ABL appeared more like playing along and following the plan I outlined in the study. Based on my direct observations throughout the study, I felt she did not prepare for the ABL lessons beyond our interactions. Suzanne put in the time and met my requirements for the
study. However, her consideration of ABL at ITMS was driven solely by the specific research procedures I established. Suzanne was held accountable by participating in research procedures, specifically coaching sessions and semi-structured interviews. However, these research procedures needed to hold Suzanne more accountable relative to investing in teaching ABL rather than just engaging with the study.

Carolyn

Findings relative to meaning schemes emerged in the areas of (a) intentional ABL outcomes and (b) using the debrief. Conversations between Carolyn and me during training often went back to the purpose of each activity within a lesson that supports specific student outcomes. On paper, these outcomes were the demonstration of effective communication and cooperation skills as well as decision making, trust, and problem solving skills later in the unit. The organizational structure of using the debrief in the ABL lessons was important for Carolyn largely due to her limited effectiveness in executing the basic functions of a debrief. She only allowed sufficient time for an effective debrief in a three of the 20 observed lessons; of those three she failed to meet my expectations of conducting a debrief as shared in training and reinforced during coaching sessions. Carolyn did not have a strong understanding of the debrief as an organizational structure. Meaning schemes, identified as specific demonstrated behaviors, were not fully present from Carolyn in the debrief.

The intentional ABL outcomes were developed in advance of the unit but created specifically for the ITMS context. The ABL unit themes and outcomes from the unit aligned with recommendations from Frank (2004) relative to sequence and flow as well maintaining high student expectations. Supported by Frank, lesson plans in the unit
included multiple activities to adequately address a particular theme (e.g. cooperation) or themes that may overlap (e.g. cooperation and communication). Other considerations made included giving appropriate attention to groups, expecting to modify original plans, and making the necessary decisions in the moment as needed. The ABL training emphasized both participants’ communication of daily and unit outcomes to their students; specifically, sharing their hope to observe students engage in a series of activities that showcase their successful demonstration of the daily themes (e.g. honesty, communication, role playing, active listening, etc.). Visible themes in these lessons, such as communication, establishing full value norms, cooperation, trust, and problem solving were more tangible for Carolyn once the unit began because the activities put students in scenarios where demonstrations of communication and cooperation were expected. Further, expectations for students in the unit were shared in advance and became more realistic during the unit because Carolyn did not have adequate experience as a participant in the activities she was leading to her students.

Despite the planned, deliberate sequence of activities designed to foster specific daily outcomes, I did not observe the expected outcomes from the ABL unit in Carolyn’s lessons. Overall, her facilitations did not align with the recommendations covered during in training for effective ABL lessons. Carolyn was ineffective in managing her classes and delivering a comprehensive ABL lesson. Rather than ignoring some inappropriate student outbursts, she addressed most of these interruptions and subsequently lost several minutes in each lesson. Her most common facilitation errors included not providing appropriate extensions or refinements in activities, spending too little time in an activity, and leading minimal debrief sessions that only gained surface student feedback. Effective
ABL facilitation, as a meaning scheme for Carolyn, was not fully present and substantially flawed.

The use of a debrief in every PE lesson was new and served as an organizational structure for Carolyn to make meaning. I immediately presented the debrief as being as important as any other function in an ABL lesson and allocated time during ABL training accordingly. As a function of the basic ABL structure, the debrief was identified by me as the most challenging during ABL facilitation and required the most preparation.

Conducting an effective debrief was a main emphasis in training through the review of materials, discussion, video review, and checks for understanding. In addition, current research with novice facilitators (Sutherland et al., 2009; Sutherland et al., 2011) was shared to illuminate potential barriers, but also to stress the importance of the debrief. Each of Carolyn’s observed facilitations had flaws in the debrief. As a result, every coaching session between facilitations addressed conducting more effective debriefs. As the unit progressed, Carolyn responded to some of the feedback provided her debriefs, particularly in terms of gaining more student perspective and allowing more time at the end of a lesson to conduct an effective debrief. Although not representative of a full, meaningful student-centered debrief, Carolyn’s, best debrief sessions were those that gained most or all student perspectives with 1-2 follow-up questions related to the general themes shared by the students.

A constant in Carolyn’s daily debriefs was the use of a standing circle formation to gain initial student perspectives. She was comfortable with her students in this formation. She saw the benefit of conducting her debriefs in this formation to best position the group for perspective sharing and aligned with the recommendations shared
during training and instructional resources. Adventure experts identified the circle formation as the best position (Stanchfield, 2007) and best opportunity (Frank, 2004) for a group to share.

Carolyn used the debrief in most lessons but it was not effective in providing an opportunity for her students to learn from their experiences. She saw the purpose of engaging in a debrief, but did not deliver these according to my expectations. She used the debrief to gain some perspective on the lesson and identified the themes of the activities, but little was achieved beyond this. Her meaning scheme could include vivid accounts of initiating the conversation to limited student engagement followed by asking a redirecting question with even fewer student responses. Her attempts at a debrief suffered largely because insufficient time was given at the end of most of her lessons. Carolyn’s consistent misappropriation of time suggests some discomfort leading debriefs in this unit; maybe Carolyn intentionally left little time at the end for debriefing because she did not feel comfortable or skilled to lead this component in an ABL lesson. Of the 17 debriefs I observed from Carolyn, each lacked at least one element of the ELC, with the *Now What* as the consistent void. She was capable of gaining some student perspective and generalizing these perspectives to be more representative of the group but failed to offer the forum to apply the themes shared to larger class concepts that transcend a specific lesson. Carolyn’s meaning scheme, organized as a novice facilitator of a 10-day ABL instructional unit in her PE classes, was utilized with reservations hailing primarily from lesson preparation, content development (e.g. activity extensions and refinements), and delivering an effective debrief.
Cross Case Analysis

There are two common areas that will be discussed in the cross case analysis: (a) daily debriefs and (b) time and trust in training. These themes best represent Suzanne’s and Carolyn’s use of meaning schemes in their day-to-day teaching.

**Daily Debriefs**

A shared meaning scheme used by Suzanne and Carolyn was leading daily debriefs in each ABL lesson. Leading a daily debrief was an expectation of the study. Suzanne and Carolyn saw value in gaining students perspectives through the debrief but not in the full debrief. The purpose of the debrief is to enhance the experience that an individual just engaged in (Frank, 2004). Debriefing allows an appropriate time for students to share their different experiences with peers in an emotionally safe environment of the classroom community. An obvious display of new knowledge for both Suzanne and Carolyn occurred through the direct experience of leading a debrief, was continuously shaped during subsequent coaching sessions, and further discussed during our informal conversations. Suzanne and Carolyn’s use of a daily debrief indicated an initial level of competence and a pursuit toward transformation (Pugh, 2002). Each used the debrief on most days and made an attempt to follow the initial structure I had recommended during the ABL training and reinforced throughout the study. The deficiencies in leading a debrief were multi-layered and included preparation and lack of direct experience as an ABL facilitator.

Leading effective debriefs includes developing and utilizing appropriate questions (Sutherland et al., 2009; Estes, 2004), maintaining flow in a conversation (Frank, 2004), generalizing group comments (Kolb, 1984), and encouraging student-generated
conclusions (Brown, 2006; Stanchfield, 2007). The daily debrief was different than any type of processing or closure previously used in Suzanne’s or Carolyn’s classes. During the ABL unit, at the end of each lesson, students would finish their second or third activity then sit down in a circle formation to talk about their experiences. The pace was slow and questions asked were pulled from the original lesson plans or generated off the cuff by Suzanne or Carolyn. Unfortunately, the daily debriefs from Suzanne and Carolyn appeared to hold little value or transfer among their students. Each debrief segment in both participants’ lessons were brief and did not appropriately identify or address students’ interactions and the implications of these interactions. Transfer is the most difficult part of conducting a debrief (Gass, 1980) and is better accomplished by ensuring the Now What part of the ELC is fully addressed. Suzanne and Carolyn’s students achieved nothing more than gaining initial perspective of their experiences. For individuals to undergo transformative experiences, the experience must allow them to see aspects of the world in a new way, and personally value this way of seeing (Pugh, 2002). For Suzanne and Carolyn, their direct facilitation and debriefing experiences with students allowed them to see ABL facilitation differently than other units at ITMS. However, there was no evidence to support this way of seeing as being transformative. In fact, my direct observations of 36 debriefs would suggest they do not value it as being as important as any other ABL lesson function.

Suzanne and Carolyn expressed value in the debrief but did not possess the CK and PCK necessary to lead a complete debrief, limiting the depth of any debrief in the ABL unit. Further, there was no additional, independent planning and preparation from either participant beyond my requirements of them in training. Effort and motivation was
a barrier as much as requisite knowledge. Both Suzanne and Carolyn were comfortable in their ABL facilitations and felt their students’ demonstration of effective communication and cooperation in ABL lessons was a valid indicator of effective ABL lessons instead of the expectations for effective ABL instruction shared in training. An assumption in the study and in ABL content was the difficulty for novice and experienced facilitators to lead a complete debrief session. Neither Suzanne or Carolyn had the opportunity to engage in sufficient practice (e.g. direct facilitation with students before their unit) prior to implementing the unit. This lack of practical application prior to their facilitation with students was a barrier to Suzanne and Carolyn’s overall understanding of ABL content and pedagogies, more specifically the debrief process.

Suzanne and Carolyn’s debriefs always lacked a key component, such as (a) an element of the ELC, (b) timely questions, or (c) an appropriate pace for optimal student processing. The Now What was never effectively addressed in either participants’ debriefs. Both struggled with using the processing questions provided on the lesson plans as well as their own questions due to an overall ineffectiveness and discomfort leading longer and more meaningful debriefs. When the pace of Suzanne and Carolyn’s lessons were too fast, they didn’t allow sufficient time to engage in a full debrief; when lessons were moving too slowly students appeared bored because a theme or activity within the theme was exhausted. The organizational structures (i.e. meaning schemes) developed by Suzanne and Carolyn were expected to be different and often dependent upon the meaning making and interactions of the learner. In this section, meaning schemes are identified that emerged largely as a function of the procedures developed in the study.
including: facilitating a new content and new unit, learning ABL content for the first time, and facilitating a daily debrief in your ABL lessons.

**Time and Trust in Training**

Suzanne and Carolyn put in the required time for the ABL training prior to their initial facilitation of the unit in their PE classes. Both presumably trusted me to adequately prepare them to be effective facilitators. It was these trustful relationships that allowed us to have questioning discussions, share information openly, and achieve mutual understanding of expectations for each ABL lesson (Eisen, 2001). Time in training included coaching sessions, semi-structured interviews, and informal conversations established for necessary preparation. Each procedure served to gain new knowledge and pedagogies for effective ABL facilitation. Training, as a meaning scheme, should not undervalue formative coaching sessions in-between my direct observations of both participants’ first ABL lesson each day. These sessions helped to inform Suzanne and Carolyn’s subsequent lessons that day as well as previewing the next days’ lesson. The majority of the time during the coaching sessions was spent on providing large-scale feedback such as reminders of effective ABL pedagogies, strategies for transitions in activities, and initiating and maintaining an effective debrief.

Suzanne and Carolyn’s initial trust, or even agreement to welcome the ABL unit was a pivotal step in making meaning. Their trust and agreement allowed for the study to take place. Meaning was made through direct experience, such as their review and discussion of ABL materials, facilitation of the materials, and review and discussion of those facilitations. Suzanne and Carolyn’s direct experiences provided a useful format for
their engagement and attention to the importance of effectively utilizing ABL pedagogies and demonstrating recommended facilitation skills as outlined in our training sessions.

Acceptance of my recommendations during ABL training for facilitating the new ABL unit was a shift or transformation for both Suzanne and Carolyn. Panicucci et al. (2002) and Stanchfield (2007) appropriately outline sections in their texts as *Final Tips for Teachers* and *Aspects of Effective Facilitation*, respectively that were highlighted in our training sessions. Panicucci et al., provided quick reminders for practitioners to include tips that emerged as the most relevant for Suzanne and Carolyn, such as (a) appearing spontaneous, (b) having more prepared than you expect to use, and (c) be flexible (p.13). Stanchfield views the primary content of ABL as the *art of facilitation* and her recommendations of (a) welcome the unexpected, (b) keep a positive attitude, and (c) be creative (p.70) were the most applicable for Suzanne and Carolyn. Each of the recommendations was new knowledge for Suzanne and Carolyn relative to ABL.

Both participants approached the coaching sessions differently. Suzanne regularly provided a rationale for each decision she made with little prompting from me on the specific lesson components. In contrast, Carolyn took on the role of a passive learner and wanted my feedback and my perspective (or even approval) of each ABL lesson. The coaching sessions, as well as the semi-structured interviews, provided the necessary formats to specifically address deficiencies in each participant’s lessons and gain some clarity on these observations. Many of these issues revolved around the lack of planning for instruction beyond Suzanne and Carolyn’s time in training and other research procedures. As such, their transformation to more effective ABL facilitators was inhibited by a lack of effort and limits in critical reflection.
Training, coaching sessions, and interviews were developed to operate as forums for critical reflection, the most common contributor to transformation (Mezirow, 1991; Taylor, 1998). Initial training, along with the coaching sessions and interviews, was conducted in a one-on-one format with myself and each participant. Critical reflection on experience and engaging in dialogue with others is a central tenet of transformation and operated in the study as those interactions between Suzanne, Carolyn, and I during initial training, coaching sessions, semi-structured interviews, as well as their ABL facilitations. Some of these interactions, particularly in training and coaching sessions, were intended to occur together with Suzanne, Carolyn, and me to share information from earlier facilitations and develop strategies for future improvements. Instead, training and coaching sessions required one-on-one interactions between me and the participants and detracted from the fostering of transformation associated with collaboration and communication among participants (Mezirow, 1997; Taylor, 2007).

Suzanne and Carolyn did not spend the necessary amount of time understanding or preparing to teach the ABL lessons. Specifically, neither teacher knew the content of facilitation techniques in sufficient detail to implement a successful unit. I didn’t expect, mandate or communicate an expectation to prepare beyond our training and therefore might be remiss in expecting such planning without explicitly stating such an expectation. However, a mistaken assumption on my part was that both Suzanne and Carolyn would spend time preparing to teach the ABL unit. In addition, a further issue that both teachers faces was their struggle with basic pedagogical skills that transfer across all physical education contexts, such as (a) a good introduction and closure, (b) arranging students for activity, and (c) gathering and dispersing students.
The use of meaning schemes (i.e. new information shared with participants and their students) could be categorized as an effort by me and the new content to change Suzanne’s and Carolyn’s minds as to what is appropriate content for their PE program. This notion became clearer when ABL facilitation began. I concluded that Suzanne and Carolyn each made a conscious decision in terms of how much effort would be spent reviewing lesson plans and preparing to facilitate effective ABL lessons. I was fully aware that I took much of their free time during the instructional unit through reviewing materials, checking for their understanding of the materials, seeking their perspective on ABL, and providing them with ongoing feedback. In hindsight, future training efforts under similar conditions should consider better framing ABL as a content area and instructional unit in physical education, as well as an approach to teaching that transcends a single unit or subject area. Training of teachers for initial ABL facilitation with students should better address the meaning of an approach to teaching informed by related ABL literature (Sutherland et al., 2011; Sutherland et al., 2009; Cosgriff, 2000). In particular, the training should illuminate the distinct differences of ABL to other instructional models in physical education and delineate (a) central themes, (b) student engagement patterns, (c) range of facilitator roles, and (d) assessing students.

Each participant trusted that training was sufficient for effective ABL facilitation in their PE classes. This assumption was wrong and misguided. The time Suzanne and Carolyn spent in training was driven by my demands for their time. All of the questions asked during our informal conversations, coaching sessions, and interviews were ones I considered pertinent for their acquisition and application of the ABL pedagogies. However, there was no evidence to make me believe that Suzanne or Carolyn reflected
on the ABL lessons without my involvement in training or coaching sessions. If not for my demands of face-to-face, detailed training that covered ABL foundations, lesson reviews, and formative checks for understanding, I believe both would have taken the ABL content packet and marginally attempted to implement the lesson plan.

**Inhibitors to Transformation**

*Planning for Instruction.* From the beginning of the study, Suzanne’s and Carolyn’s meaning making from experiences facilitating the lessons was limited by their efforts to engage in critical reflection. Therefore, planning and preparation for future lessons was compromised. I recognized the often non-linear nature of reflection; however, the participants’ behaviors in the study suggested a minimalist approach to planning for instruction. Without my involvement, I had no confidence in Suzanne’s or Carolyn’s efforts to engage in reflective processes such as those conducted in this study. I sensed during training that Suzanne and Carolyn only wanted materials to review independently and make sense of before their unit facilitation. My recommendations for an effective unit as first time facilitators included to (a) rehearse portions of their lesson, (b) visualize transitions from one activity to another, and (c) consider the possibilities of topics and questions asked for an effective, meaningful debrief session. However, it was clear from my observations of their teaching that this did not occur.

*Accountability.* Suzanne and Carolyn participated in training as expected. My evaluation of the effectiveness of this training lacked the necessary rigor. Both completed open-ended surveys during training and answered questions to show their understanding of the ABL content. Any difficult questions or unclear themes were discussed verbally before moving on to other topics. Suzanne and Carolyn’s limited training was evident
when observing early ABL lessons as they were not adequately prepared to facilitate effective ABL lessons. When they facilitated a poor lesson, the various reasons for ineffectiveness were discussed during our informal conversations and coaching sessions. My interpretation of their ineffectiveness was immature and ineffective CK and PCK in ABL. Specifically, Suzanne and Carolyn were unable to facilitate a complete, effective lesson. Both were deficient in executing task extensions, providing timely debriefing questions, and maintaining the integrity of the ELC in each lesson. I shared similar feedback with both participants in almost every coaching session. I determined Suzanne and Carolyn became numb or oblivious to the feedback because they were unable or unwilling to make the changes I recommended. Physical education teachers operate in a system that does not hold them accountable in the ways that other teachers are held accountable. I determined they were unable or unwilling to make changes because they didn’t possess the skills and pedagogies to make the changes, nor did they care to spend the time to learn the necessary skills to make the changes. These teachers were consistently deficient as ABL facilitators, and at times appeared to knowingly lead minimal debriefs. The debriefs led by Suzanne and Carolyn could have better addressed all components of the ELC (Kolb, 1984), such as effectively gaining student perspectives, generalizing group themes, and applying newly learned information to other contexts.

Limited direct experience as ABL participants. Suzanne and Carolyn had limited experiences as participants in the activities that they were leading during the ABL unit. Suzanne and Carolyn were assessed in training through their general understanding of ABL unit outcomes, lesson themes, and specific activities selected to address themes and achieve outcomes. However, there was some disconnect in Suzanne's and Carolyn's
experiences as participants before leading experiential-based activities. Experience, both as a participant and facilitator, should not be compromised (Kolb, 1984). Training should offer opportunities for novice ABL facilitators that are novice to ABL activities to engage in authentic adventure experiences. In this study, training operated as more of a sharing of information between me and the participants. Future efforts in training would provide participants with direct experience in ABL activities, direct facilitation experiences with students, supported by a collaborative training format led by an expert facilitator.

**Summary**

Meaning schemes are organizational structures formed by the learner. These were identified to make better sense of Suzanne’s and Carolyn’s ABL facilitation. Meaning schemes were illuminated through critical reflection (Taylor, 1998). In this section I both (a) identified the organization of meaning schemes that emerged in the data from Suzanne and Carolyn and (b) built in critical reflection in the procedures of the study. Suzanne and Carolyn utilized meaning schemes related primarily to their ABL training and regular use of a debrief in each ABL lesson.

This study and specifically my use of this research question, assumed both Suzanne and Carolyn were ready for more meaning. Similar to finding one’s *edge of meaning*, more meaning can be made when learners can come to terms with limitations of our knowing and begin to stretch those limits (Berger, 2004). In this study, I did not consider the participants as being at an edge of meaning. Instead, ABL offered an opportunity, or another road to take in the name of quality PE programming for their context.
Summary of the Findings (Frame of Reference)

Research Question 3: In what ways do physical education teachers transform meaning schemes and meaning perspectives during a critical self-review of teaching?

The focus of this question was to describe the transformation of Suzanne’s and Carolyn’s frame of reference, defined as the structure of assumptions through which we understand our experiences (Mezirow, 1997). My rationale for this research question was to operate critical reflection as well as describe and explain the transformation of both participant’s frames of reference through ABL training, data collection methods, and the ABL unit facilitation. Findings common to both participants was (a) the demonstration of new pedagogies over the 10-day instructional unit and (b) leading ineffective debriefs. These pedagogies were promoted throughout the study and acknowledged formatively during the ABL training, coaching sessions and interviews. Ineffective debriefs were largely the result of poor planning and preparation for instruction, inadequate training, and the participants’ lack of ABL content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge.

Suzanne

Suzanne’s frame of reference was transformed in the following ways: (a) an awareness of student behaviors, and (b) preparation for effective facilitation. Her awareness of student behaviors and interactions during the ABL lessons was due in part by content that promoted more student engagement and demonstration of specific behaviors. These intentions for student behaviors were shared in advance of the ABL unit. By the end of the unit, Suzanne recognized the importance of and time needed for effective ABL facilitation. Further, she understood the necessary detail in lesson plans as
well as the range of materials considered for use in training. Ideally, these realizations would have occurred before the ABL unit or shortly into the early days of Suzanne’s facilitation.

Students’ direct experiences were emphasized in the ABL training as a pivotal forum for use later in the same lesson or later in the unit, during subsequent debrief sessions for better student understanding. During initial contact with Suzanne before the study, I explained how students would demonstrate personal and social skills in her PE classes, and how she could help facilitate these interactions. Suzanne’s awareness of student behaviors in her lessons was driven by the ABL content that put students in deliberate situations which offered them opportunities to showcase personal and social skills. In short, Suzanne now had access to content that was appropriate and well planned for delivery in a context like ITMS. Multiple forms of critical reflection (e.g. coaching sessions, informal conversations, interviews) were in place during this study to help clarify Suzanne's understanding of ABL.

In support of the multiple forms of critical reflection, Cohen (2004) emphasized the use of various mediums when promoting transformative learning. Once the ABL unit began, Suzanne’s critical reflection was driven by my involvement during daily coaching sessions and informal conversations that asked questions related to her rationale and decisions made during the ABL lessons. Further, if any issues were not addressed in these sessions I would add them as talking points during one of the three semi-structured interviews that occurred within the unit. Using multiple mediums for critical reflection offered more opportunities for the participants to contribute their own voice and make sense of their educational experience as a more tangible product (Cohen, 2004). Suzanne
and Carolyn’s meaning making was enhanced through the critical reflection process. Suzanne was aware of student behaviors in her ABL lessons but her awareness was not entirely accurate. She thought students were always on task in her lessons when they were, in fact, often off task due to Suzanne’s own management deficiencies. Before the ABL unit, the students were off task because the content of the lesson was unclear or inappropriate. Suzanne shared early in the unit that the positive student interactions in ABL were because the content was new for her students. Suzanne’s interpretation of the positive student reactions is supported by Brown (2006), who shared that facilitators profit from the novel, surprising, and more engaging interactions where ABL is new content for students.

I believed that students were more on task in the ABL unit than Suzanne’s other PE classes because the content was new and more appropriate than what is normally delivered. When students were on task, Suzanne was able to observe positive and appropriate student interactions. Suzanne’s instances of positive facilitation experiences were based mostly on having appropriate content in her classes. The content was not always delivered effectively but it was covered daily. The ABL content packet was the most detailed and thorough arrangement of content that Suzanne had used in her PE classes. At the very end of the unit in our final interview, she came to terms with the importance of a strong ABL foundation and having comfort in leading ABL lessons. Suzanne’s frame of reference was more inclusive to the preparation necessary for effective ABL facilitation in the unit. This emerged later in the unit when students were participating in activities that required less of her direct and verbal involvement. This allowed her to take a step back and spend more time watching the students interact.
addition, a lack of preparation and experience was more obvious in Suzanne’s debrief sessions at this stage of the unit. For example, in *Turning Over a New Leaf*, Suzanne assumed the role of a consultant for the students; this role allowed her to observe more positive student behaviors. However, during the debrief session Suzanne did not facilitate the group in a fashion that addressed their positive experiences in the activity, such as active listening, taking turns, and self-control. Thus, although she observed the positive student behaviors, she did not provide an opportunity for the students to recognize and learn from these behaviors, or to transfer this learning beyond the gymnasium to other areas of their lives. In her last few days in the unit, Suzanne realized that she had more to talk about in the debrief because she observed valuable interactions in her classes; unfortunately, she did not possess the necessary skills to lead more meaningful debriefs, such as facilitating a class’ processing of experiences appropriately using all stages of the ELC.

Lack of preparation was most obvious and relevant in the study during the debrief sessions. Overall, Suzanne’s debriefs were not effective. A more fully developed frame of reference for Suzanne included agreement later in the unit of the importance of having relevant questions prepared before the start of a debrief session. In the event that questions were not able to be generated in the moment, she would have these for her use. Suzanne’s agreement on the need for more detailed debrief planning came only after her own direct experiences and struggles in these sessions. Her direct experience facilitating debrief sessions confirms previous work done with pre-service teachers (Sutherland et al., 2009; Sutherland et al., 2011) on the necessary steps in preparing novice facilitators to
conduct meaningful debrief sessions in ABL lesson, including the selection of a debrief strategy and preparation of probable questions for use given the lesson theme.

**Carolyn**

Carolyn presented a more developed frame of reference in the following ways: (a) more instructional materials were added to her teaching repertoire, and (b) holding higher expectations in her PE classes. She was accepting of the ABL packet and demonstrated engagement with the materials during training. Carolyn also applied information shared and developed during the critical reflection process to improve her facilitation. Her higher expectations in ABL classes were driven by new, detailed content provided in the lesson plans. Carolyn shared daily expectations with her students that were validated by the new content.

Carolyn’s frame of reference was inclusive to information supporting a more mature teaching repertoire. It was developed through a willingness to participate in all functions of the study. She initially agreed to participate in the study because she wanted more information on ABL to use in her classes. Based on our initial contact Carolyn saw a fit for ABL in her PE classes. Once the unit began Carolyn recognized the different types of interactions affiliated with the activities. Specifically, more opportunities were present for students to communicate with one another (e.g. Marketplace Relay), take on different roles in activities (e.g. Cardio Rocks), and share their perspectives to help others complete a task (e.g. Turning Over a New Leaf). Carolyn acknowledged the value in being able to present these types of interactions regularly in her PE classes.

Carolyn’s frame of reference now included holding higher expectations in her PE classes. Further, each lesson provided the standard ABL structure and reminders on the
daily purpose and how students would achieve daily outcomes. She had appropriate content through which to hold them accountable. The ABL content packet provided more than enough activities and backup materials for a comprehensive, 10-day instructional unit. The detail in lesson materials offered an environment driven by the planned content but open for individualism, similar to recommendations for facilitators to appear spontaneous while being completely prepared (Panicucci et al., 2002; Stanchfield, 2007). In activities where Carolyn knew the instructions clearly, she spent more time directly observing students in successful, positive interactions. This aligns with Metzler’s notion that being prepared trumps being planned (Metzler, 2011).

**Cross Case Analysis**

Two common areas will be discussed in the cross case analysis: (a) use of pedagogies, and (b) daily, incomplete debriefs. Suzanne and Carolyn learned through their direct experience in this study. As first time facilitators, I did not assume that they would adequately reflect on their own ABL lessons to inform their future facilitations. Under these conditions, I fostered critical reflection through the employment of multiple checkpoints of data collection. These checkpoints provided the best indicators of meaning making for Suzanne and Carolyn during their ABL facilitation.

**Use of Pedagogies**

A more inclusive frame of reference was present in Suzanne and Carolyn’s use of new pedagogies during ABL facilitation. Both accepted these pedagogies as appropriate for ABL and teaching physical education. These were demonstrated daily, including the use of the basic ABL structure (brief, activity, debrief), following instructions on daily lesson plans, effective verbal communication of activity rules, and conducting a debrief.
The daily demonstration of these pedagogies align primarily with Panicucci et al. (2002) and her tips for teachers as well as Stanch field’s (2007) recommendations for being an effective facilitator while still allowing your own style to be present.

I considered both Suzanne and Carolyn’s use of the ABL structure (despite their facilitation deficiencies) to be transformative. Rather than considering their act as “just following my instructions”, both were trained on the foundations of ABL and affiliated themes that operate within activities in a physical education environment. Each was able to communicate instructions for activities and deliver a structured ABL lesson. My feedback to both participants during the informal conversations and coaching sessions aligned with their consistent deficiencies.

Each participant shared their perception of being more in tune with student behaviors during the ABL unit. Suzanne and Carolyn observed a range of student interactions that provided vignettes of direct student experiences that could have been used for meaningful debriefs. Suzanne and Carolyn were trained on what behaviors to look for during the ABL unit and were reminded continuously on the types of student engagement patterns in the unit. Daily coaching sessions dissected specific learning activities and instructional decisions and provided recommendations for their second half of facilitation on that day, as well as informing their facilitation for the next morning’s classes.

**Ineffective Debriefs**

Suzanne’s and Carolyn’s frame of reference was more informed by recent experiences to facilitate daily debriefs. The debrief as a function of ABL and an ABL lesson was new to both participants before the study. Suzanne and Carolyn conducted
daily debriefs in their ABL lessons and had unique differences in their ineffective delivery of a daily debrief. Suzanne was better at using questions off the cuff while Carolyn had a strong view of ABL as a foundation for her classes, providing positive reference points of demonstrated skills that may transfer to the next unit, the rest of the school year, etc. Debrief formats ranged from the rigid pursuit of the ELC (Kolb, 1984) to more of an open discussion; the most commonly used debrief technique (Panicucci et al., 2002). Early in the unit, Suzanne would cut off activities or would decide against fitting in another activity in order not to compromise the debrief time. At times Suzanne maintained longer debriefs; however, in this time she was allowing off-task student behaviors, thus the actual content of the debrief was lacking depth and wholly ineffective. Her ineffective debriefs were the result of inadequate planning. The longer but disengaging debriefs from Suzanne included a series of made up questions and little student response.

During the ABL training, time was spent emphasizing the importance of the debrief, explaining the necessity of allocation adequate time for the debrief during the lesson, and following the ELC in its entirety. Despite these measures, it seems as though this part of the training did not meet the needs of the participants as evidenced by the quality of the debriefs conducted by both Suzanne and Carolyn during the unit. Training did not meet the needs of participants because the debrief was consistently ineffective and incomplete. In many lessons Suzanne and Carolyn (a) did not know how to advance the conversation of the debrief, (b) did not fully understand the ELC, or (c) did not comprehend the function of an initial debrief strategy and the range of initial strategies dependent upon the timing in the unit and the comfort of your groups. In essence both
Suzanne and Carolyn followed the instructions of initiating the debrief and knew what to do, but did not know exactly why they were leading students through these steps. Not until after the fact (i.e. after a facilitated lesson, after a theme in the unit, after the entire unit) did both participants better understand the function of the debrief. Despite the continuous attention in training and during the unit to leading effective debriefs, an element of direct experiences with students seemed to provide the most powerful imprint on their frame of reference as ABL facilitators.

**Inhibitors to Transformation**

*Planning.* Suzanne and Carolyn each lacked detail in their daily lesson facilitations. Both modified activities for their own benefit rather than to make the lessons more meaningful for their students. Their lack of planning resulted in more generic versions of lessons that were meant to be surprising and engaging. I expected both participants to have better knowledge of each lesson based on the detail I provided on lessons plans. I also expected the participants to rehearse their facilitations or prepare their instructions before their first lesson each day. Suzanne and Carolyn simplified the ABL lessons that diluted their students’ experiences in a new instructional unit. Future efforts in planning should include ensuring participants’ competencies of content knowledge; ABL training should require lesson *walk-throughs* prior to facilitating with their students that include each ABL lesson component in the rehearsal.

*Critical Reflection.* Three formats were considered as critical reflection in the study; coaching sessions, informal conversations, and semi-structured interviews. Each format was purposefully offered throughout the study/ unit, including our daily interactions. Unfortunately, the critical reflection was offered within the artificial time frames of a 10-
day unit as well as a daily school schedule. These time restrictions placed limits on the depth and detail of discussions during the critical reflection times. Further, these interactions may not have appropriated the necessary amount of time to remedy a flaw in facilitation or adequately address observed issues from participants in their lessons. Lastly, critical reflection was compromised based on the types of interactions in the critical reflection format in this study, particularly my role as researcher and Suzanne’s and Carolyn’s role as participants. I asked most of the questions or provided the prompt for reflection. Future efforts to enhance critical reflection among participants should include the development of common planning time, scheduled meeting time and space, and the combination of pre-planned questions and open sharing of teachers’ perspectives of ABL lessons.

*Direct Facilitation Experience.* Suzanne and Carolyn had not been exposed to examples of expert ABL facilitation. Their limited experience and incomplete grasp of effective facilitation contributed to their lack of comfort at times in the ABL unit. Both felt that their own direct experiences in the ABL would greatly benefit instruction in another, future ABL unit. Suzanne and Carolyn each recognized the purpose behind the ABL structure, the debrief structure, and ABL’s potential in their classes while also defending their newness to the content and pedagogies.

*Summary*

Suzanne and Carolyn both transformed their frames of reference in two common areas: (a) use of pedagogies and (b) daily, incomplete debriefs. Each area was supported by the study procedures and data collection methods that I identified as critical reflection. Suzanne and Carolyn’s roles in the study provided unique, related experiences in the
acquisition and application of a new content area considered highly useful for their professional contexts. Suzanne’s and Carolyn’s frames of reference were transformed by experience that was fostered by critical reflection embedded into their daily teaching schedules at ITMS.

**Strengths, Limitations, Reflexivity**

In this section I discuss the use of the methods that benefited the execution of the study related to transformative learning, the research questions, and ABL. The theoretical frame was used as a lens to view significant moments throughout the study, including times of critical reflection, benchmarks of growth and achievement as adult learners, and effective facilitators of ABL instruction. The limitations with the methods of the study, as well as a description on the how methods influenced the interpretation of the study are also addressed.

**Strengths**

This study provided an in-depth look at learning to deliver a student-centered pedagogy with in-service teachers. It extended previous research with pre-service teachers in peer teaching and clinical contexts (Sutherland et al., 2009). Suzanne and Carolyn volunteered to participate in the study. I considered their agreement to participate as having a personal sense of readiness for the content and the affiliated procedures of the study. Taylor (2007) discusses the ability to determine student readiness for transformation, specifically addressing pedagogical entry points. I considered both Suzanne and Carolyn to be *ready* for transformation and this study during my recruitment of them as participants. Initial, brief contact between me and the participants before the study concluded that both were accepting of new ideas and content
that could be shared with their students and could improve their PE program and individual instruction. Berger (2004) discussed the role of helping participants find their “edge of meaning”. I felt it was a function of my overall responsibility to help them find their edge of meaning. This notion identified by Berger was initially difficult to grasp in the context of ITMS with Suzanne and Carolyn but became clearer during their unit facilitation. Procedures (in training and daily interactions with me) were provided to help participants discover the necessary detail in planning and delivering good content. This new discovery of detail may be done more deliberately to ensure more effectiveness. Taylor (2007) provided a reminder that fostering transformative learning is more than implementation of a series of instructional strategies; it includes a keen awareness of student attitudes and preferences. It also means developing a sense of trust in the process of transformative learning, allowing for students to live with some discomfort while on the edge of knowing, in the process of gaining new insights and understandings.

The study benefited from prolonged engagement (i.e. continuous, daily face-to-face interactions) in the research setting for the entire range of the research timeline. Developing and maintaining a positive relationship and consistent presence in the research site allowed for ongoing review and refinement of research methods, and talking points during coaching sessions and conversations. The amount of direct contact and number of face-to-face interactions between the participants and I contributed to a more efficient recognition of agreed upon facilitator behaviors and effective facilitation. Further, it was important to consider the differences in the types of reflection and reflexivity presented in the study. This study had a high frequency of direct contact in a short period of time (i.e. four weeks), resulting in long, but productive days. A longer
duration would likely have supported more detailed and thorough reflection, thus garnering additional or deeper data.

The participants were taken through procedures in training, facilitation, and a variety of data collection methods to support both communicative and instrumental learning (Garvett, 2004). Communicative learning in itself is not adequate; instrumental learning, with specific steps and direction, is needed as well to ensure that students have the necessary skills to act on their new understanding (Garvett, 2004). The combination of both learning types, represented best by daily facilitation and coaching sessions, allowed for a focused pursuit of more effective instruction from participants.

Strengths of this study address some holes in the literature related to the study of ABL, such as training in-service (and novice) ABL facilitators, the utility of ABL in a school physical education program as an instructional unit with in-service teachers. Additionally, the methods of training teachers, directly observing lessons, and coaching teachers in between their classes provided a unique and beneficial addition to the literature in physical education teacher education (PETE) and the context of ITMS.

**Limitations**

The timeline and procedures of training and facilitating a 10-day ABL unit was a relatively short amount of time to implement and document change with teachers. Demands of in-service teachers and their expected time commitment were lofty and there was limited time between classes to discuss changes to their lesson facilitations and issues with training. Participants were identified as effective PE teachers prior to the study and were asked as part of a convenient and purposeful sample. The school context of ITMS was one where ABL was not part of the curriculum. The existing curriculum at
ITMS was directed by the large district for which it is a member, but the day-to-day operations appeared to be carried out based on the individual preferences of the teachers, supported by the limited equipment available on site. Any limitation related to the context (ITMS) was viewed more as an opportunity. A formal curriculum existed in physical education that was developed by the district but not effectively delivered at ITMS. There was minimal equipment for physical education and limited facilities for instruction.

The development of content knowledge in this study was completed through the review of lesson materials, formative checks for understanding, video review, agreement/disagreement of current assumptions, and the continue critique of facilitation in the moment. I developed content materials based on current assumptions for best practices for in-service teachers. Materials were similar to those used in beginning ABL undergraduate courses but modified in good faith for better fit for the ITMS context and provided a limited scope.

**Reflexivity**

I acknowledged biases leading up to, and those occurring in the study, including my position as a teacher, researcher, and educator in higher education. This study was my interpretation of two teachers’ journey as facilitators of ABL content as an instructional unit in their physical education program while using TLT as a lens to make sense of their experiences as novice facilitators with newly acquired ABL content. Significant time was dedicated to the importance of ABL as a content area in physical education and approach to teaching. I perceived the context, including school site and participants involved, to be useful in the further review of ABL in the natural environment of a P-12 physical education classroom. Both participants were identified because of their previous
performance as effective teachers within their district as well as their novice experience with ABL related content. The school and PE context seemed by all intents and purposes to be a good fit to conduct the study.

A central lesson learned from this study was the amount of time necessary for comprehensive, acceptable, and effective training in a content area. An emphasis was kept on not compromising the experiential learning nature of acquiring content knowledge and its presentation to students during an instructional unit.

**Methodological and Theoretical Lessons Learned**

Many of the lessons learned were informed by pre-unit ABL training. First, teacher training was presented as a 10-hour seminar, divided in five even segments that would occur before the start of the ABL unit. However, the variability in Suzanne and Carolyn’s schedule forced me to conduct mostly one-on-one training sessions at varied time segments with each participant. Training was intended to involve the sharing and development of effective content necessary for the context by way of formative checks for understanding (e.g. coaching sessions) and participant perspective sharing (e.g. semi-structured interviews). Instead, much of the time spent in coaching sessions was dedicated to correcting recently observed practices and providing a rationale/ support for the feedback (i.e. sequencing, approaches of facilitation, etc.). Future efforts in training should include the framing of ABL content specifically as the (a) the art of facilitation (including debriefing) and (b) appropriate ABL activities. This research, while illuminating some deficiencies in effective ABL facilitation from two participants, supports the further development of training methods. Also recommended is better use of time in critical reflection. Most instances of critical reflection in the study rested on my
motives as the researcher. I drove the critical reflection agenda and it would not have occurred without me.

Transformative Learning Theory served as a useful lens to view the meaning making processes of adult learners. The theory informed data collection procedures and aided in the operation of critical reflection throughout the study. It offered a strong foundation to support the differences in each research questions, from the more global nature of exploring the ways in which (1) participants’ transformed, (2) their use of meaning schemes, and (3) transformation of a frame of reference.

**Implications**

Working with in-service teachers with intact classes can be messy and this study was no different. The content was unique, comprised of instructions from activities and the art of facilitation. Suzanne and Carolyn made an effort to gain knowledge and deliver lessons but their acquisition of content and delivery of ABL lessons occurred without rigor or adequate accountability. In conducting this research I have gained further insight on how the training needs to be modified to address some of the issues raised in implementing a new student centered pedagogy.

The training workshop should include experiences that simulate the experience of authentic facilitation with students. Micro-teaching episodes, where Suzanne and Carolyn could have facilitated mini-lessons to similarly aged students may have provided more useful reference points to develop a stronger knowledge base for ABL, and better understand the complex workings of ABL content as both (a) sequenced activities and (b) the art of facilitation. I believe it is necessary for ABL facilitators to first live the experiences of their students and understand the value of these experiences as they
(teachers) engage in the activities. This process can help teachers to experience a range of feelings and physical activities and understand the all-encompassing nature of ABL. Once teachers participate in such activities (or a similar form of activity) they will be better equipped to teach the same content. However, other forms of experiences, such as lesson analysis, case study review, or a group “walk through” are necessary to develop CK and PCK prior to the facilitation of ABL in their program. More time needs to be allocated for ABL training, particularly with participants that may identify as novice facilitators or novices to ABL altogether. Teacher training would ideally include real life examples of expert facilitators leading sessions for novice facilitators to view and analyze, as well as debriefing the debrief; in this exercise, an expert facilitator describes their recent facilitation to the group of ABL facilitator trainees. This exercise involves the expert discussing the numerous pedagogical decisions made during the facilitation and provides rationale for these decisions.

*P-12 Physical Educators.* This study was done in part to increase an awareness of ABL with current P-12 physical education teachers, share learning materials, and offer experiences for teachers to directly participate in the acquisition of appropriate ABL content. Implications for in-service physical education teachers include the importance of planning for instruction, and the necessary preparation for classes at the lesson and unit level. This study utilized new content presented in preliminary training in the form of a content packet. The participant’s use of this information for their upcoming facilitation indicated marginal planning and preparation for more important lesson functions, specifically the delivery of daily debrief sessions. This study encourages more attention
to developing requisite content knowledge and pedagogical content knowledge prior to initial ABL facilitation.

The difficulty of working with in-service teachers within a school context and with in-tact classes should not be overlooked. Empathy for the participants’ (i.e. in-service teachers) daily professional and personal schedules are necessary considerations. It may have been unreasonable to expect in-service teachers to engage in training during every free moment in their daily school schedule, and then expect them to apply the newly covered material to their PE classes and do so with proficiency. More thought should be considered relative to in-service teachers’ planning for instruction and developing appropriate knowledge to inform future instruction, with and without training.

PETE Professionals. This study intends to inform PETE professionals on the utility of ABL as a unit of instruction and curricular model in a current physical education program and as a valuable commodity within a new context (i.e. school; physical education program). The study provides more detail on training novice ABL facilitators, with particular attention to the art of facilitation (Stanchfield, 2007). The study illuminated effective and ineffective practices in teacher training prior to the participants’ facilitation for the first time. The study provides detail in the use of ABL as an instructional unit and approach to teaching. Recommendations include more specific framing of ABL, as it has been previously used in multiple formats. Making the distinction of ABL as (a) an approach to teaching, (b) instructional model, (c) PE content area or unit of instruction, or (d) school-wide perspective on teaching or student engagement.
Professional Development in Physical Education. The efficacy of implementation of ABL training and similar professional development workshops in physical education should consider factors outlined by Baranowski and Jago (2005). In particular, the following recommendations are important to consider; (a) the selection criteria, (b) ability of participants, (c) the extent in which participants were trained, (d) fidelity of the training to the original intervention design, and (d) preferences of participants for the program. Baranowski and Jago proposed that a deficit in any of the factors could impair the effective of the intervention.

Participants in this study were considered for their relative ability as physical educators in the context of the large school district. Their ability, other than an informal recommendation, was not determined prior to the study and could explain participants reverting back to common pedagogical strategies to survive lessons in a new content (e.g. ABL). The fidelity of the ABL training was compromised based on the incongruence of procedures in training to the training of pre-service teachers in a university course in ABL.

Barriers to effective delivery of an ABL instructional unit include the complexities of a new content area that required new teaching skills. Training did not assume prior participant knowledge but held standards that were not met nor appropriately measured and evaluated. As Baranowski and Jago (2005) stated, “Too extensive content, too difficult levels of content, or inadequate resources can impair implementation and mitigate change down the paths of effects” (p.165) and was clearly evident in this study. Each participant reverted back to more comfortable, teacher-directed pedagogies in their ABL lessons. The most plausible explanation for their
default to trusted methods was inadequate ABL knowledge and inadequate preparation for instruction. ABL was new and it demanded much more than Suzanne or Carolyn appeared to be willing to invest to become effective ABL facilitators.

Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to explore the journey of two in-service teachers facilitating an instructional unit of ABL for the first time in their physical education program. The findings indicated that both participants made use of previous experiences and dispositions to support their practices as adult learners and professional educators. Each teacher tried to make ABL fit into a previously existing meaning scheme rather than change their meaning scheme to accommodate new knowledge.

The summary of findings determined ABL to be a difficult content area to implement in schools for novice facilitators. Second, no determination could be made on the effectiveness of the ABL training. There was not substantial evidence that the ABL training or content was the problem, but rather the lack of preparation for facilitation by both participants. A lack of fidelity existed in the observed versions of ABL lessons in each of Suzanne’s and Carolyn’s classes, with what was expected and shared in training. Too many modifications were made daily that compromised the integrity and intent of ABL programming. The ABL lessons implemented by the teachers resembled a skimmed, ineffective representation of ABL. The activities suggested on the lesson plans were followed but some instructions were missing in Suzanne’s and Carolyn’s facilitations. Participant-led debrief sessions at the end of each lesson lacked perspective, generalized themes, or practical application.
Physical education is a marginalized entity in an educational system where little is expected and little is delivered. Further, expectations and delivery are most often dependent upon the internal (i.e. district, building, program) motives for accountability and quality control (Baranowski and Jago, 2005). Suzanne and Carolyn were not prepared to deliver an effective lesson that was shared in training and were not held accountable to do so.

Findings suggest (a) further training, support, and evaluation of in-service teachers is necessary prior to facilitating ABL and (b) trying to make changes in a system (e.g. education, P-12 physical education, physical education at ITMS) that does not hold teachers accountable is very difficult. Recommendations include (a) formal identification of effective ABL pedagogies through methods similar to those used in the formative review of participants in this study (e.g. detailed training, critical reflection, and formative coaching sessions) and (b) improved procedures in delivering and evaluating ABL training.
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Appendix A: Life History Interview Questions
Teacher Interview Questions (Life History Interview)

1. Take me through your experiences as a child. What was it like growing up?
2. How were you cared for as a child?
3. How did family play a role in your upbringing?
4. Who were your primary caregivers? How did they influence you?
5. What do you remember most about your childhood?
6. What were some of the most vivid memories or incidences during your childhood?
7. What was the happiest time for you as a child?
8. What would you say was the most significant event in your life up to age 12?
9. Can you describe a memory that brings back fond memories when you reflect upon this event?
10. How did you parents/guardians feel about education? Was it valued? How?
11. Can you describe the most significant event in your life as a teenager?
12. What special people have you known in your life? What makes these people special?
13. What has shaped or influenced your life the most?
14. How did you change or transform from your early childhood into adolescence?
15. Describe the type of person you were as an elementary school age student. As a middle school student. As a high school student.
16. What primary beliefs guide your life? How did these beliefs become so important?
17. What values would you not want to compromise?
18. What do you see as the highest or most important value to strive for in our lives?

19. What has been the most important event in your teaching career? Why has this left such a lasting impression?

20. When did you know that you wanted to be a teacher?

21. What were significant instances that influenced your decision to become a teacher?

22. In what ways did your college years confirm or disconfirm your decision to become a teacher?

23. If you could not have been a teacher, what career path would you have chosen? Why?

24. How do you measure success or effectiveness as a person and/or teacher?

25. Can you provide specific examples of instances in which you were successful and/or effective as a person or teacher?

26. What are some of your initial reactions leading up to teaching this unit to your students for the first time?

27. What does adventure education mean to you? How has that changed over the course of your teaching career?

28. What is your experience in teaching ABL?

29. What does physical education mean to you?

30. What does “good” physical education look like?

31. What are some of the outcomes that you have developed for your students and your physical education program?
32. What are the outcomes of an adventure based learning unit? Are these outcomes aligned with standards/curricular requirements in physical education?

33. What is the background of your students?

34. How do they perform in your physical education class?

35. What do you consider to be your strengths in teaching?

36. What are some of your weaknesses?

37. What are some potential barriers that will not allow you to fully deliver an instructional unit effectively?

38. Are students typically highly active in your physical education class? Discuss.
Appendix B: ABL Training Agenda
Day 1 Training Agenda

I. Overview of ABL Content
   a. Building Community
   b. Establishing Full Value Norms
   c. Cooperation
   d. Emotional and Physical Trust
   e. Problem Solving and Challenge

II. Challenge By Choice/ Full Value Contract
   a. Levels of Participation
   b. Five Finger Contract

III. Effective Facilitation
   a. Adventure Wave
   b. Sequence and Flow
   c. Debrief

IV. Questions and Answers
   a. Check for Teacher Understanding

Day 2 Training Agenda

I. Building Community
   a. Review of Main Concepts
   b. Lesson Plan Analysis
   c. Lesson Plan Walk-Through
   d. Tips for Facilitators

II. Debriefing Community Building Lessons
   a. Use of Appropriate Debrief Strategy
   b. Questioning Strategies/ Experiential Learning Cycle
   c. Facilitating the Debrief

Day 3 Training Agenda

I. Cooperation
   a. Review of Main Concepts
   b. Lesson Plan Analysis
   c. Lesson Plan Walk-Through
   d. Tips for Facilitators

II. Debriefing Cooperation Lessons
   a. Use of Appropriate Debrief Strategy
   b. Questioning Strategies/ Experiential Learning Cycle
c. Facilitating the Debrief

Day 4 Training Agenda

I. Debriefing ABL Lessons
   a. Gaining Student Perspectives
   b. Generalizing Themes
   c. Making Applications of Discussed Themes

II. Video Analysis of Debrief Sessions
   a. Identify Elements of Debrief
   b. Critique Processes of Debrief
   c. Detect Errors in Debriefing
   d. Prescribe for Effective Debriefing

Day 5 Training Agenda

I. Review Overview of ABL Content
   a. Sequence and Flow
   b. Experiential Learning Cycle
   c. Adventure Wave
   d. Challenge By Choice
   e. Full Value Contract
   f. Check for Teacher Understanding

II. Video Analysis of Debrief Sessions (Part II)
   a. Identify Elements of Debrief
   b. Critique Processes of Debrief
   c. Detect Errors in Debriefing
   d. Prescribe for Effective Debriefing

III. Lesson Plan Review/ Walk-Through
   a. Review Lesson Plans 1-10
   b. “In the Moment” Teaching
   c. Tips for Facilitation

IV. Debriefing ABL Lessons
   a. Purpose of the Debrief
   b. Role of the Facilitator in the Debrief
   c. Experiential Learning Cycle
   d. Lessons Learned

V. Evaluation of Facilitation
   a. Review of ABL Checklist
   b. Identify Essential ABL Components
Appendix C: ABL Block Plan
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Day 2</th>
<th>Day 3</th>
<th>Day 4</th>
<th>Day 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brief:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Brief:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Brief:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Brief:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Brief:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“All human beings….”</td>
<td>“One’s vision is not….”</td>
<td>“Bad eggs arrange…”</td>
<td>Consider the following scenarios…</td>
<td>“Things do not change…”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Activities:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Activities:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Activities:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Activities:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toss A Name</td>
<td>Marketplace Relay</td>
<td>Card Have You Ever</td>
<td>Warp Speed</td>
<td>Monarch Tag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laughing Matters</td>
<td>Twizzle</td>
<td>Growth Circles</td>
<td>Group Juggle</td>
<td>Circle Clap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screaming Toes</td>
<td>Peek-A-Who</td>
<td>Asteroids</td>
<td>Cardio Rocks</td>
<td>Triangle Tag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everybody’s It</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Group Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debrief Strategy:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Debrief Strategy:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Debrief Strategy:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Debrief Strategy:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Debrief Strategy:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thumb Up/ Side/ Down</td>
<td>Yard Stick/ Ruler</td>
<td>Statue</td>
<td>One Word</td>
<td>Five Finger Consensus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day 6</th>
<th>Day 7</th>
<th>Day 8</th>
<th>Day 9</th>
<th>Day 10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brief:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Brief:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Brief:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Brief:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Brief:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“We may have come…”</td>
<td>Imagine yourself in…</td>
<td>“A single arrow…”</td>
<td>“Trust is like a vase…”</td>
<td>“For every failure….”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Activities:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Activities:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Activities:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Activities:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Activities:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation Dots</td>
<td>Partner Sit and Stand</td>
<td>Pigs in a Blanket</td>
<td>Mass Pass</td>
<td>Catch as Catch Can</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radioactive River</td>
<td>Human Knot</td>
<td>Key Punch</td>
<td>Mergers</td>
<td>Turn Over a New Leaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four Pointer</td>
<td>Hula Hoop Race</td>
<td>Carabiner Walk</td>
<td>Turnstile</td>
<td>Balloon Trolleys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debrief Strategy:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Debrief Strategy:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Debrief Strategy:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Debrief Strategy:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Debrief Strategy:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Plates</td>
<td>Beach Ball</td>
<td>Feelings Cards</td>
<td>Food Metaphors</td>
<td>Faces</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Block plan is subject to change according to each teacher, day, and class session
Appendix D: ABL Lesson Plans
LESSON 1

Terminal Motor Objective/s: The student will participate in each of the community building activities.

Cognitive Objective/s: Students will participate in activities to get to know each other better. Students will be able to explain the importance of working together and using communication during the debrief session through participation in each of the activities.

Affective Objective/s: The student will demonstrate to the teacher behavior associated with respect as it relates to the directions of each activity, demonstrating appropriate communication, and exhibiting proper use of the social skills related to the rules of the classroom.

Other lesson objectives: The students will be able to: (a) demonstrate positive working relationships with each other, (b) work together as a new group, and (c) recognize each person by name

Topic/Activities:
1. Toss a Name - * Have 6-8 items on hand to toss to students
2. Laughing Matters-
3. Screaming Toes (time permitting)
4. Everybody’s It (time permitting)

Equipment and Resources Needed
- Items to toss (i.e. multiple foam balls)
- Minimal equipment needed today
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development &amp; Management Tasks</th>
<th>Anticipated Time</th>
<th>How will the task be communicated include Teaching Cues/Critical Elements</th>
<th>Organizational Arrangement</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Debriefing Questions (1) What? (2) So What? (3) Now What?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brief:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><em>To increase physical activity.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'All human beings are born with unique gifts. The healthy functioning of our community depends on its capacity to develop each gift.'</td>
<td>1 minute</td>
<td>Read this quote to students</td>
<td>Standing in the gym in circle formation</td>
<td>Read the quote so students can hear</td>
<td>Be sure to tie this quote back into the conversation during the debrief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Peter Senge 'The Learning School.'</em></td>
<td>5-15 minutes</td>
<td>Students must say their name clearly so others may hear.</td>
<td>Circle Formation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Teacher can determine the pace of the activity by using more than one ball, encourage a faster pace, direct students to follow instructions of passing, eye contact, saying thank you, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If students already know names (or are close to knowing names), the teacher can check for understanding by asking a student to identify people in the circle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Toss a Name</strong> is an ice breaker activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Students will stand shoulder to shoulder in a circle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In round 1, students will toss an object to each other and say their name clearly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In round 2 the teacher will pick a student to start by saying the students name before tossing it to him/her.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The students will then follow suit and call out who they are throwing to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Teacher will add more objects to the circle increasing the speed of the game.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
students can walk in place or walk a lap around the circle and watch others play catch as they make it back to their spot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Laughing Matters (CC, p. 80)</th>
<th>5-25 Minutes</th>
<th>Rules: the walker must keep his/her eyes open.</th>
<th>Double Line Formation with students facing each other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ask students to agree on a nonsensical word</td>
<td>People making up the lines must stay out of the walker’s way (give them space to walk) and may not touch the walker in any way.</td>
<td>Was this hard for you? How?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice saying the word in different ways (accent, baby, goat, dog, monster, ghost, etc)</td>
<td>The only word that may be spoken is the nonsensical word that was introduced.</td>
<td>What strategies did you use to try not to smile?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have the class line up in two lines, facing each other and fairly close so proximity plays a role in the activity</td>
<td>The people in the lines may say the word any way they choose.</td>
<td>How did it feel to be the ones saying the nonsensical word?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Task 1:</strong> One student will walk between the two lines without smiling or laughing</td>
<td></td>
<td>How did it feel to walk down the line?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Consider modifications to promote more physical activity within this task.</em></td>
<td></td>
<td>Was it easy or hard for you to decide to take a turn? Are you glad you had the choice?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What are some ways to deal with teasing?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What is an activity that you have chosen not to participate in?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coping strategies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Task 2: This time the single student is allowed to express herself/himself while walking down the tunnel of students are still are only speaking the single, nonsensical word.

**Screaming Toes (CC, p.57)**

Have the class stand in a circle

Tell everyone to look down at someone else’s shoes. When you say “look up”, they should look that person in the face.

If that person is looking at someone else, nothing happens. If that person is looking directly back- making eye contact- then both parties act surprised by letting out a scream or yell.

Those who make eye contact then meet in the middle for a high-five/handshake and switch places in the circle.

**Everybody’s It (CC, p. 73)**

Create boundaries of which everyone is aware; the only rule of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5-25 Minutes</th>
<th>Students are in a circular formation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cues used are “Look Down” and “Look Up”</strong></td>
<td>Students will create a celebration that includes a brief physical activity, then switch spots in the circle…suggest that the group has the same celebration (hand shake, cheering, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circle Formation</td>
<td>Look at other person’s feet, then look at their face on “look up”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If you make eye contact with that person, then complete the celebration, physical activity, and switching spots in the line</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Screaming Toes**

How did you like screaming in this activity?

Did you try to avoid eye contact or to get eye contact? Why?

What made this game fun/not fun for you?

What are differences in trying not to laugh vs. laughing freely and trying to make someone laugh and not having the pressure of having to make someone laugh?
the game is that everyone is “it”.

Once the game starts, if a person gets tagged, he or she must squat down

If two people tag each other, they both squat down

When a few people are left, create a count down of 10 and start again

Play several rounds of the game….ask a few processing questions…then try a few more rounds

students that “the name of the game is Everybody’s It”….establish time frames for each game, ranging from 30 seconds to 1 minute per each round

Having several rounds of this will likely create several individuals that are the last person remaining…de-emphasize winning and emphasize the processes involved in the activity

playing area

DEBRIEF:

Thumbs up, thumbs to the side, and thumbs down

Rate how we (or you) did, and say why you rated it that way

Following each student offering their perspective, steer the conversation toward initial themes shared by students and how these themes apply outside of the physical education class
LESSON 2

**Terminal Motor Objective/s:** The student will participate in each of the community building activities. Students will move safely throughout the activities (i.e. running to read cards in Marketplace Relay, and walking/hopping/jumping/turning/landing during Twizzle)

**Cognitive Objective/s:** Students will participate in activities to get to know each other better. Students will be able to explain the importance of working together and using communication during the debrief session through participation in each of the activities.

**Affective Objective/s:** The student will demonstrate to the teacher behavior associated with respect as it relates to the directions of each activity, demonstrating appropriate communication, and exhibiting proper use of the social skills related to the rules of the classroom.

**Other lesson objectives:** The students will be able to: (a) demonstrate positive working relationships with each other, (b) work together as a new group, and (c) follow directions

**Topic/Activities:**
1. Marketplace Relay- Index cards with words to act out
2. Twizzle- Polyspots
3. Peek A Who- Blue Tarp

**Equipment and Resources Needed**

Bring cones to mark off the playing area
Index cards for Marketplace Relay Game
Blue Tarp for Peek-A-Who

Bring a Yard Stick for the Debrief
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development &amp; Management Tasks</th>
<th>Anticipated Time</th>
<th>How will the task be communicated include Teaching Cues/Critical Elements</th>
<th>Organizational Arrangement</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Debriefing Questions (1) What? (2) So What? (3) Now What?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brief:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Students are standing in appropriate formation on the gym floor</td>
<td>Per the teacher’s request</td>
<td>Students are actively listening</td>
<td>At the end of the class, consider bringing up questions related to this activity such as:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketplace Relay (AE, p.34)</td>
<td>1 minute max</td>
<td>Each player will be shown a card and will then act out the word…the actor cannot talk</td>
<td>Group Formation with 5-8 people about 30-40 feet from the stack of cards</td>
<td>Ensure all students are participating in the activity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-25 Minutes</td>
<td>This first group to guess all of its words (or 5, or 7, etc.) is determined the winning team.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Were you more comfortable as an actor or guesser?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>When everyone is ready, the teacher will say “Go”. One person from each team runs to you and gets a card.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What skills were necessary to be successful at this game?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The person reads the card, leaving it on the floor by your feet….or the teacher can hold the cards and more than one group may act out the same word</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What were some of the successes/ frustrations of participating in this activity?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The person must then run back and act out the feeling for his or her team. Once a team guesses the feeling correctly, a new player from that group can come to you to get a new card.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Twizzle (AE, p.72)** | 5-25 Minutes | Students will need to learn five commands:  
- **Go**: walk in the direction that you are facing  
- **Stop**: stop moving and freeze  
- **Turn**: make a half turn and freeze, keeping both feet on the ground  
- **Jump**: make a half turn and freeze  
- **Twizzle**: Jump and make a full turn (360), then freeze  
Have students practice following the commands while you call them out. Players do need to be reminded to “freeze” after each command. Play a competition round with students being eliminated when not fully following the directions. When eliminated, students will become judges/assistant judges in the middle of the circle. Play a few rounds. Questions to consider during the debrief for “Twizzle”:  
- Was following directions difficult?  
- Were the instructions clear?  
- When are instructions important in our class?  
- Why is important to follow directions?  
- How do these themes translate to life outside of our class?  
- What were some other characteristics/skills needed to be successful in this activity? |
| **Peek-a-Who (AE, p. 111)** | 5-15 Minutes | Ask two participants to hold the tarp or sheet between them...these two players should be unbiased to a team. It should create a vertical barrier that can be raised and lowered. Students are safely engaged in the activity. Peek-A-Who  
How did it feel to have to change teams?  
Did your allegiance change?  
Does everyone know each other's names? This game will test how many names you actually do know! The object of the game is to
get people from the other team onto your team” The activity ends when there is only one large team.

easily. Divide the rest of the class into two groups, one on each side of the screen. Each group should sit on the ground and not be able to see anyone from the other team.

Ask one volunteer from each team to sit directly in front of their side of the screen. They need to do this quietly. **When the screen is dropped, the two players must verbally identify each other by name.**

Whoever first identifies the other person correctly wins. The slower player moves over to the faster person’s team.

Only permit the two volunteers to speak; the rest of the players must remain silent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yard Stick/Ruler</th>
<th>Have a ruler to pass around. Each student can show how they rate the activity by touching a number and sharing why they touched that number. Following each student offering their perspective, steer the conversation toward initial themes shared by students and how these themes apply outside of the physical education class. <strong>Questions from Marketplace Relay:</strong> What feelings should be associated with the Full Value Contract of our group? What words should be used for our FVC and under which heading do they belong? Discuss how these behaviors show respect for self and others.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

other’s name? If not, introduce yourself**

**Debrief:**
LESSON 3

Terminal Motor Objective/s: The student will participate in each of the community building activities.

Cognitive Objective/s: Students will participate in activities to get to know each other better. Students will be able to explain the importance of working together and using communication during the debrief session through participation in each of the activities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development &amp; Management Tasks</th>
<th>Anticipated Time</th>
<th>How will the task be communicated include Teaching Cues/Critical Elements</th>
<th>Organizational Arrangement</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Debriefing Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brief:</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 minute…keep this brief</td>
<td></td>
<td>Circle Formation</td>
<td>Students are actively engaged, moving, listening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'A clever arrangement of bad eggs will never make a good omelet.'</td>
<td>5-25 Minutes</td>
<td>Ensure the “have you ever” question is appropriate enough to be told to a middle school student. When the scenario applies to the student, the student will move to a different spot that is not immediately to the left or right of their original spot.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Card Have You Ever?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The class will form a circle with a polyspot directly in front of them. The teacher will have a polyspot in the middle of the circle that will be the designated card draw spot. The teacher will ask a “have you ever” question that will start the game. Students that have never fit the scenario will stay at their spot while students</td>
<td></td>
<td>What did you learn about someone that you didn’t know before class?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C S Lewis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
that have will move to a different spot. The student that is left with the card drawing spot will draw and ask the next question.

**Growth Circles** *(CC, p. 75)*
Outline the growth circles on the gym floor and discuss the meaning of growth circles.

When we are in the **comfort zone**, each of us is in a place that is safe and secure. By choosing to step out of our comfort zones to the **growth zone**, we are open to new ideas and experiences. Although not always comfortable, this is a place for optimum learning...what we try to avoid is going beyond the growth zone into

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5-15 minutes</th>
<th>Ask students questions and have the people put themselves into the circles they feel are most appropriate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How do you feel about:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Spiders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Speaking in front of a large group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Singing solo in front of a large group (this group)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Singing in a choir?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Bungee Jumping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Camping in a tent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Telling a family member that you love her/him?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Heights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Confronting a friend about something they did or said</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Snakes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Taking a math test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Introducing yourself to someone new?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>o Others?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Circle Formation to begin as they think of a scenario that is “high risk” or puts them in a “panic zone”**

Use **Challenge By Choice** at the beginning. Growth Circles allow for this.

**What did you learn about your peers?**

**What characteristics are important in this activity?**

---
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>The panic zone</strong></th>
<th>5-25 minutes</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asteroids (AE, p.32)</td>
<td>At the signal, players begin by throwing their ball into the air (over head height) and move into space to pick up another ball to begin play.</td>
<td>Scattered formation within the designated playing area</td>
<td>Introduce this game by reminding the group that <em>honesty is crucial for a safe environment</em> that allows members to take risks. This involves being honest with others as well as oneself.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Play is initiated with players with only one fleece ball at a time attempting to strike other players with the ball (using an underhand/ not sidearm or overhand throw) from close range. Players may only have one ball in possession at a time.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Be very clear on the types of permissible throws at other students (underhand, below the waist) and avoiding being hit by the ball (stay on your feet)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Once hit, a player stoops down and is “out”. If a ball is in the player’s hand when he or she is hit, that ball must be rolled away.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The round ends when there is only one player left standing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For the next round, if a ball rolls by a squatting player who can reach it, that player can take the ball, get back up, and resume playing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To modify the activity, change the size of the court, establish a time limit, play additional rounds of elimination, re-entry, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Debrief:** *Statue*

Each student will strike a pose related to an aspect of the activity and others will view each of the poses for a period of 15 seconds.

Each student will explain the meaning of their pose
Affective Objective/s: The student will demonstrate to the teacher behavior associated with respect as it relates to the directions of each activity, demonstrating appropriate communication, and exhibiting proper use of the social skills related to the rules of the classroom.

Other lesson objectives: The students will be able to: (a) experience a sense of community, (b) recognize similarities and differences among themselves, and (c) identify the potential outcomes of cooperative and competitive activities.

Topic/Activities:
1. Card Have You Ever- *Develop cards/ sheet for the scenarios and have a poly spot for each of the students -1 (ex. 30 students need 29 spots)
2. Growth Circles- organize cones for different zones for students to move into
3. Asteroids- series of small foam balls

Equipment and Resources Needed (See above)
LESSON 4

Terminal Motor Objective/s: The student will participate in each of the community building activities. Students will move safely throughout the activities (i.e. running to read cards in Marketplace Relay, and walking/ hopping/ jumping/ turning/ landing during Twizzle)

Cognitive Objective/s: Students will participate in activities to get to know each other better. Students will be able to explain the importance of working together and using communication during the debrief session through participation in each of the activities.

Affective Objective/s: The student will demonstrate to the teacher behavior associated with respect as it relates to the directions of each activity, demonstrating appropriate communication, and exhibiting proper use of the social skills related to the rules of the classroom.

Other lesson objectives: The students will be able to: (a) demonstrate positive working relationships with each other, (b) work together as a new group, and (c) follow directions

Topic/Activities:
1. Warp Speed- one or two objects decision making, problem solving, agreeing on a solution, executing the plan
2. Group Juggle- many objects that can be thrown and caught group norms, agreeing on norms, stating values/ norms, handling norms
3. Cardio Rocks- rocks and hula hoops honesty, cooperation decision making, personal identity, personality, fair play,

Equipment and Resources Needed

Bring cones to mark off the playing area
Multiple objects to be thrown and caught
Enough materials for Cardio Rocks
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development &amp; Management Tasks</th>
<th>Anticipated Time</th>
<th>How will the task be communicated include Teaching Cues/Critical Elements</th>
<th>Organizational Arrangement</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Debriefing Questions (1) What? (2) So What? (3) Now What?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brief: Consider the following scenarios:</td>
<td>5-15 minutes</td>
<td>RULES: Passing of the object will start and stop with the same person; not everyone can touch the object at the same time; each player must have possession of the object as it moves through the cycle. After establishing a baseline, ask the group how it can get faster and faster each time.</td>
<td>Students can be in a range of formations (i.e. circle, line, cluster, etc.)</td>
<td>Students will use problem solving and listening skills to work together to accomplish the task. They will need to increase the speed with which they accomplish the task. We will use an object to represent a goal that they need to accomplish as a group</td>
<td>PROCESSING: Which of the Full Value Norms were evident in this activity? Which were not that need to be addressed? Which ones need more work? Do we need to add any more concepts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Imagine a busy intersection at rush hour. What would it be like if nobody paid attention to the traffic light?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Imagine being in a movie theater and everyone is talking during the movie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Imagine a school where none of the teachers came to work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Imagine a business where nobody listened to the owner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Warp Speed</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each person will receive an object and then toss it to someone else (who hasn’t previously received it). The last person who receives it will return the object to the first person to complete the cycle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Students** can be in a range of formations (i.e. circle, line, cluster, etc.)

**Students** will use problem solving and listening skills to work together to accomplish the task.

They will need to increase the speed with which they accomplish the task.

We will use an object to represent a goal that they need to accomplish as a group.
Players must remember who throws the object to them and to whom they throw it. If everyone remembers correctly, the group established a pattern in which each person catches the ball from one particular person and tosses it to another.

**Group Juggle (AE, p. 118)**

We are going to do an activity that will bring to life our *Full Value Contract* concepts and norms.

Each student will write one full value norm that you feel is very important on a piece of tape, or one that you feel may be difficult to follow. Each student will get a ball that your norm can be taped onto.

This activity will require us to effectively juggle our norms.

| 5-20 minutes | Students will be in circle formation and begin to pass the object among all the students in the circle. With a large number of students in a circle, it is important that all are aware of the established pattern and know who to expect a pass from during the juggle. Once students can demonstrate that a norm in the class can be handled, we will add new “norms”/ balls to the circle. When each new object is entered into the circle, the teacher may “freeze” the group and identify the object as another norm that should be considered in the group. If a norm is dropped/ bobbed etc. continue the activity....however, you may want to remove the object if it is too much for the group | Students are in circle formation...in a position where they can all see one another. Students are throwing and catching objects in circle formation | What are the norms of our class? Norms and rules are different. How do you differentiate these? What are important norms that we addressed in this activity? What did this activity symbolize as it relates to our class, our school, and our lives? |
### Cardio Rocks

**Objective:** Students will work together planning offensive and defensive team strategies as they attempt to capture opponents’ “rocks” while protecting their own team’s “rocks.”

**Overemphasize safety at the beginning of class. No reckless running, etc. If a player bumps another player, he/she should say “excuse me.”**

If players break rules, play unsafely, or use poor social skills, pull them out of the game for a time out.

**Modifications:** We have tried playing without goalies and it works fine. Players need to be reminded not to goal-tend, however. They can chase a player into the goal, but once the player reaches the safety of the goal, the defensive player must back away from the goal at least 15 feet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time Limit</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>The game starts with a whistle or “go” call</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Players should try to sneak into opponent’s circle, grab a “rock” (only one at a time) and return to their own circle without being tagged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opponent’s circle is also a safe area. If a player has one foot over the center line or one foot inside the circle that player is considered safe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time limit in opponent’s circle is a 5 and must be counted out loud.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If caught, a player must “freeze” on the spot where tagged, hand the rock over, kneel on one knee, and raise one hand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students who are caught with rocks must hand them over in a friendly manner to the other team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is only one goalie allowed per team. Goalies must be identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Goalies are the only players allowed to guard the players inside the circle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A kneeled teammate can be “recovered” by a high five from an active teammate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are no free walk backs. Unfrozen players can either jog to their own side or to the opponent’s side. Students may not guard frozen players.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The game is over when one team has all the “rocks” in their circle or the team that has the most rocks at the end of a time interval.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Encourage students to be a good sport and keep their heart rate up by taking risks, rescuing teammates, going for rocks, etc. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Debrief- “One Word”</th>
<th>Following each student offering their perspective, steer the conversation toward initial themes shared by students and how these themes apply outside of the physical education class</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Students will choose one word to describe the experiences or something that happened during the activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ask questions that will ensure the students are controlling the discussion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The conversation can go in multiple directions…it is the teacher’s call to make these decisions.
LESSON 5

Terminal Motor Objective/s: The student will participate in each of the community building activities. Students will move safely throughout the activities (i.e. running to read cards in Marketplace Relay, and walking/ hopping/ jumping/ turning/ landing during Twizzle)

Cognitive Objective/s: Students will participate in activities to get to know each other better. Students will be able to explain the importance of working together and using communication during the debrief session through participation in each of the activities.

Affective Objective/s: The student will demonstrate to the teacher behavior associated with respect as it relates to the directions of each activity, demonstrating appropriate communication, and exhibiting proper use of the social skills related to the rules of the classroom.

Other lesson objectives: The students will be able to: (a) demonstrate positive working relationships with each other, (b) work together as a new group, and (c) follow directions

Topic/Activities:
- Monarch Tag- awareness, agility: 2-3 balls, decision making, cooperation, awareness, agility
- Circle Clap- stopwatch or wristwatch to keep time: timing, following directions, listening
- Triangle Tag- no equipment necessary: fleeing, reaction time, avoiding, move to open space
- Group Interview (time permitting)- Questions, talking stick: community, confidence, identity, sharing, emotional safety

Equipment and Resources Needed
Bring cones to mark off the playing area
| Development & Management Tasks | Anticipated Time | How will the task be communicated include Teaching Cues/Critical Elements | Organizational Arrangement | Criteria | Debriefing Questions
|------------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------|------------------------
| **Brief:** 'Things do not change; we change.' Thoreau | 5-25 minutes | Ensure students are aiming below the waist when making underhand throws...will result in better accuracy and acquiring more monarchs. | Students are to stay in the designated gym area. | Ensure monarchs are cooperating while recruiting anarchists. | (1) What? (2) So What? (3) Now What? |
| **Monarch Tag:** A monarch who will be IT will be randomly selected by the teacher (a student skilled at throwing will help). The monarch student will recruit students to his/her monarchy by hitting them (below the waist) with the soft foam ball. Underhand throws are to be made | 3-15 minutes | Teacher will explain that students are going to participate in a clap that is similar to a “wave” at a sporting event. | Circle formation or another formation that may be | Students can successfully | How were you successful? What lead to being unsuccessful? What was it like being THE monarch? Being one of several monarchs? An anarchist? | What skills/ traits are needed for success?
### Circle Clap

“Being Here” requires full participation and concentration.

Gather students in a tight circle (shoulder to shoulder)

The first student claps their hands

This process is continued around the circle until it reaches the student who started the clap

The processes is timed, and each round the students try to beat their time

**Modify with different claps, students going in reverse order, doing a double clap, etc.**

### Triangle Tag

Have students form groups of three and join hands. The fourth group member will be outside the circle of the three that are holding hands. The person on the outside will be the chaser.

Designate one person in the circle as the person that the chaser will try to tag.

#### This is a good transition activity and also is a good low impact activity following Monarch Tag

The teacher may want to explain that the entire class needs to participate and pay attention for the time of the circle clap to improve

The teacher will have a group of four get up and demonstrate the activity

3 of the 4 students will link arms and designate a person as the “tagee”...the 4th person will be the tagger and have a designated time period to tag the tagee

If the triangle breaks then the tagger gets a point...if the group keeps the tagee from being tagged, the tagee receives a point

The teacher will check for understanding of the activity

Students will ask one student

Success according to the discretion of the class

3 students are in a triangle formation

A group of four students in open space; the “it” person is outside of the triangle

All students are actively engaged in the activity

If there is a number not multiple to 4, a group of 5 with one spectator/ official is appropriate

### Group Interview

How did it feel to be the center of attention?

Did it seem like you really had a choice

### What skills were necessary for success in this activity?

As a tagger?

As a tagee?
On the teacher’s signal the chaser will try and tag the designated person in the group. The group holding hands will work together to try and protect the “taggee”. Play for a designated time and if the taggee is tagged, then switch roles.

**Group Interview (CC, p.78)**
Brainstorm a list of questions that people are curious about to ask students in the class.

**Facilitation Notes:**
You may want to have a talking stick for the students asking questions and an object to serve as the “microphone” for the students being interviewed.

This is a good activity when little time is left at the end of class.

The objective is for the person to be questioned by the others and answer the questions as honestly as possible.

Allow yourself to be

| 3-25 minutes | volunteer a series of questions (teacher determines the number) based off of their own questions or off of the list created by the teacher. The questions should be school appropriate.

The interviewed student will answer the questions AND can pass on any questions that they don’t care to answer….encourage active listening and support of the person being asked the questions.

Have multiple students interviewed | Varies:
Semi-circle
Seated circle
Line formation
Cluster formation, |
| Remind students that questions are to be respectful and that this community is a place that is both emotionally and physically safe.

Be prepared with your own questions to help the process get going. |

about answering the questions?
Why or why not?

How did your classmates treat you when being interviewed?

**DEBRIEF:**
Five Finger Consensus

Have students show a 1-5 finger rating on the experiences/enjoyment level and describe why you gave this ranking.

Following each student offering their perspective, steer the conversation toward initial themes shared by students and how these themes apply outside of the physical education class.
LESION 6

Terminal Motor Objective/s: The student will participate in each of the cooperation activities

Cognitive Objective/s: Students will be able to explain the importance of cooperation while working together and how it affects the outcome of an activity. They will also be able to participate in the debrief session and share their perspectives.

Affective Objective/s: The student will demonstrate the ability to work together cooperatively as a team. The students will be express the correct behavior, communication skills and being able to follow the rules of the classroom.

Other lesson objectives: The students will be able to: (a) work together as a new group, (b) understand the importance of creating a safe environment, (c) identify possible outcomes of cooperative and competitive behaviors, and (d) demonstrate positive working relationships with each other.

Topic/Activities:
Cooperation Dots- * You will need polystocks or other dots (i.e. hula hoop, jump rope, flat side of a box, etc.)
Radioactive River - * Teacher will need a scooter for each group (3-4 scooters) and 3-4 items per group to step on (carpet squares, etc.)
Four Pointer- No equipment needed

Equipment and Resources Needed
- 25-30 poly spots
- Stopwatch
- 6-8 cones
- 2-3 scooters
- 3-8 carpet squares
- Different colored construction paper with letters on them
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development &amp; Management Tasks</th>
<th>Anticipated Time</th>
<th>How will the task be communicated include Teaching Cues/Critical Elements</th>
<th>Organizational Arrangements</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Debriefing Questions (1) What? (2) So What? (3) Now What?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brief</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(1) What?</strong> What strategies did you use?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Who in your group made the decisions?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>How was this decided?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Is this the best way to come to an agreement on who will/ should take leadership?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>What is the lesson here?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cooperation Dots</strong></td>
<td>10-25 min</td>
<td>The teacher will explain the activity and ask for questions or concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrate how to use the dots effectively, but not give the “only” solution.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Check for student understanding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students will be able to find the fastest way to get across the gym by following the rules of the activity.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>They will have to cooperate with their group members to be able to work together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Students should make it across the space and back with their team members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What strategies did you use?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Who in your group made the decisions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How was this decided?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is this the best way to come to an agreement on who will/ should take leadership?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>What is the lesson here?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“We may have all come on different ships, but we’re in the same boat now.”

Dr. Martin Luther King Jr.

Have the students get into groups of four or five (five or six teams)

Each team gets a stack of dots made out of construction paper. You should have more circles than players. If there are 3 people on your team you should have 4 dots.

The object of the game is to race the other teams to the finish line and back, but you can only step on the dots.

If someone steps on the floor the whole team will have to start over. You cannot drag your foot on the floor.

Try to figure out the fastest way to get your team across the course and back.

Progression- Start out with large dots and make them smaller; provide a time limit for students to get across the space and back

Try to figure out the fastest way to get your team across the course and back.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Radioactive river</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Set up cones to make a river in the middle of the space available</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Form the class into 2-3 teams and give each team one scooter and 3-4 objects</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- Their mission is to get their entire team across the “river” without having anyone touch the radioactive river. If any student touches the river the whole team will have to start over.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- If the team has to start over make sure the student who touched the river goes to the end of the line to make sure all students get a chance to cross the river.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>- First team to cross wins.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progression-</strong> Use different objects to get across the river or limit how many times they can use a certain item; if an item is on/in the river, it must be in contact with a person and not being “washed” down the river</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>5-25 min</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher will explain the activity and ask for any questions about the rules.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Check for understanding.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Students cannot touch the floor.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The first team to get across the river wins.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debrief question:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>How should we determine a winner? Being faster than the other group; Being faster than your first time?</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>The students will have to get across the river by still following the rules:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Having the entire class cross the river successfully.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>How the students respond to the use of different objects or having limited objects to use.</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Four Pointer (Cowstails, p. 86)</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The object of this challenge is to get a group of students (7-10 students) across a thirty foot area using only 4-5 points of simultaneous contact with the ground</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Facilitation:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Make sure that all groups are beginning at the same time so they will</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Rules:</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>All students must start at the marked starting line and end at the finish line</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No props may be used</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All students must be in contact with each</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Small group formation. Students will move together from point A to point B** |

| **Students are moving safely in the area Challenge by Choice activity** |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Debrief-</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>“Paper Plates”- Give everyone a paper plate and a marker…</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>They draw or write (a) a face on the paper plate in regard to how they think things went or how they felt, (b) words,</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>discover solutions independently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students can present their “creation” to peers or to the entire group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking Points:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What worked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies/Methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What happened?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you run into any problems?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How did you communicate?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was there only one leader or several?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What strategies can you use to respond more effectively?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does this relate to our classes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can this be applied to your life outside of physical education?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LESSON 7

Terminal Motor Objective/s: The student will participate in each of the cooperation activities, using strength, balance, and hand-eye coordination.

Cognitive Objective/s: Students will be able to explain the importance of cooperation while working together and how it affects the outcome of an activity. They will also be able to participate in the debrief session and share their thoughts.

Affective Objective/s: The student will demonstrate the ability to work together cooperatively as a team. The students will be express the correct behavior, communication skills and being able to follow the rules of the classroom.

Other lesson objectives: The students will be able to: (a) work together as a new group, (b) understand the importance of creating a safe environment, (c) identify possible outcomes of cooperative and competitive behaviors, and (d) demonstrate positive working relationships with each other.

Topic/Activities:
Partner sit and stand- * No equipment necessary
Human knot- * No equipment necessary
Hula Hoop Race- * 2-4 hula hoops per group….* Beach ball for the debrief

Equipment and Resources Needed
10 hula hoops
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Development &amp; Management Tasks</th>
<th>Anticipated Time</th>
<th>How will the task be communicated include Teaching Cues/Critical Elements</th>
<th>Organizational Arrangements</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Debriefing Questions (1) What? (2) So What? (3) Now What?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brief</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imagine yourself in another classroom and you are given a group assignment where you have to work together. The assignment is to create a map of a journey you will take across the country. Where would you start? Would you take charge? Would you assign each other responsibilities? How would you organize your project? How would you communicate with your partner? How will you handle problems or adapt to changes within your project or group?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partner sit and stand</strong></td>
<td>15 min</td>
<td>Teacher will explain the activity and ask if there are any questions. Demonstrate with two of the students. Check for understanding. “Push against each other” You and your partner join another group to make a</td>
<td></td>
<td>Success will be determined by demonstrating the ability to perform the task efficiently with their partner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group sit and stand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The students should be able to sit and stand up cooperating using each other as a team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Group Size</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Knot</strong></td>
<td>group of 4</td>
<td>Teacher will explain the activity and ask for any questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Check for understanding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Get into circle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Shake hands &amp; hold with 2 different people, excluding the person directly next to you; once holding hands try to untangle without letting go of your classmate.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>You should end up in a circle holding hands at the end.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progression</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>Success will be determined by demonstrating the ability to perform the task efficiently within their group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Being able to follow directions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Learning to cooperate while working in larger groups.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hula Hoop Race</strong></td>
<td>group of 8</td>
<td>The teacher will explain the activity and ask for any questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Check for understanding.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Communicate with your team &amp; be patient.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Make sure you encourage your teammates.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Debrief</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>The students will be able to move the hula-hoop around the circle while keeping their hands connected.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The students will use each other’s arms and legs to help one another move the hula-hoop around.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>“Beach Ball”</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Write questions on a beach ball, such as: “Something that went well”, or “Someone who showed leadership and why.” Throw the ball to whoever wants it. Each person answers whichever question is closest to them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with the hula-hoops place around someone.

On the teachers cue they will them move the hula-hoops around the circle to a designated spot without breaking handgrips.

Time each group and fastest time wins.

Add more hula-hoops to make more difficult.

**Talking Points**

What did you have to do to move the hula-hoop around quickly and efficiently? Was it difficult staying connected with your classmates? Did you accomplish your goals?
LESSON 8

Terminal Motor Objective/s: The student will participate and attempt to solve the problem in each of the problem solving activities

Cognitive Objective/s: Students will be able to explain the importance of working together, taking roles, and using communication to find solutions during the debrief session

Affective Objective/s: The student will demonstrate to the teacher behavior associated with respect as it relates to following the directions of each activity, representing proper communication, and displaying correct use of the social skills related to the rules of the classroom and the full value contract.

Other lesson objectives: The students will be able to: (a) learn techniques to solve problems to accomplish group tasks, (b) understand the importance of contributing ideas in the process of solving problems

Topic/Activities:
1. Pigs in a Blanket
2. Key Punch
3. Carabiner Walk

Equipment and Resources Needed
- 2 large tarps
- 2 rubber chickens, 2 kick balls, 2 beach balls, or other objects that can be moved during Pigs in a Blanket
- 15 numbered poly spots
- Cones
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development &amp; Management Tasks</th>
<th>Anticipated Time</th>
<th>How will the task be communicated include Teaching Cues/Critical Elements</th>
<th>Organizational Arrangements</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Debriefing Questions (1) What? (2) So What? (3) Now What?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A single arrow is easily broken, but not ten in a bundle.</strong> Japanese proverb</td>
<td>1 min</td>
<td>Direct instruction by the instructor – Website projected onto screen and discussed.</td>
<td>Makes sure all students are using active listening skills before starting the brief.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Pigs in a Blanket** – Introduction to problem solving | 5-25 min | 1. The teacher will explain the activity  
2. The teacher will allow each group to practice using the tarps to toss and catch the object for one minute.  
3. Then the teacher will check for student understanding by asking questions regarding the directions of the activity | This activity encourages group members to coordinate their movements and utilize cooperation techniques as well as communication to complete the task assigned. | | Cooperation, communication, timing, synchronization |
| **Key Punch** - Strategize and Communicate | 5-25 min | 1. The teacher will explain the rules of the game.  
2. The teacher will check for understanding by quizzing the students about each rule. | Students begin to communicate, strategize, and assign roles. | | Problem solving, communication, leadership, risk, trust, being put on the spot |
2. Each team must touch each numbered poly spot in sequence, each team member must touch at least one number, only one student in the key punch area at a time, ropes and spots may not be moved, players will be timed.

3. Any infraction to the rules adds ten seconds to that trial.

4. After the first trial give students three minutes to strategize.

5. Students will have three trials to attempt to beat their own times.

| Carabiner Walk (Cowstails, p.78) | 5-15 min | “Get into one large group that will allow you to stand within the “jump rope belt”. Your group will try to move from cone to cone in the shortest amount of time. All participants must be standing throughout the activity.

**Rules:**
- All students must start at the marked starting line and end at the finish line.
- No props may be used.
- All students must be in contact with each other as they progress across the ground.

**Debrief Strategy:**
- Feelings Cards
  - Using the feelings cards, have students select two each and describe someone that would experience one of the two feelings listed on the cards.
  - Additionally, apply these initial responses to their lives outside of our class (i.e. school, home, real life, life lesson, etc.)

|  |  | Students are moving safely and efficiently from point A to point B.
|  |  | Students are moving safely in the area.
|  |  | Challenge by Choice activity.
LESSON 9

Terminal Motor Objective/s: The student will participate and attempt to solve the problem in each of the problem solving activities.

Cognitive Objective/s: Students will be able to explain the importance of working together, taking roles, and using communication to find solutions during the debrief session.

Affective Objective/s: The student will demonstrate to the teacher behavior associated with respect as it relates to following the directions of each activity, representing proper communication, and displaying correct use of the social skills related to the rules of the classroom and the full value contract.

Other lesson objectives: The students will be able to: (a) learn techniques to solve problems to accomplish group tasks, (b) understand the importance of contributing ideas in the process of solving problems, and (c) understand techniques to evaluate the process of problem solving.

Topic/Activities:
1. Mass Pass
2. Mergers
3. Turnstile

Equipment and Resources Needed
- Plenty of jump ropes or hula hoops for mergers
- Fleece Balls and Flying disks
- 2 Buckets
- 1 large jump rope for Turnstile
| **Development & Management Tasks** | **Anticipated Time** | **How will the task be communicated include Teaching Cues/Critical Elements** | **Organizational Arrangements** | **Criteria** | **Debriefing Questions**
(1) What?
(2) So What?
(3) Now What? |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust is like a vase. Once it broken, though you can fix it the vase will never be the same again. <strong>Unknown</strong></td>
<td>1-2 min</td>
<td>Direct instruction by the instructor – Read quotes and allow moments for reflection.</td>
<td>Makes sure all students are using active listening skills before starting the brief</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Mass Pass** – Teamwork and effective planning | 5-25 min | 1. The teacher will explain the activity  
2. The teacher will allow each group to discuss their strategy for three minutes.  
3. Then the teacher will check for student understanding by asking questions regarding the directions of the activity. | This activity encourages group members to use organized communication and teamwork. | | |
4. All sides of the boundary must be occupied by at least one student, every student must touch each object at least once before it is dropped into bucket 2, objects may not be passed to anyone immediately to the left or right, and it must cross over the boundary, not passed around the perimeter, no one is allowed inside the perimeter, all action must stop when time is up.

*Modification:* Fleece balls are worth one point, disks are worth three points.

**Mergers:** Finding new ways to solve old problems and adapting to change.

1. Have each student take a jump rope, make a loop on the group and stand on it. *You can also use hula hoops*

2. Explain that inside the when two feet are inside a loop they are safe.

3. When the teach says “Change” students must leave their loop and find a new safe place, which means that two feet are inside a loop.

4. After each change remove some loops, students must figure out how to remain safe when there is not a loop for

| 5-20 min | 1. The teacher will explain the rules of the game. |
|  | 2. The teacher will check for understanding by quizzing the students about each rule. |
|  | 3. The teacher will not tell the students during instruction but will eventually take away all the loops during the changes and leave only one loop, students will need to figure out to sit outside the loop with just two feet inside the loop. |
| Students will need to figure out a new way to stay safe when their situations and number of safe places decreases. |
**Turnstile (AE, p. 38 & CC, p. 98)**

The entire group needs to solve a problem and each person will take an active role in implementing the solution.

**Suggested Modifications** - students in the role of rope turner, types of movement through rope, modifications for students with special needs (slow turn, slanted rope, etc.)

What I have done in the past:

*This is a turnstile at a game and we all have to get into the game...we have tickets and are sitting together in a group*

1. Pass through the rope
2. Get in – jump once – pass through
3. “2 for 1” ticket night – partners
4. “playoffs” – must win 3 or 4 games to win series (aka 3-4 students through at once)
5. “finals” - all must get through
6. “Olympics” – for the gold medal, you must all be able to jump the rope as a group.

| 15 min | **The task is for everyone to get through the turning rope** | **Rules** | **Debrief Strategy:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Once the group begins going through, the jumping area can never be empty again</td>
<td>One person at a time; Pass without touching the rope; Maintain one person jumping through</td>
<td>“Food Metaphors”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Two students will assist as a rope turner. Other participants will begin as a large group on one side of the rope</td>
<td>The group begins again if a rule is broken</td>
<td>Use food metaphors to describe the experiences during these activities (i.e. jello because we were jiggling around on the polyspots; string beans as we were moving through the turnstile; like eating soup with a fork...it was real messy, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How do we encourage other students like <em>Jim</em> to continue to take risks?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Why is emotional trust so important?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Who is involved in emotional</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Processing Questions for Turnstile:**

*Was the group successful? Why?*

*How were ideas shared?*

*What helped you get organized to succeed?*
| | | | trust? | How did it feel to be the individual that did not make it successfully through the rope? |
| | | | Why is that the appropriate behavior? |
LESSON 10
Terminal Motor Objective/s: The student will participate in each of the challenge activities. Students will physically challenge themselves in a safe environment.

Cognitive Objective/s: Students will be able to explain the importance of risk taking and challenging the self during the debrief session. Students will understand their strengths and weaknesses. Students will demonstrate the importance of goal setting and goal achieving.

Affective Objective/s: The student will demonstrate behavior associated with risk taking as it relates to following the directions of each activity and demonstrating appropriate communication

Other lesson objectives: The students will be able to: (a) physically challenge them in a safe environment, (b) understand their own strengths and weaknesses, and (c) understand the value of relying on their group to support positive risk taking

Topic/Activities:
1. Catch as catch can
2. Turning over a new leaf
3. Balloon trolleys
4. Fire in the Hole
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development &amp; Management Tasks</th>
<th>Anticipated Time</th>
<th>How will the task be communicated include Teaching Cues/Critical Elements</th>
<th>Organizational Arrangements</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Debriefing Questions (1) What? (2) So What? (3) Now What?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quotes:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“For every failure, there's an alternative course of action. You just have to find it. When you come to a roadblock, take a detour.” ~Mary Kay Ash</td>
<td>1-2 min</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Many of life's failures are people who did not realize how close they were to success when they gave up.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catch as Catch Can</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain the game and play right away, and then give time to make a strategy and play again.</td>
<td>3-15 min</td>
<td>On the count of three everyone must throw their objects in the air and (name) and (name) will try to catch as many as possible.</td>
<td>Students stand in a circle with 2 catchers in the middle</td>
<td>Students participate in the activity, while adhering to the rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need two volunteers who will stand back to back in the middle of the circle.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of this activity is for (name) and (name) to catch as many objects as possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turning over a new leaf</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explain the activity let</td>
<td>5-45 min</td>
<td>On a piece of tape I want you to write one thing that you are frustrated with or</td>
<td>Students stand on the blue tarp</td>
<td>Students participate in the activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
them strategize and
play.

unhappy about today and
tape it onto the blue tarp.

Once everyone has done that
I need you all to stand on the
tarp. The object of this game
is to **work together** to get
rid of your frustrations or
cause of unhappiness by
turning over a new leaf or
flipping the tarp. The rules
are that you cannot step off
the tarp or touch the ground
beyond the tarp at any time.

### Balloon Trolleys (Challenge)

1. Divide groups into 10-12 each
2. Each group stands in a single file line
3. A balloon will be placed between each student in the line, and their task is to move together without dropping any balls.
4. If a balloon is dropped, assign a penalty, either restart or move back five feet (time, score, etc.
5. Each person must keep their hands on their own shoulders and they cannot touch the ball

| 15 min | Explain the activity
Demonstrate the activity to the students
Keep hands off the balloons, and on own shoulders. Communicate with each other
Hold your hand in the air if you understand how to perform the activity and what our goals are |
| 1-5 minutes | In this activity the students will be able to challenge themselves in a safe environment, understanding their own strengths and weaknesses. They will learn to communicate with each other |

**Debrief Strategy:**
Face Making – can be done in person or by drawing a face on Paper Plates
**Fire in the Hole**  
*(cooperation)*

On the teacher’s command, students must be in groups of 2 to burst their balloons.

Modifications – must be in groups of 3, 4, etc.; must say a “buzzword” when it bursts, team handshake, etc.

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) How did this activity make you feel? How was this challenging?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) In what way was grip useful? What made this challenging?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) How did our past activities influence this activity? How would you use what we just learned on the climbing wall?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E: ABL Content Packet
2. Applies movement concepts and principles to the learning and development of motor skills.

3. Exhibits a physically active lifestyle.

4.Achieves and maintains a health-enhancing level of physical fitness.

5. Demonstrates understanding of and respect for differences among people in physical activity settings.

6. Understands that physical activity provides opportunities for enjoyment, challenge, self-expression and social interaction.

LESSON OBJECTIVES. The specific lesson objectives expected for each lesson appear at the beginning of each lesson. These have evolved directly from the Desired Results described previously. This linkage gives the teacher an immediate guide as to the goal of each lesson without having to sift back through the more global Desired Results.

Format

AGE GROUPS AND CORE THEMES. Four developmentally appropriate age groups have been identified in this PA curriculum. Each of these levels has its own particular thematic focus. The core themes are intended as guideposts for educators in framing and discussing the activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary (Kindergarten–Grade 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kindness/Caring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working together</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary (Grades 3–5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressing feelings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciating diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict resolution</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middle School (Grades 6–8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect for differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-esteem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compassion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>High School (Grades 9–12)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk taking</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IMPORTANT ASSUMPTIONS

Training
Implementing this curriculum requires proper training. Project Adventure suggests a comprehensive training plan that addresses the following key areas:

- Basic theory of Adventure and experiential education
- Experiencing of activities including warmups, ice-breakers, initiatives
- Facilitation and debriefing skills
- Technical skills as appropriate for the grade being taught
- Safety and risk-management skills appropriate for the grade being taught

Project Adventure offers a variety of workshops to meet these needs, including program consultation on specific guidelines and tools for properly implementing a program.

Safety
This curriculum does not include a safety manual. For detailed safety information, all educators should refer back to their own training. Written guidelines for low and high elements can also be found in Project Adventure's Safety Manual. Some of the activities in this curriculum can be dangerous if conducted without proper training on the facilitator's part.

Props and Equipment
Each lesson details the props that are necessary for its related activities. This curriculum does assume that specialty props not typically found in the traditional physical education storage closet will be purchased. Project Adventure offers a number of prop packages that help make the acquisition of the necessary materials cost-effective. (See the PA catalog for a prop kit developed especially for this program.)

The curriculum contained in this book also assumes the construction, by qualified installers, of a low and high challenge course for certain grades. We understand that some schools will need to modify the curriculum based on what they already have installed or based on what they can have installed. Such modification is easily done. Our assumptions are:

- Primary and Elementary (Grades K-5): No challenge course elements needed, lots of props required
- Middle School (Grades 6-8): Low challenge course elements needed; some props required
- High School (Grades 9-12): Low and high challenge course elements needed; some props required

Warmups

Warmups are a critical aspect of Adventure programming. They serve to prepare students both physically and emotionally for the rest of the lesson as well as set the tone for the class. As physical educators, we assume that you will be able to select a proper warmup activity to meet the needs of your class. Consequently, the lessons included here do not include them. However, at the back of this book you have included an extensive list of warm-ups and resources to aid in building a solid repertoire of appropriate activities. (See Appendix 3 for more information on warmups.)

Use of Assessment

Assessment in physical education has historically been a controversial and potentially complex topic. This curriculum, unfortunately, does not solve the assessment dilemma. It does, however, offer a variety of assessment tools that can be adapted to your specific program. Once again, the generic nature of this curriculum prevents the actual scripting of assessment tools. However, it provides options that can be used or integrated into your existing structure. Assessment suggestions are found both in the lessons themselves and in the Assessment chapter near the end of the book, which also contains a glossary of key assessment terms used in this curriculum.

CORNERSTONES OF AN ADVENTURE PROGRAM

The success of an Adventure program lies in the development of a foundation that supports and promotes the attributes of Adventure: risk taking, fun, challenge and safety. At the base of this foundation are three very important Project Adventure cornerstones: the Full Value Contract, Challenge by Choice, and the Experiential Learning Cycle. These concepts underlie all of the activities in this curriculum. It is critical that they be kept in focus and in play while you teach and work with the PA curriculum.

The Full Value Contract

Every grade in this curriculum starts their Adventure unit by developing community and creating a Full Value Contract for the class. This is crucial to the success of the unit, because it creates an environment where students feel safe enough to take risks. The Full Value Contract serves as a structure for creating behavioral norms that everyone in the class agrees to follow, and that everyone in the class agrees to work on maintaining throughout the life of the class. The norm-setting process establishes an atmosphere of caring, of feeling connected and of feeling valued. This atmosphere is critical to students' being able to participate fully in Adventure activities.

There are many ways to develop a Full Value Contract. A number of different methods are included in the lessons in this book. However, feel free to create your own unique way of establishing this critical agreement in your class. We have
included here a general guideline of developmentally appropriate ways in which to frame a traditional Full Value Contract for each age group. They are as follows:

**Primary (Grades K-1)**
- Be Kind
- Be Gentle
- Be Safe

**Elementary (Grades 3-5)**
- Play Hard
- Play Fair
- Play Safe

**Middle School (Grades 6-8)**
- Be Here
- Be Safe
- Set Goals
- Be Honest
- Let Go and Move On

**High School (Grades 9-12)**
- Be Present
- Pay Attention
- Speak Your Truth
- Be Open to Outcomes
- Create a Safe Environment

Remember: However you decide to establish your contract, consider it more a continuous process than a discrete activity. The process needs constant attention so that the contract becomes a living part of the class.

**Challenge by Choice**

Our more than thirty years of teaching Adventure have taught us many things. One of the most powerful lessons learned involves the use of choice. Coaxing young people into doing a difficult task or element teaches them only that they can be talked into doing something. On the other hand, helping students see that they have the right and ability to choose their level of challenge, and how to assess what is and isn't an appropriate level of challenge, teaches them how to make positive decisions for life. This is critical to a well-taught Adventure program.

As professionals, we have to understand that what is a challenge for one individual may be a panic-producing process for someone else. The art of our work is to present activities that offer choice to students, and then to allow students to make those choices. The Adventure process can support the use of choice as long as you, the teacher, respect and integrate Challenge by Choice into your work. This does not assume that you will allow students continually to opt out of activities because they have chosen not to play. It assumes that students will learn how...
to work safely in their «stretch zone» while avoiding situations that will put them
more into their «panic zone.»

Some find it easy to understand and explain Challenge by Choice in the fol-
lowing three-part way:

• Students have the right to choose how to participate.
• Students are asked to add value to the experience at all times.
• Students are asked to respect and value the decision of their class members.

There are some activities in this program that help specifically teach this key
concept. Educators who keep the concept of Challenge by Choice in mind each
moment of their Adventure work will meet with much more success than those
who approach their work with the attitude that everyone must do everything!

Experiential Learning and the Experiential Learning Cycle

This Adventure curriculum is experiential and is based on the theory of experien-
tial learning. Much of what you already do in physical education is experiential
in nature. However, any experience in isolation can be just that—a game, or an
isolated activity or event. As educators, it is our responsibility to provide students
with the opportunity to gain as much from each experience as possible. The
Experiential Learning Cycle (shown in the graphic below) explains the rationale
for the activity structure that is used in the PA curriculum.

The Experiential Learning Cycle was developed from David Kolb’s learning the-
tory model. Kolb highlights four phases of a learning cycle: concrete experience,
reflective observation, abstract conceptualization and active experimentation. Each
of these phases aligns with one of the four stages of the ELC. Kolb also identifies
four basic learning styles: diverging, assimilating, converging and accommodating.
Each style combines and uses different phases of the learning cycle. Varieties of
learning styles in the class are provided for when teaching with Adventure and
using the ELC.

Once an activity has been completed, a period of reflection (or Debriefing)
helps students to draw relevance from the experience. Connecting the present
experience to past experiences also enhances learning. In this curriculum, the
Debrief comes in many forms. During this phase, the simple questions, “What
happened in the activity?” “So, what can we learn from what occurred?” and, finally,
“Now what can we do with this information?” or “How can we apply what we’ve
learned to other areas of our lives?” provide the structure. This Debrief period can
be active and involve action-oriented experiences, or it can be discussion-oriented.
If no reflection period is provided, we limit the potential learning opportunities
for our students. (See Appendix 4 for more Debriefing information.)

Hall, 1984).
The Experiential Learning Cycle

SCHOOL/HOME

Concrete Experiences

Transfer to New Situations

Observations and Reflections

Formation of Abstract Concepts and Generalizations

GOAL SETTING AND FULL VALUE CONTRACT

Now What?

What?

So What?

I see, and I forget.
I hear, and I remember.
I do, and I understand.

—ancient Chinese proverb
GRABBing the Right Activity

This curriculum outlines a sequence of activities that we feel will be effective with a majority of standard physical education classes. However, it is impossible to predict exactly what is appropriate for every class at every stage in this program. Following is a very simple guide to help educators decide whether or not each activity in the given sequence is appropriate for their classes. The art of making a K-12 or multi-year curriculum work, however, is in “saving” some activities for later grades. If this is not respected, students participating in the same activity year after year are robbed of the spirit of wonder and surprise that so often accompanies Adventure. If you do need to GRABB another activity, try to select one of the Adventure activities that are designed to be done in your particular grade. Here are some simple questions to consider before choosing an alternative activity, or when deciding if a specific activity is appropriate. (Project Adventure uses the acronym GRABBSS to reinforce these key considerations about your students’ particular situation and stage of development.)

GOALS. How does this activity relate to the goals the group has set, your goals for the lesson and your goals for the class?

READINESS. Is the group ready to do this activity? Are they emotionally and physically prepared? Do they have the necessary skills to attempt and complete the activity? If not, can the activity be altered to meet their level of readiness? Is there something that can help them increase their level of readiness?

AFFECT. What is the feeling of the group? Are they excited and energetic, or are they apathetic and low-energy? What is the level of empathy in the group? Are students at a stage where they can emotionally support each other?

BEHAVIOR. How is the group acting? Are they agreeable or disruptive? How does the group interact with each other? Are they positive or negative? Will their behavior be appropriate for this activity?

BODY. Is the group physically ready for this activity? Are they too tired, are they too hyper? If touch is involved, is that OK for this group at this time?

SETTING. What is your setting for the lesson? Are you outside? What is the weather? What are the physical conditions of the ground? Are you inside and near any obstacles? Is your space limited? Is the space quiet enough for the reflection you have chosen?

STAGE. At what stage of group development is your class in? Are they ready for a more difficult activity, or do they need to return to some basic norm setting? Do they need additional skills to work together better?
FINAL TIPS FOR TEACHERS

Leading Adventure activities can be a new experience for many physical educators. Here are some basic tips that will go a long way toward ensuring your success. In reviewing these, consider how some suggestions can also enhance your traditional physical education instruction. Remember, Adventure is not about what you do, but more about how you do it!

1. **Appear spontaneous.** Sometimes you also need to be spontaneous, but at a minimum, appear as casual as possible as you do the activities. This will keep students wondering, "What the heck will he ask us to do next?" They like the surprise element.

2. **Use this curriculum as a guide.** As mentioned already, we have put a lot of thought into the sequence of activities. However, you know your students best. Do what is appropriate using your GRABBSS guide.

3. **Be playful.** How you brief (prepare students for) an activity often sets that activity up for success or failure. If you are asking students to do something playful, join in and be playful, too. The framing notes for each activity are just suggestions for how to brief; make your stories relevant to you and your students.

4. **Have more prepared than you think you need.** Adventure activities can be unpredictable. You never know when an activity you thought would take 30 minutes takes only 10. Have a good "bag of tricks" available so that when you have extra time, you have plenty to fill it with.

5. **Be flexible.** We can't say this enough ... sometimes the right activity for the moment becomes apparent only at the last minute. Go with your gut.

6. **Don't be afraid of the discussions.** Students often like to talk! Yet, they so rarely are given chances for real reflection. Relax and go with the tenor of the conversation. If students are silent, ask better questions, or move to small-group discussions.

7. **Be communicative.** For a sequential curriculum to work, educators must keep the lines of communication open with their colleagues. Share what you are learning about what works and what doesn't so that the entire department can benefit.

8. **Keep safety in mind.** Adventure activities can go in many directions. It continues to be the teacher's responsibility to manage the safety of the class. Help students learn to manage their own safety as well.

9. **Keep the Full Value Contract, the Experiential Learning Cycle and Challenge by Choice present.** These are cornerstones principles of Adventure that are essential.

10. **Have fun!**
As indicated in the Introduction to this program, assessment is a complex topic that touches on a variety of educational issues. One’s own philosophy of assessment certainly informs the types of assessment that end up being integrated into one’s curriculum. The assessment section in this book has not been included to answer the debate of whether grading students A-F enhances or diminishes overall learning. Nor does it suggest how your department should answer the global question of how to evaluate students’ overall physical education requirements. However, as national and state standards become more prevalent in physical education, so do well—designed assessment tools to help us understand whether the standards that have been set are met. This curriculum offers guidelines and tools for assessing students in the Adventure program described in this volume. We hope that some of these suggestions can both inform your teaching and will be integrated into your existing assessment or evaluation criteria.

BASIC DEFINITIONS

The topic of assessment is so expansive that it is important for educators to agree on a common vocabulary. Following are some terms and definitions that will be used in this section.

**Assessment:** Systematic data gathering, used to make inferences about student progress in achieving designated learning outcomes, based on various sources of evidence

**Evaluation:** Judgment regarding the quality, value or worth of a student’s work and/or performance based upon established criteria and on multiple sources of information—using alternative tools when assessing

**Authentic assessment:** Any form of assessment that emphasizes validity, fairness and the enhancement of learning

**Embedded assessment:** Assessing students while they are involved in the learning process

Adventure activities and experiential programs naturally incorporate frequent embedded assessments. While students are engaged in problem-solving activities, teachers are able to assess performance, evaluate the appropriateness of student behaviors in relation to safety, and predict whether students will be successful so that discussion questions can be framed accordingly. In fact, embedded assessment is usually more present in Adventure activities than in a traditional physical education curriculum, where the number of goals scored determines success.

What is often missing in Adventure programs, however, are authentic assessment tools. How can a teacher assess whether or not a student is actually learning to get along better with others? How does one know that an individual is respecting the differences in the class? Although there may not be a good written test that allows educators to objectively evaluate topics such as these (thankfully), there are authentic assessment tools available that can certainly help assess such characteristics in a group of students.
Which assessment tools are appropriate to use depends on a number of factors, which is why this curriculum does not specify which tools to use when. These factors include:

- Age of the students
- Resources available
- Amount of time available
- Level of evaluation desired
- What you are trying to assess

However, there are some cornerstones to assessment that need to be kept in mind regardless of which tool is used for what purpose.

GOALS

Throughout this curriculum—and throughout a student's educational experience—a variety of goals are being set. These goals may be student—driven, teacher—driven, even district—and/or state—driven. Regardless of where these goals are generated, they should form the basis of student assessment. Data must be collected to help teachers and administrators understand if these goals are being achieved. Moreover, within each goal, it is important to clarify the level of "knowing" expected. For example, there is a significant difference between being able to identify something versus being able to do something. The clearer the goal, the clearer the assessment objective.

In the program described here, the Learning Outcomes detailed in each lesson provide a solid framework for class goals as they pertain to specific activities. Some activities ask students to set goals for themselves, which also become relevant in the assessment process. As you read through the Learning Outcomes, it will become obvious that some goals are easier to assess than others. For example, if an outcome is, "Every student can identify each classmate by name," this is easy to assess quickly. If the outcome reads, "Students will understand the different strengths and weaknesses in the class," a rubric style of assessment—and significantly more time—may be appropriate.

GIVING FEEDBACK

Regardless of which tool is used, assessment should include giving feedback to students so that they can continue to learn. This feedback should encompass information on areas of strength as well as areas needing improvement. Adventure activities provide many opportunities for this feedback to occur, both from teachers and from peers. A process that incorporates feedback is so much more meaningful to students than being given letter grades with no explanation as to what the letter grades mean. All that students learn from this process is that they have received a C, for example, instead of an A. With feedback, students have a clear understanding of specific areas needing development and specific areas of strength from which they can grow. Be aware, though, that feedback needs to be approached carefully—with thorough consideration of what is being
said and how it might be heard. You may want to conduct a short lesson on feedback before engaging students in any peer feedback sessions.

LEVEL OF ASSESSMENT

There are two key levels of assessment involved in the measurement of learning and growth: one for students and one for teachers. Student assessment is more prevalent and should focus on whether students have achieved the objectives of a particular lesson or unit. Did each student reach the desired level of understanding as set by both student and teacher?

Assessing the teacher involves assessing the effectiveness of the lesson implementation. Did the group have a chance to achieve the learning outcomes? Could the activity have been framed differently? Did the teacher use GRABBSS effectively in choosing what to do when?

Both of these assessment levels—student and teacher—can be addressed in a self—assessment format, a peer assessment format or in a teacher-supervisor format. Be careful when using a peer assessment model as a grading tool. Parents expect that an adult will grade their child, so teacher assessment should be incorporated in the final peer—assessed grade. In fact, we believe that using a variety of formats and getting feedback from a variety of levels provides individuals with the most comprehensive picture of their progress.

AUTHENTIC ASSESSMENT TOOLS

A variety of assessment tools are described below for your review and consideration. In each case, basics of each tool are highlighted. At the end of this section, some examples of specific assessment options that can be used directly in this curriculum are included. We fully expect that in order for you to thoroughly assess your students in a way that meets the evaluation criteria of your school, you will take these options and create a "system" that meets your needs. Staff members at Project Adventure are available for consultation in this process as well.

Rubrics

Rubrics incorporate criteria and standards to be evaluated that students know about in advance. For example, a traditional assessment tool may rate a student on a scale of 1—4 in a particular skill area, yet the that rating criteria may never be explained to the student. A rubric, on the other hand, clarifies in detail the level of understanding or mastery that each number represents, and these numbers are applied to the specific area being assessed. An example of such a rubric follows.

SAMPLE SCORING RUBRIC
1 = Unable to perform the skill
2 = Able to perform the skill with difficulty
3 = Able to perform the skill well
4 = Able to perform the skill at an advanced level
Students are aware of these criteria while they engage in their activities. This enables them to understand what, in fact, the goals of each lesson are. Teacher expectations and goals are thus clarified.

Observation with Checklist

A good checklist is very similar to a rubric if it includes a clear structure outlining what is being evaluated and how. Once again, when shared with students ahead of time, checklists help them to understand their progress and set personal goals. Checklists and rubrics can also be used effectively as peer assessment tools.

Journals

Journals are a very common authentic assessment tool, as they provide students with a wonderful opportunity to reflect on particular events or classes. This reflection can be left as a free—form medium, where the goal is to see that students have reflected on key aspects of a class, or they can be structured, with guiding questions to be answered in a journal—like medium. These guiding questions can be quite broad and act merely as catalysts for reflection, such as, "I am proud of what I did when..." Allowing for some unstructured writing is recommended. The use in Adventure programs has proved to be very powerful.

Self—Assessment Questions or Worksheets

When your intent is to keep journals a free—form reflection tool for students, structured self-assessment questions can be introduced in the form of worksheets. These sheets should include a variety of components, including open—ended questions for students to answer as well as rubrics or checklist models requiring students to rate themselves.

Projects

The expression of what someone has learned can be captured powerfully in special projects. When given the opportunity to develop skits, create posters, make videos or use some other creative form to demonstrate their key learning points, students often shine. Students and teachers alike can be surprised and impressed by the depth of understanding that this type of assessment can exhibit. Obviously, such projects take time and commitment, but when appropriate, they can be outstanding.

Standardized Assessment Tools

Information is available about more formal assessment tools, including their reliability and validity coefficients and the populations for which they are normed. Such information can be found through the Buros Institute of Mental Measurements (www.unl.edu/buros).

Specific Assessment Tools Designed for this Curriculum (Grades 6—8)

The following tools can be used, as they are written, with this curriculum. However, there is plenty of flexibility allowed so that you can redesign these tools to meet any specific requirements that exist in your program. We have included tools for teachers to assess both individual students and whole classes, tools for peer assessment and tools for self—assessment. Also included in the lessons themselves are numerous suggested assessment opportunities.
• Prepare students for future physiological needs in warmups. If you know that swing ropes will be used later in the program, for example, add arm-strengthening opportunities to your warmups.

Help with Applying GRABSS

During the warmup phase of a lesson, make a note of key pieces of information that can help you with activity selection or reselection, framing ideas, even rule variations. Classes have moods; a teacher can observe the mood of a class as students act especially playful in a warmup, for instance, or as they ignore the Full Value Contract in a tag game, or as they move carefully in a running activity.

What we mean by this is simple. Try to use warmups that are fun and engaging. A list is provided here for your reference. The key activity of every lesson will be much more successful if students are properly warmed up and if they are in the spirit of Adventure before beginning. And, remember this simple concept: Use warm-ups that are appropriate to Adventure programming.

There are literally hundreds of warm-ups that can be used. Following is a sample list of reliable warm-ups; these are referenced in some Project Adventure publications (listed in the right column of the chart that follows).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Publication Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Back to Earth</td>
<td>Cowstalls II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bottoms-Up Stretch</td>
<td>Cowstalls II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Como Esta Usted?</td>
<td>Back Pocket Adventure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Copy Cat</td>
<td>Quicksilver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Dog Shake</td>
<td>Silver Bullets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Everybody's Up</td>
<td>Adventures in Peacemaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Impulse</td>
<td>Cowstalls II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Inchworm</td>
<td>Cowstalls II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. King Frog</td>
<td>Adventures in Peacemaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mrs. O'Grady</td>
<td>Silver Bullets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Pass the Shoe</td>
<td>Adventures in Peacemaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Red Baron Stretch</td>
<td>Cowstalls II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Robart Tag</td>
<td>Back Pocket Adventure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Row Boat Stretch</td>
<td>Cowstalls II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Sacky Hack</td>
<td>Silver Bullets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Stork Stretch</td>
<td>Silver Bullets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Triangle Tag</td>
<td>Silver Bullets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Twelve Hours of Cooperation</td>
<td>Adventures in Peacemaking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Wamsamsam</td>
<td>Back Pocket Adventure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Weird Walkin'</td>
<td>Back Pocket Adventure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Wiz Bang</td>
<td>Quicksilver</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX 4: DEBRIEFING

The doing of a particular activity can be powerful. Likewise, reflecting on and debriefing about the activity can be enlightening. An experiential educator needs to use a balance of both doing and reflecting to make teaching and learning most effective. Recall the Experiential Learning Cycle that was described in the Introduction. This theoretical model highlights the role of the debrief as a chance for a number of key things to occur. These include replaying important moments in the activity so that everyone is reminded of what actually happened, and forming some generalizations about behaviors and team or individual performance. The final step in this process is helping students to understand how to transfer these generalizations to other activities—and, most importantly, to other real-life situations.

Facilitation of the Experiential Learning Cycle process is often referred to as the Adventure Wave.

```
DOING
(THE PLAYING)

BRIEFING
(THE FRAMING)

DEBRIEFING
(THE DISCUSSION)
```

The Adventure Wave is a simple way of describing the steps that are already designed and incorporated into each lesson. The start of the Wave is the Brief or Framing of the activity. This sets the stage for what is to be done, in essence creating the atmosphere. The Doing or Playing is the actual performance/execution of the activity. The end of the Wave is the Debrief or Discussion period, that critical step where students are given an opportunity to glean important learning from what they have done. Not every individual game needs to go through this Wave, but every lesson or series of games should. As educators become more comfortable with Adventure activities, it becomes easier for them to know when to take the time to step back and reflect and when it is better to move on. Overprocessing can be as deadly as underprocessing.

Discussion is the most prevalent debriefing technique used in Adventure education today. It is also the most common technique that is overused. A good discussion session can be terrific. Yet, if done after every activity, with no other medium through which students can express themselves, those who are uncomfortable about speaking to the group, auditory learners and nonverbal learners can be lost. Discussion, day in and day out, can also get boring. So, a balanced approach is often the most effective way in which to keep students’ interest in the reflection
aspect of the Adventure Wave. As mentioned in the Introduction, the Debrief should review the basic themes of “What happened?”, “So what about what has occurred?”, and the critical transfer, “Now what do we do with this information?”

After each activity in this book a list of discussion questions is included. These can serve as topic suggestions that can either be discussed or explored in a variety of different ways. Following are some of the different ways in which to approach a Debrief.

Debriefing Techniques

TRIADS AND DYADS: The difference between talking in front of a large class versus talking to a partner is dramatic for many students. Splitting the class into twos or threes is a wonderful way to gain more participation in the discussion. Often, it is effective to have small groups share key points of their discussions with the larger class.

• VIDEO: Ask the class to close their eyes while you do a brief guided imagery of the initiative that you are debriefing. As you guide them through the factual review of what happened, ask students to “stop the video,” mentally and silently, on a particular frame that is poignant for them individually. The frame should be relevant to the theme you are focusing on. When your imagery is done, ask students to share with the class the frames that they have selected.

• SNAPSHOT: As in the video technique above, ask students to reflect silently on the past initiative. Individually, they are to take a mental snapshot of a key moment, frame it in a particular frame, and then verbally present this snapshot to the class.

PLAY DOUGH: Nonverbal students often love this. Ask each person or small group to create a play dough representation to answer a question posed or to illustrate their reaction or thoughts on an activity or event.

• PIPE CLEANERS: Easier to store and less messy than play dough, pipe cleaners can serve the same function as play dough.

FEELINGS MARKETPLACE CARDS: These are a "must have" in your Adventure bag of tricks. This series of cards, each with a feeling creatively written on it, are very versatile. In general, they offer students a choice of words to select to help them share or explain their emotions about whatever you are debriefing. The cards can be selected to describe oneself, given to someone else as a feedback tool, to describe the class or the group, etc. Be creative with these cards.

• STATUE OR POSTURE: Kinesthetic learners will be engaged when asked to stand in postures or as statues to describe their reflections on an activity. Small-group and full-class statues are effective as well.

JOURNALS: Journal writing can be both an assessment tool and a reflection tool. Asking students to spend time reflecting in their journals, and then verbally sharing key points with partners or the class, can help those who are comfortable with
writing to share their thoughts with the group. If journaling is used, be sure to tell people before they write that they will be asked to share their thoughts. If you are collecting the journals, do not correct for grammar and spelling. Let the journals be a place where students feel free to express themselves.

BUMPER STICKERS OR HEADLINERS: Have students create individual bumper stickers or newspaper headlines that capture the performance of the class (or other situations you may assign). Providing colorful markers makes this an even more creative outlet for the artists in the class.

HIGH-LOW, QUICK WHIPS, ONE WORD: These are all large- or small-group debriefing techniques that can vary the typical discussion format. They are often used after completing high challenge course activities. For High-Low, ask each person to describe his or her personal high for an activity, and then the personal low. Quick Whips and One Word debriefs involve simply asking students to quickly say the one word or sentence that describes what they felt about a particular event or activity.
DEBRIEFING TIPS FOR TEACHERS

1. Don't be afraid of debriefing. Students will talk, share and reflect if given the right tools.

2. Be flexible. If one question does not elicit any response, ask a different one or use a different technique.

3. Don't overprocess. Sometimes it is more powerful to just move on to the next activity, allowing the group to transfer their learning naturally.

4. Use a circle. Creating a physical setting that allows for good discussion and sharing is important. Standing or sitting in rows, or with some students not able to see others, can create a negative environment.

5. Try new things. Don't get caught just asking questions. Give some of the above suggestions a try!

6. Don't ask, "How did that make you feel?" over and over again. Feeling questions are hard to answer.

7. Be playful even in the Debrief. The discussion does not have to be heavy.

8. Be careful of any cans of worms you may open. If a Debrief begins to get heavy, make sure that you have the skills—and the time—to manage or terminate the topic appropriately.

9. Stay focused on the lesson outcomes when preparing questions. Keep the goals of the activity in mind as you design the Debrief.

10. Listen. Students will have a lot to say and will say it in different ways. Listen.
Appendix F: ABL Facilitation Checklist
Facilitation Rubric

Teacher will facilitate an adventure based learning lesson that includes a debrief session:

Lesson Number/ Activities: ________________________________

Scoring: YES = 1 point NO = 0 points

2 points for Debrief Section

Preparation for class
- Equipment and facilities ready for use and uses appropriate activities from lesson plans yes no

Facilitation
- Able to provide an appropriate brief to frame the activity yes no
- Rules and safety were clearly explained yes no
- Checks for student understanding – not just asking if there are any questions yes no
- Teacher allows groups to work through the problem without solving it for them yes no

Debriefing
- Used alternative method or tool other than asking “What Happened” to start the debriefing session yes no
- Allowed each group member opportunity to give input during debriefing session yes no
- Clearly covered the “So What” question during the debriefing session yes no
- Clearly covered the “Now What” questions during the debriefing session yes no
- Provided a clear link between the purpose of the activity and what the group learned during the debriefing session yes no

Class climate
- Exhibits enthusiasm and provides positive feedback yes no
- Good time management (activity and debrief session are appropriate) yes no

TOTAL POSSIBLE POINTS: 12 Points Earned: ____

Additional Comments: Teachers will engage in self-reflection following their facilitation.
Appendix G: Participant E-Journal Sample Questions
Below are sample questions that are similar to the types of questions presented to participants following their facilitation of an ABL lesson each day. Questions used for the e-journals will emerge based on each teacher’s facilitation. Participants will be presented with 3-4 questions per day.

1. Reflect on initial experiences in gathering students for activities, presenting a brief, and getting students into activities

2. Reflect on your role as a facilitator throughout all of today’s activities, including successes/ frustrations that you may have had

3. Talk about your use of the debrief in today’s class. Was it effective?

4. Comment on your overall impression of the first day in leading activities

5. Reflect on your comfort level in leading the activities, including the time during the brief, the activity, and the debrief.

6. How are students responding to these activities?

7. Reflect on a positive experience from today’s class. What made it a positive experience?

8. What would help you to better lead these activities to students?

9. What is your perception of students’ response to the ABL unit? Does student perception influence your teaching? Discuss.

10. How could this unit and these activities be modified to best meet the needs of your students?

11. How have you used the lesson plan in your daily teaching? Do you refer to it during teaching? Have you added or taken away elements in each lesson?
Appendix H: Content Knowledge Assessment
Section One

1. What does building community in the classroom mean to you?

2. Why is this important within the context of the physical education classroom?

3. What is an emotionally safe classroom?

4. What do the following terms mean to you:
   a. Challenge by Choice
   b. Full Value Contract
   c. Goal Setting within ABL?

5. What is inclusion by choice and why is this concept important for teachers to utilize during physical education?

6. What is the Experiential Learning Cycle? Explain all four phases in the cycle.

7. Please explain the debriefing process.

8. What are some debriefing strategies that you believe are the most important for student learning to occur within your classroom? Why?
9. Frank (2001) states, “It is not the activity that dictates what is accomplished, but the level at which the group is operating” (p. 247)? Why is this important for a teacher to understand and follow?

Section Two

10. On page 13 in AC is a list of teaching tips for implementing and facilitating adventure education. Please choose the top 3 tips that you would make sure you followed if you had to plan an adventure education lesson. Why these 3? Please explain your rationale for choosing these 3 tips.

11. What you believe adventure education is all about (i.e. what is it)?

12. Why is adventure education important to use in PE?

13. How should a teacher sequence the activities (The first set of activities should be community building)?

Section Three

14. On the first day of class students may feel anxious, nervous, or maybe scared of the unknown. What you would tell your students on the first day of class that might lower their anxiety or help them feel as though the environment is a safe place to learn?