

Section III

Is This Worth Doing?

What's Worth Doing: Reflections on an After-School Program in a Denver Elementary School

Nicholas J. Cutforth

How can concerned physical educators in higher education show more of a commitment to addressing the growing crisis among children and youth? A physical activity-based after-school program in a Denver elementary school provides the context for an account of how I, as a third-year tenure track assistant professor, have answered the question, "What's worth doing?" Ongoing program evaluation and dissemination of demonstrable results ensures that my work is not merely a service activity but also applied, scholarly research. In this essay, I trace the three-year history of the program, describe my struggles and successes, and conclude with my reflections on the personal benefits and strains which accompany my commitment to undertaking community work.

In 1994, a report by the Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development warned that societal change has left nearly 50% of American young people with large amounts of unsupervised discretionary time, while subjecting them to growing pressures to experiment with drugs, engage in sex, and turn to violence to resolve conflicts (Carnegie Council, 1994). These warnings come at a time when the general public is expecting universities to shed their cloth of traditional insularity, to become engaged with solving social problems, and to be jointly responsible for reform of society in partnership with local schools, civic leaders, and parents (Plater, 1995). There is an urgent need for professors, particularly those working in institutions located in large metropolitan areas, to respond both to the Carnegie Council's distressing warning and to

Nicholas J. Cutforth is with the College of Education at the University of Denver, Denver, CO 80208. He is the chairperson of the DU/Northwestside Schools Partnership: United for Educational Excellence, a collaborative venture between the University of Denver and three Denver public schools.

the public's demand that they pursue activities that are focused on the world literally outside the university's door. However, in the past, with a few notable exceptions, universities have focused their collective intelligence on other matters. Attempts to be responsive to the neighboring community's needs have often been conceived as marginal by the professorate.

During graduate school, I was part of a group of faculty and doctoral students who developed and implemented alternative physical education programs for underserved children and youth in Chicago. These community programs used sports and physical activity instruction as vehicles to teach personal and social responsibility primarily through a variety of reflection and empowerment strategies (Hellison, 1995). The organizers believed that it was possible to serve through teaching in neighboring schools while simultaneously conducting research into the impact of the programs. Research and service were no longer fragmented and separate goals, but instead were reconceptualized as service-based scholarship and thus became essential and integrated functions of both doctoral students' and university professors' work.

What follows is one tenure track assistant professor's answer (so far) to the question, "What's worth doing?" Although one answer could be found in the culture of doctoral programs and in tenure and promotion committee guidelines, that answer has come under increasing attack, particularly from those who advocate a return to our collective social conscience, our activism, our passion for connection with and improvement of practice (Hellison, 1992; Lawson & Hooper-Briar, 1994). In this article, I discuss the development of an after-school program from its inception through its three-year history. Next, I elaborate on the program's struggles and successes and offer evidence of benefits to the students. Finally, I reflect on the personal benefits and strains which I experience while undertaking community work.

Program Background

For the past two years, I have been teacher/director of an after-school program that meets twice weekly in the gym of an elementary school located in an economically depressed neighborhood in northwest Denver. The program serves 4th and 5th grade Mexican American boys and girls, and the purpose is to use physical activity—more specifically sport and exercise—to help them take more responsibility for their own welfare (e.g., performing effectively in and out of school) and for becoming more sensitive and responsive to the welfare of others (e.g., caring for and including others). Five affective goals (Hellison, 1995) provide guidelines for becoming more responsible by identifying specific characteristics. Two of these goals—effort and self-direction—address the students' responsibility for personal development; another two—respect for the rights and feelings of others and caring for and helping others—address the students' social and moral responsibility for their relationships with others and as a member of groups. The fifth goal focuses on transfer of responsibility from the program to the rest of school, the playground, "the street," and the home.

The after-school program is my attempt to blend service and research in ways that do not oversimplify research. Students' self-reports, my reflective

journal, and end-of-year interview data comprise the ongoing scholarship component of the program. Information is obtained concerning what is experienced and learned in the program; whether and how students perform more effectively in and out of school by showing greater effort and self-direction in their academic and social life; whether students become more sensitive, respectful, and responsive to the welfare of others; and whether the lessons learned in the program transfer to other environments. This information advances the knowledge base concerning the potential of physical education to produce students who possess essential social skills and who are able to make responsible decisions in their daily lives (see, for example, Cutforth & Parker, 1996) and has been shared through publications and presentations to teachers, teacher educators, and other researchers (see, for example, Hellison & Cutforth, in press; Hellison, Martinek, & Cutforth, 1996). Thus, my work is not merely a service activity but also applied, scholarly research. Furthermore, the deliberate attempt to apply knowledge of and expertise in physical activity programs to the alleviation of social problems, together with immediate dissemination of demonstrable results, conforms to Ernest Boyer's notion of the "scholarship of application" (Boyer, 1991).

Program Implementation

Getting My Foot in the Door

Immediately after taking up my new position at the University of Denver, I began to search for a site to undertake community-based work. I contacted the principal of the northwest Denver elementary school and explained the philosophy behind my proposed after-school program. A week later, I presented my ideas to the faculty, informing them that I was interested in teaching an after-school program in their school and explaining the purposes of the program. At this meeting I also addressed two questions that professors who are interested in working in schools often have to answer. In reply to the question, "How often are you going to come here?" I stated that I planned on teaching the students once a week for at least a year and probably longer, and that this was not just another example of a university person making a brief foray into their school. (The principal later told me that several teachers were surprised that I wanted to run such a program, saying in effect, "Why doesn't he just stay in his office at the university and write articles—that's what most professors do!") To the question, "Is this just a research project?" I said that my motivation for getting involved in their school was primarily to try out some ideas that are intended to make a positive contribution to children's lives and not just to collect data for a research venture. However, I did say that I would be writing articles about the program eventually using the students' journals, my reflections, and possibly some interview data, and that I would be sharing some of the results with students at the university, as well as in academic and professional journals. I ended by asking the teachers to give their principal the names of students who they thought might benefit from the program.

It has been my experience that teachers are often skeptical about both my motivation to work with their students and my ability to control them. Consequently, these teachers are unwilling to recommend students for a program

organized by a stranger from the university who has no track record at their school. After this meeting, however, the 4th and 5th grade teachers felt that many of their students would benefit from the program and soon provided a list of 20 students who would comprise the after-school program.

The First Year

The students were referred to the program by their teachers for a variety of reasons. These reasons are perhaps best summarized by the principal as, "All kids are needy here, but the kids in your program are extra needy because of their behavior, attitude toward school, and lack of social skills." Many have troubles and fears that emanate from their often-violent urban neighborhood and, in some cases, from disconnected, chaotic family lives. A few examples illustrate the challenges that these students present: Mercedes has experienced sexual abuse at home and harbors a considerable amount of anger and is always threatening "to quit" the program; Victor has a veneer of toughness which induces him to goad others with unkind words or actions; John is a shy fellow but is prone to lash out at others at the slightest provocation; Edwin's mood swings mean that he is likely to be friendly and cooperative one moment but to disintegrate into tears the next, the perceived victim of others' injustice.

During the program's first year, I taught the students once each week for one hour after school. Lessons typically began with stretching and fitness exercises, then included tag games and cooperative games, skill practices in volleyball, soccer, or basketball, and modified small-sided games. Throughout the year, two data sources provided information about the effects of the program as it unfolded: the students wrote self-reports in the form of end-of-class journals which provided me with a record of their feelings about the program and its impact on them, and I kept a journal of reflections of each session that recorded the affective strategies employed, how often, and to what extent the children were engaged in these activities. The students' journals were replete with comments such as "I am working on being better," "I like playing basketball," "I learned to pass the ball to other people," and "I didn't like today." My reflections contained both positive and negative reactions to the students' responses to the activities.

As the year progressed, it became clear that the large class size coupled with the challenging behavior of several students was creating a conflict between my personal and social responsibility goals and my classroom management strategies. When teaching for personal and social development, I am inclined to resist authoritarian inclinations and practices in favor of providing individual attention that students who have not been successful in school need. However, throughout the first year of the program, my journal contained evidence that management issues were causing me to abandon my preferred flexible and informal teaching style, hindering the overall effectiveness of the program. For example, "I couldn't focus on both soccer games because I was too concerned about management issues," "The kids knew I was getting angry and that only made things worse," "Several students told me that it wasn't good today," "Ricardo had been in trouble in school and never really settled down in class today. How can I deal with all his problems when I have 19

other kids to teach?" and "I am frustrated about not being able to reach some of the kids." While on most occasions I was able to deal successfully with the challenges presented by individual students, there were several instances of failure. For example, according to my journal entries, I did not always view troublesome students in a positive light. Also, my inability to deal effectively with some of the more difficult students meant that, on occasion, they verbally abused other students. Therefore, some program members did not always experience a psychologically safe environment and thus were not regular attendees.

My end-of-year evaluation provided further evidence of the varying degree of success of the program (Hellison & Cutforth, in press). During interviews, some of the students' comments showed that they learned the explicit values expressed in the levels of responsibility, that they experienced them and reflected upon their relevance. For example, "The program taught me to control my temper and now I don't lose it so fast," "I learned to have faith in myself," "When I achieved my goal I felt great," and "In the program, people learned to like everybody." However, comments from other students indicated minimal interaction with the personal and social goals of the program. They tended to couch their experience and development in relation to the physical activities provided in the program—"I learned how to play basketball," "I got stronger and fitter," "I'm better at volleyball," "The program was a lot of fun."

During interviews with teachers it became clear that my program, while popular among most of the participants, had not generated any noticeable behavior and attitude changes in many of their students. The conclusions from my evaluation were clear: I had achieved only a limited degree of success in conveying the personal and social goals of the program to the participants. On further reflection, I concluded that this limitation had its origins in the relatively large number of students who were being served by the program, the resulting management problems which often occurred, and the tendency of these management problems to divert my teaching focus away from the personal and social responsibility goals of the program.

The Second Year

As I planned for the second year of the program, I explored ways to make changes that would reduce the management challenges and increase the potential for achieving the personal and social development goals of the program. Fortunately, I was awarded a small grant from a local foundation which enabled me to obtain some release time from university teaching duties and devote more of my time to the program. My desire to increase the potential impact of the program on the students was reflected in my decision to double the number of class meetings to two a week. My concern about the management challenges of the previous year led me to consider ways to involve additional teaching help.

My trepidation at expanding the program was alleviated considerably by two instances of good fortune. First, after a social event for incoming graduate students at which I briefly outlined the program, two female students responded to my request for volunteer assistance and soon became integral parts of the program. Second, I remembered that during the end-of-year interviews,

three 5th-grade boys had mentioned that they were going to miss the program when they were in a neighboring middle school. These students were about to enter 6th grade and asked if they could continue to be involved in the following year's program as assistant teachers. I assented to their request, and to my surprise and delight, these students did return the second year and became reliable and valued helpers throughout the program. Although I did not provide the assistant teachers with any formal training in teaching, they worked effectively with the 4th and 5th graders in small groups, coached teams, and even disciplined individual students on occasion. Their regular attendance shows that urban children and youth have a need for association with relevant activities, and that they will respond positively to activities which promote autonomy, self-confidence, and self-determination. Growing in maturity and becoming competent and popular leaders, they were exemplary students who ignored the pressure to join neighborhood gangs.

The middle school and graduate students made invaluable contributions in numerous ways to the effectiveness of the program. Interestingly, the benefits of this involvement for these two parties is worthy of investigation. For example, Viko, one of the assistant teachers, provided some insight when he said, "It's great fun helping the kids and teaching them self-control skills. When I was in the program last year, I learned to encourage my team members. Now I'm trying to teach the kids what I learned." The graduate students believe that this opportunity succeeded in enabling them to connect their coursework with practice as well as shattering their previously held myths about urban schools and children. As one said, "I had the typical stereotypes of these kids [but] since participating in the program, the kids are real to me. They have so many strengths, and they need guidance to develop their skills."

The additional contact time and staff increased the potential of the program to address all students' needs in three ways. First, the improvement in the teacher/student ratio resulted in students receiving more individualized attention both in terms of skill development and in progressing toward personal and social goals. For example, during most sessions, students made participation choices between several skills and activities, and their progress was continuously monitored by the staff, who knew each student's aptitude and ability. Second, in comparison to the program's first year, interpersonal relations were much improved. When the students are better known and understood, it is easier to counsel those whose attention needs to be directed toward the priorities of the program. The additional help also made it less likely to overlook students who were more independent and who did not exhibit behavior or attitude problems. Third, there was evidence that the students were experiencing a sense of belonging to a valued group. Attendance was more consistent and a sense of community much more evident. For example, there was greater participation in group meetings, as students volunteered opinions about activities, commented on the actions of themselves and fellow students, and made suggestions about activities. Judging by the regular requests from other students to join the program, it appeared that students currently in the program were conveying positive feelings about their experiences to their peers.

Also, teachers' and the principal's actions and words suggested that they approved of the program and understood its purpose. The principal related an

incident that took place at a school council meeting in which she responded to a parent's criticism of the program being a waste of time in relation to more pressing literacy and numeracy needs of the students. Apparently, she told him that my program was of much benefit to the overall development of students and said that "Mr. Cutforth really knows what he's doing." One teacher commented that she had noticed positive changes in the behaviors and attitudes of certain students in the program, and another asked whether two new students, who were having social and academic difficulties in the classroom, could join the program.

The Third Year

The three 6th graders' fine example during the second year prompted five graduates of the 1995-96 program to ask to become leaders in this year's program. With a total of eight middle schoolers now committing to the program, I have decided to conceptualize their involvement into a service-learning experience. In September 1996, *Project Lead* began with the eight middle schoolers (now called apprentice teachers) participating in six one-hour training sessions to familiarize them with the program model and their roles. Graduate students and I provided instruction in teaching and coaching procedures, conflict resolution, communication skills, and time management. The apprentice teachers were treated to dinner at a local restaurant after successfully completing the training program. In October 1996, the after-school program for 4th and 5th graders began, and the apprentice teachers put their knowledge into positive action by using their newly acquired skills as teachers in the program. In the coming year, in addition to their program responsibilities, the apprentice teachers will participate in several enrichment activities, including visits to the University of Denver campus where members of the Latino Student Alliance will take them to lectures and show them dormitories, the library, the student union, and sports facilities. Also they will attend lectures by guest speakers about pertinent issues and visit sporting and cultural events. I anticipate that *Project Lead* will be a continuous and long-term intervention which will help these young people deal with the pressure of their peer group and neighborhood, improving their chances of being able to assume a positive role in society.

Project Lead will be evaluated in five ways: survey data will track the apprentice teachers' academic performance, attitude toward school, and attitude toward the program; I will record the apprentice teachers' attendance and teaching performance in my personal journal; the apprentice teachers will record their reactions to their progress in the program in personal journals; program activities will be videotaped; and the apprentice teachers will be interviewed to evaluate the impact of this experience on their sense of self-worth and their vision for the future. Evaluation research will consider whether *Project Lead* is a meaningful alternative to self-destructive behaviors such as gang activity and other criminal involvement, has a positive effect on academic achievement, and leads to an increased sense of competence and aspiration for the future.

What began as a one-man project at an elementary school now has expanded to include middle school and graduate students as well. In January

1996, I sought additional support from faculty colleagues and northwest Denver principals by initiating the Urban Task Force. Later renamed the DU/Northwestside Schools Partnership: United for Educational Excellence, this forum allows the University of Denver to connect theory and practice and be increasingly involved in the shaping of the lives of future generations of urban children and youth in this community.

Personal Reflections About Adopting an Ethic of Service

Recently, two representatives from the foundation that funds the after-school program observed a class session in the gymnasium. After the students had left, they asked me about the program, about the needs of the students, and about the surrounding neighborhood. Toward the end of the discussion, one of the representatives asked, "Why do you do this work?" I was stumped by this question and stumbled upon the answer, "Because it seems worth doing." On reflection, this answer is true to the mark yet too simplistic.

I could have answered the question by making reference to links between my program and the academic literature. My program strives to meet three characteristics of successful urban youth programs: access, persisting groups, and challenge (McLaughlin & Irby, 1994; Siedentop, 1996). It is accessible to the students (my graduate students, the apprentice teachers, and I go to the students' school and always show up), safe (after a difficult first year, the program has become a safe place for all students), and attractive to the participants (they keep coming and, as we have seen, evaluations are becoming more positive). The program provides membership in an inclusive, persisting group (the program and its competent and caring leaders are popular among students and their teachers), and the program provides challenging activities which result in real accomplishments as defined by the participants themselves and their teachers.

On the other hand, I could have responded to the foundation's representatives in more personal terms and described how I balance my personal motivation with time constraints and self-doubt. Clearly working in an urban community contrasts strongly with the routine work of university life: teaching classes, advising students, serving on committees, and writing articles. Community work is difficult and sometimes draining (yet ultimately immensely satisfying). It is an adventure, like plunging into an activity whose outcome is uncertain and unpredictable. When one is committing oneself in an enduring way to such practice, one's internal motivations are important. Service involves a personal sense of striving to leave a positive mark on students and schools which, in turn, comes from one's commitment to understand, to contribute to, even to meliorate human affairs (Coles, 1993).

Furthermore, there is a time commitment to such work. It takes time to perceive and understand the needs of students, especially in a time of social and cultural change. My service work occupies my thoughts long after I have left the teaching environment. This work requires me to think holistically about my program in terms of content, aims, and approaches to education. In concrete terms, I am asking if it is worthwhile for these students to have an opportunity to learn in my program, and this question influences my planning and how I teach the curriculum to the students. Undergirding and permeating such deliberations are a strong

value base and the questioning of my educational and social values about what constitutes a proper learning environment—one which is just and fair and in which people are treated fairly.

Often I have real doubts about the success of the program and its impact on the needs of the students, and these uncertainties provoke much self-questioning. There is much frustration, surprise, delight, and sadness in this work. Often I do not know where the work will lead. Understandings and insights emerge, and there are always new possibilities in ways of thinking and working. Also there are the mistakes that seem to take place continually, and along with the desire to make a difference in the lives of students, one also must possess a sense of realism and humility.

Perhaps the best answer to the question, "Why do you do this work?" would have been a combination of the academic and the personal. My after-school program represents my attempt to respond to the social, economic, and health problems of urban areas and, more particularly, to improve the lives of children who have large amounts of unsupervised discretionary time and a need for safe places to go. My experiences represent an ongoing struggle to figure out how to live my life as a physical educator in higher education, and the emerging awareness of my responsibility is best exemplified by the phrase, "You are what you do, not what you talk." To me, what is worth doing is best expressed in my need to embrace a research agenda which acknowledges, rather than ignores, the challenge of building a more just and humane world for students.

References

- Boyer, E.L. (1991). *Scholarship reconsidered: Priorities of the professorate*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Carnegie Council on Adolescent Development. (1994). *A matter of time: Risk and opportunity in the out-of-school hours*. Carnegie Corporation of New York: Author.
- Coles, R. (1993). *The call of service*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Cutforth, N., & Parker, M. (1996). Promoting affective development in physical education: The value of journal writing. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance*, 67(6), 19-23.
- Hellison, D. (1992). If Sargent could see us now: Values and program survival in higher education. *Quest*, 44, 398-411.
- Hellison, D. (1995). *Teaching responsibility through physical activity*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Hellison, D., & Cutforth, N. (in press). Extended day programs for urban children and youth: From theory to practice. In H.J. Walberg, O. Reyes, & R.P. Weissberg (Eds.), *Urban children and youth: Interdisciplinary perspectives on policies and programs*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hellison, D., Martinek, T., & Cutforth, N. (1996). Beyond violence prevention in inner-city physical activity programs: Theoretical and practical issues. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 2(4), 321-337.
- Lawson, H.A., & Hooper-Briar, K. (1994). *Expanding partnerships: Involving colleges and universities in interprofessional collaboration and service integration*. Oxford, OH: The Danforth Foundation and The Institute for Educational Renewal at Miami University.

- McLaughlin, M., & Irby, M. (1994). Urban sanctuaries: Neighborhood organizations that keep hope alive. *Kappan*, 76(4), 300-306.
- Plater, W.M. (1995, May/June). Future work: Faculty time in the 21st century. *Change*, 23-33.
- Siedentop, D. (1996). Valuing the physically active life: Contemporary and future directions. *Quest*, 48, 266-274.

Acknowledgment

I would like to thank Susan Dunlap, Program Assistant in the College of Education at the University of Denver, for her invaluable editorial assistance during the writing of this paper.