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# ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACRONYM</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TLDL</td>
<td><em>The Little Dog Laughed</em>, Animal-Assisted Therapy Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAT</td>
<td>Animal-Assisted Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>Animal-Assisted Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAE</td>
<td>Animal-Assisted Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAR</td>
<td>See-Tag-And-Reward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBIS</td>
<td>Positive Behavioral Intervention Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV</td>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASD</td>
<td>Autism Spectrum Disorder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Animal-assisted interventions compliment virtually all forms of contemporary therapy, in a variety of contexts and with a myriad of populations. One common form of intervention, Positive Behavioral Intervention Support (PBIS), is a particularly common behavioral modification methodology for children with development disability, geriatric populations with dementia or Alzheimer’s, adults and children with neuromuscular problems, and for children of domestic violence. This project reflects a longitudinal program evaluation of an animal-assisted activity program that works specifically with this latter population, child residents of short-term domestic violence shelters. Most animal-assisted interventions are part of an individualized education or therapy program, the interactive sessions are long-term, goal-directed, and outcome driven.

The Little Dog Laughed, Animal-Assisted Therapy Program is a nonprofit organization that engages dog training as a model for non-violent problem solving, psychosocial, and life skills education. In conjunction with behavioral therapy professionals, this program gives opportunities for children of domestic abuse to interact with the dogs in short, 20-minute training sessions once a week. The children are introduced to a learning goal, provided guidelines for respectfully working with the dog, as well as tools (e.g., clickers and hand signals) to promote clear communication between the child and the trained dog model. The opportunities to train and observe outcomes are limited both in terms of the length of each visit as well as the number of visits each residence receives; therefore, evaluating individual outcomes for a program of this kind can be challenging. Behavioral improvement was evaluated through focal observation every 5 minutes for the 15 to 20-minute training sessions over a 12-week period. Improvement was evaluated using seven categorical learning and behavioral domains: 1.) Engagement (e.g., paying attention); 2.) Instruction Compliance; 3.) Concept Recognition; 4.) Attitude (verbalized emotional response to the activities, dog, or the facilitator), 5.) Affect (e.g., non-verbal emotional expression); 6.) Dog Approach/Avoidance; and 7.) Social Civility relative to the goals of TLDL mission statement.

Data was collected over a three-year period from 2013 –2016 with over 200 logged observation hours of TLDL programming, annual reports with recommendations, a pilot phase, formative evaluation, and the final summative evaluation.

Bottom Line: Based on the observational data, The Little Dog Laughed, Animal-Assisted Therapy Program demonstrated efficacy for child residents of two domestic violence shelters. Evidence was established through statistically significant behavioral improvement for each of the seven behavioral constructs (as represented by TLDL mission) within a single 15 to 20-minute animal-assisted activity session. TLDL Animal-Assisted Activity/Therapy model is adaptable to a number of contexts and target populations. It is conceivable that the seven behavioral outcome categories for child residents of domestic violence shelters could be modified for a variety of other populations, including but not limited to assisted living residents, youth and adolescent life skills training, and adults or children with physical or intellectual disability.
PROJECT BACKGROUND

“Our volunteer dog(handler) teams work with therapists/counselors/teachers in their effort to nurture empathy and nonviolent problem solving skills in at-risk youths. We offer a carefully structured set of short classes that teach behavioral skills by engaging the children in actively training our dogs using positive training techniques.”

TLDL Mission Statement

Presenting Problem

In the spring of 2013, The Little Dog Laughed Animal-Assisted Therapy Program contacted the Center for Civic Engagement at Pacific University to find resources in helping them establish a program evaluation for TLDL. The Behavioral Research and Instructional Neuroscience Laboratory responded and with the initial help of the laboratory principal investigator, Heide Island and six psychology college students, a pilot evaluation was underway in the fall of 2013. Granting agencies require evidence-based programming to provide funding support and in the words of the original solicitation email from Linda Keast, Director of The Little Dog Laughed,

“We have no evidence. This is a new model, and our successes fall in the realm of anecdotal. We are looking for a student or class of students willing to help design and document a study that is rigorous and compelling; and we need guidelines on what to capture/document going forward. We wish to be a pilot program for other [animal-assisted activity] groups nationally. While there is a plethora of documentation on the positive effects of animal use in therapy, virtually all major therapy animal organizations (e.g., Pet Partners/Delta Society, Therapy Dogs International) specifically prohibit the use of clickers, off-leash work, or training by the child. Agencies which have incorporated dog training into their therapy programs have established a good track record, but rely on a formal class structure (impractical in many interventions) and the use of shelter dogs (strictly forbidden in Washington Co. facilities). By using therapy dogs, we answer safety concerns and by having “primed the pump” by including only clicker-savvy dogs we are more agile concerning class content and pace. A local elementary school counselor who has incorporated us as a standing part of her work with at-risk kids is 100% behind us, but to reach a wider audience we need an unbiased assessment of the program. We need metrics internally for improvement and externally to validate the program’s efficacy.”

Animal Assisted Interventions Background

Since the early 1970s, animal-assisted programs have been an important part of the corpus of therapeutic options available to both medical patients and mental health clients (Pichot, 2012). Animal-assisted intervention (AAI) is an umbrella term for the inclusion of
animals as part of any number of therapeutic protocols. These interventions describe a variety of animal-assisted programs including: Animal-assisted therapy (AAT), Animal-Assisted Education (AAE), and Animal-Assisted Activity (AAA).

Kruger and Serpel (2006) reported 20 different definitions of animal-assisted therapy (AAT) within the current psychological literature. The ambiguousness of the language defining the scope of animal-assisted interventions lead the Delta Society to publish a standardized rubric for terms and definitions (Delta Society, 1999). As such, Animal-assisted therapy (AAT) is defined as a goal-oriented intervention that uses animals as a fundamental part of the treatment procedure (Palley, O’Rourke, and Niemi, 2010). The typical AAT program is managed and directed by mental health professionals who, through an initial intake assessment, establish individualized therapeutic goals for their clients. Those goals may be achieved in part through the use of animal-assisted therapy. In this context, the term “therapy” broadly refers to any healing, empirically supported, treatment for mental, physical, and behavioral conditions, disorder or injuries. The primary aim of AAT is to foster growth in social, cognitive, behavioral, emotional, and physical functioning (Palley, et. al., 2010). The programs are accomplished in a variety of settings, including residential communities like in-residence hospitals, rehabilitation centers, or outpatient clinics. Although in the cases of larger animals with special environmental needs like horses (e.g., equine-assisted therapy; Berget, Ekeberg, Pedersen, Braastad, 2011) and dolphins (e.g., dolphin-assisted therapy; Nathanson, 1998), patients are taken to farms, petting zoos, aquaria, marine rehabilitation and research centers. The established success of these programs extends to a number of populations including those with: dementia; psychiatric conditions; heart disease; cancer; developmental disabilities; speech and fluency conditions, and attachment disorders (Palley, et. al., 2010). Regardless of the setting or population, for most all AAT the care is outcome-oriented, therefore progress is documented and longitudinal, occurring over a specific period of time, and tailored to each client or patient’s needs (Delta Society, 2015).

In contrast to animal assisted therapy, animal-assisted activities (AAA) are more flexible and less individualized. Animal-assisted activities are often referred to as the “meet and greet” of AAI, with therapy animals, in most cases dogs, visiting hospitals, senior centers, domestic violence shelters, client homes, and schools for the purpose of education, recreation, entertainment, or simply to improve the quality of life for the participants (Souter and Miller, 2007). Although trained professionals or volunteers also facilitate the animal-assisted activities, AAA does not necessarily have a predetermined treatment outcome, the same activity may involve more than one participant, progress is not necessarily recorded, and the participants’ enthusiasm or interest generally drives the length of the visit (Souter and Miller, 2007). The goal of AAA is to improve quality of life, provide life skills training, or simply to assist in education (i.e., Animal-Assisted Education; AAE). The populations AAA serves is however, often the same as those served through AAT: clients or patients with cognitive conditions (e.g., aphasia; Macauley, 2006; Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder; Schuck, Emmerson et al., 2015); adults or children with development disabilities (e.g., autism spectral disorder; Bass, Duchowny, Llabre, 2009); children of sexual abuse (Dietz, Davis, and Pennings, 2012); patients with Alzheimer’s disease (Mossello, Ridolfi et al., 2011); persons with psychiatric conditions (e.g., depression, Souter and Miller, 2007; anxiety, addictions, depression, and schizophrenia, Berget, Ekeberg et al., 2011); patients with a terminal illness or debilitating motor conditions (Caprilli and Messeri, 2006; Serpell, 2012), children of in-patient care (Caprilli and Messeri, 2006); nursing home
residents (Kawamura, Niiyama and Niiyama, 2009), and adjudicated populations (e.g., Jasperson, 2010).

**Presenting Problems and Evaluation Challenges**

Children who witness persistent stressful life events are at risk for behavioral, academic, and developmental difficulties (Dubow and Tisak, 1989). However, it is reasonably well documented that individual coping skills, social support, and life skills training can help mitigate the impact of stress (Altschuler and Ruble, 1989). In a country where annually more than 3 million children experience or witness domestic violence in their homes (SafeHorizon, 2016) there is certainly a need for life competency training and coping management for children. Additionally, domestic violence is the third leading cause of homelessness and with Portland’s disproportionately large homeless population—the current count is 3,800 homeless Portland residents as of 2015 (Griffin, 2015), more than half of those without residence are women with children (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development).

In addition to children of domestic violence, homeless youth are also at risk for a variety of negative health outcomes not the least of which include inadequate nutrition and health care, peer bullying, sexual victimization, and suicide (Rew et al., 2001). In spite of this, studies of resilience show that outreach programs that encourage, promote, and provide life skills training and serve as a protective factor against feelings of loneliness, isolation, uncertainty, and self-doubt (Rew et al., 2001). According to Robinson and Zajicek (2005), the authors of the Youth Life Skills Inventory (YLSI), life skills are any adaptive or positive behavior that allow us to deal effectively with the demands and challenges faced every day. For children, these competencies are distilled into six behavioral skills: Collaboration, Introspection, Communication, Decision Making, Leadership, and Civic Responsibility (i.e., Volunteerism). Although certainly some may have a natural talent for any one of these skills, but for the most part, these are skills that can be learned and improved with practice (Boyd, Herring, and Briers, 1992).

The difficulty with a transient population, like families of domestic violence or homelessness, long-term programs are not always possible. This does not mean however, that these populations cannot benefit from short-term support. The Little Dog Laughed Animal-Assisted Program delivers this kind of interim attention using brief bouts of animal-assisted activity (AAA). Rather than long-term interactions where the child and the dog are able to establish a bond, consistent with more convention animal-assisted therapy (AAT). The transitional nature of residents of domestic violence shelters provides a limited window for behavioral improvements to occur. Rather than frequent, extended, and ongoing therapy over a period of months or years, the interaction with the therapy dog may be as constrained as one visit and no more than four for a single residential stay. Further, those interactions are limited to a 20 to 25-minute period. On any given visitation day, the participants vary. Given the emotional vulnerability of child residents of domestic violence shelters, children elect to participate in the animal-assisted activities. This means that TLDL program facilitators have little advance notice to prepare age-appropriate or child-specific activities prior to the visit participation. Both the dogs and their facilitators must be exceedingly flexible in the kinds of programming and activity provided. That said, the narrow activity window may also offer some advantages, for one, the child participants know the opportunity to interact with the therapy dog and their facilitator is only offered once a week. A reserved child may recognize
the opportunity cost of not choosing to participate when TLDL visits. Further, the interaction period of 20-minutes is sensitive to the attention span of young to very young children. The brief bout of activity during the program session encourages sustained attention and learning within the timeframe that the children are best able to assimilate information.

Among child residents of domestic violence shelters, their schedules, security, and emotional, behavioral, and cognitive resources are transitional at best. There is very little stability outside of their routine in attending school, therefore one major concern among the staff at the DV shelters and among the facilitators of TLDL program is that none of the activities feel overtly school-like. TLDL program is designed to be didactic, both instructive and flexible without feeling like homework or overtly instructive and pedantic. The idea is that all activities feel both entertaining as well as instructive. TLDL uses dog training as a model to impart nonviolent problem solving, empowerment, and motivational tools when faced with overwhelming challenges that may feel unmanageable. These skills are imparted by presenting each child participant with a problem (i.e., teach Eli how to dance), then through the Socratic method, the facilitator, the child and the dog work toward solving the problem by breaking the solution down into individual elements. Through shaping each of the dog’s successive behavioral approximations toward the target outcome with positive reinforcement using clicker training and food reinforcers (e.g., See-Tag-And-Reinforce) the dog achieves the desired goal. By emphasizing gentle, safe, and respectful interactions with animals, children are afforded the opportunity to see how to find and approach the solution to what might appear at first, an unmanageable task.

The S.T.A.R. methodology is similar to the Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) model, an empirically supported, evidence-based platform for behavior change. PBIS, an extension of operant conditioning (Skinner, 1938) was designed to reduce problem behaviors as well as increase adaptive, socially appropriate behaviors within academic settings (Reynolds, 2012). The model requires the program administrator and participant to establish behavioral expectations together, which are then taught rather than assuming they arrive in possession of all necessary behavioral skills. It contrasts with standard practices that monitor and exact punishment which create a “bottom-line” consequence for failure to correct behaviors and instead rewards children for appropriate behavior. PBIS is flexible in goal setting, yet operant in immediacy, reinforcing good behavior on the spot. The STARS model used in dog training is analogous to PBIS and offers a behavioral framework for long-term behavioral modification, despite the brief bouts of animal interaction indicative of animal-assisted activity.
EVALUATION PURPOSE AND QUESTIONS

Purpose

The purpose of this program evaluation was to establish the efficacy of The Little Dog Laughed, Animal-Assisted Therapy Program. Efficacy was measured as a statistically significant improvement in behavior over the course of the animal-assisted interaction. Ideally, the behavior observed and recorded at the end of TLDL session would be significantly higher than at the onset for all 7 behavioral categories.

TLDL mission statement asserts, “Our volunteer dog/handler teams work with therapists/counselors/teachers in their effort to nurture empathy and non-violent problem solving skills in at-risk youths. We offer a carefully structured set of short classes that teach behavioral skills by engaging the children in actively training our dogs using positive training techniques.”

In order to evaluate the efficacy of their mission we essentially dissected the mission statement into component parts so we could identify what behavioral categories addressed the goals of their mission. Not all of the 7 evaluated behavioral categories are represented in TLDL’s mission statement, based on our interpretation of their mission, 6 of the 7 categories either directly or indirectly addressed the goals of their mission statement. These are identified in the table below.

Table 1. Translated TLDL Mission Goals into Operationalized Behavioral Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission Statement Goals</th>
<th>Corresponding Behavioral Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Nurture empathy”</td>
<td>Attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dog Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Civility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Non-violent problem solving skills”</td>
<td>Concept Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Civility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach behavioral skills…using positive training techniques.</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Civility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We did not feel “Affect,” was an appropriate correlate with the mission since not all children are emotionally demonstrative or animated in activities they enjoy. To avoid
discriminating against children with flattened affects, social or developmental disabilities (e.g., ASD) we did not include Affect in the above.

**TLDL Program Goals**

Program efficacy was defined as any behavioral change in a positive direction between blocks (Pilot and Formative Evaluations) and more importantly from Block 1, onset of the activity to Block 4, at the end of the activity (Summative Evaluation). The overarching goals of this program evaluation are:

1.) **Short-Term Behavioral Modification:** Does The Little Dog Laughed, Animal-Assisted Therapy program facilitate behavioral improvement over the course of the animal-assisted activity sessions (behavioral comparisons from onset to conclusion)?

2.) **Long-Term Behavioral Modification:** Additionally, do children with prior TLDL programming experience demonstrate greater behavioral scores at the onset of the targeted behavioral constructs than TLDL program naïve children?

Although there are any number of variables that might contribute to behavioral change from one session to another, these variables would contribute equally to program experienced and program naive children.

**EVALUATION MANAGEMENT**

**Timeline**


- **PHASE II: Formative Evaluation (Summer 2015–2016):** Measure efficacy of program in achieving behavioral change in the target sample, short-term residents (age 7 – 17 years) of domestic violence shelters and provide suggestions for improvement. Help TLDL implement recommendations, assess efficacy, evaluate improvements of program, if improvements were not evidenced, revisit implementation.

- **PHASE III: Summative Evaluation (Summer 2016):** Cumulative results with suggestions for further improvement, recognition of the strengths and challenges of the program.

- **Additional Support (2016–2017):** Following the summative program evaluation, provide consultative support to TLDL in their efforts to write and submit a program-relevant grant.

Data was interpreted statistically on bimonthly to evaluate how the progress of the evaluation and the efficacy of the program. Every January all data was analyzed both for
cumulative interpretation as well as for each formative assessment. The data was again evaluated at the end of the spring in May to provide the results to TLDL and the observers of the program’s efficacy relative to the most recent recommendations.

**Stakeholders**

For this evaluation, stakeholders were defined as any person or group with an interest in The Little Dog Laughed, Animal-Assisted Therapy program, or a stake in the results of this TLDL program evaluation outcomes. All stakeholders benefit from the outcome of the program evaluation, if so no other reason than it provides information regarding efficacy. However, given the reported outcomes of TLDL programming and the effectiveness of the program in promoting behavioral change, across all behavioral categories, they also benefit through the association with an effective learning and behavioral modification program.

**Table 2. Assessment of Stakeholders**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>What they contribute to TLDL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TLDL Board Members</td>
<td>Overseer TLDL programming</td>
<td>Provide community context and expertise for the programming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLDL Handlers</td>
<td>Participate in TLDL programming</td>
<td>TLDL handlers, dogs, and trainers are the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific University</td>
<td>Institutional support for the program evaluators</td>
<td>Credibility and professional influence for the evaluation outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pacific University Program Evaluators</td>
<td>Authors, observers, evaluators of TLDL program assessment</td>
<td>Provide volunteered time, resources, and expertise both at the sites, as well as in lab for the successful completion of TLDL PE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monika’s House Staff</td>
<td>Facility and supporters of TLDL programming</td>
<td>Provide the target population and the site for program delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monika’s House Residents</td>
<td>Direct recipient of TLDL programming</td>
<td>Supportive testimonials, suggestions for improvement, and data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raphael House Staff</td>
<td>Facility and supporters of TLDL programming</td>
<td>Provide the target population and the site for program delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raphael House Residents</td>
<td>Direct recipient of TLDL programming</td>
<td>Supportive testimonials, suggestions for improvement, and data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKay Elementary School Staff</td>
<td>Facility and supporters of TLDL programming</td>
<td>Provide the target population and the site for program delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKay Elementary School Students/Parents</td>
<td>Direct recipient of TLDL programming</td>
<td>Supportive testimonials, suggestions for improvement, and data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hills Village Staff</td>
<td>Facility and supporters of TLDL programming</td>
<td>Provide the target population and the site for program delivery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hills Village Residents</td>
<td>Direct recipient of TLDL programming</td>
<td>Supportive testimonials, suggestions for improvement, and data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Weekly Schedule**

The program evaluation for TLDL was established in 2013 and concluded in the spring of 2016. For the 3-year period, each evaluation period began in early September until early
December (3 months), and started again in early February until the beginning of May (3 months), for a total of 6 months during each year. During the 6 months of evaluation, field observers (i.e., evaluators) visited two domestic violence shelters once each week for a total of approximately 2 hours (including setup and cleanup). The weekly schedule is outlined in Table 2, with the contact name for the director of both domestic violence shelters.

Table 3. Weekly Site Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Center</th>
<th>Contact</th>
<th>Weekly Observation Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Raphael House</td>
<td>Amanda Grebner</td>
<td>Tuesdays: 4:15 – 5:30 pm Allow an hour for commuting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monika House</td>
<td>Evanna Bradley-Tschirigi</td>
<td>Wednesdays, 6:30 – 8:00 pm Allow an hour for commuting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Roles and Sites**

Over the 3-year period, twelve program evaluators and one principal investigator participated in the different phases (e.g., pilot, formative, and summative reports) for the TLDL program evaluation (see the Evaluator section for more description). Their roles and responsibilities are articulated in Table 3 below.

Table 4. Program Evaluators, Roles and Responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Individual</th>
<th>Title or Role</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Dates of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dakota Davison</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>Monika House</td>
<td>Sept. 2013–May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lori Engle</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>Raphael House</td>
<td>Sept. 2013–May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abby Eiseleben</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>Monika House</td>
<td>Sept. 2013–May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heide Island, Ph.D.</td>
<td>Principal Evaluator</td>
<td>Faculty Advisor/Coordinator</td>
<td>Sept. 2013–Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Keast</td>
<td>Director of TLDL</td>
<td>Director of TLDL</td>
<td>Inception–Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebecca Klassy</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>Monika House</td>
<td>October 2014–Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April Knowlton</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>Raphael House</td>
<td>February 2015–May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colton Markham</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>Monika/Raphael House</td>
<td>September 2013–May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hannah Olson</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>Raphael House</td>
<td>September 2015–May 2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monique Slusher</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>Raphael House</td>
<td>Sept. 2013–May 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Smith</td>
<td>Observer</td>
<td>Monika House</td>
<td>October 2014–May 2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Communication and Reporting Plan**

During the months of September through December and from February through May from 2013 - 2016, evaluators meet weekly to discuss how the evaluation was going, to share information about the two sites and to exchange ideas of how the evaluation may be
improved and what challenges emerged for TLDL during the previous week. When pertinent, this information was conveyed to the TLDL Director and Facilitator, Linda Keast.

**Professional Academic Conference Presentation.** Over the course of the program evaluation, the methodology and results were communicated at professional academic conferences (see Table 5).

### Table 5. Professional Conference Presentations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Material Presented</th>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>Person(s) Responsible</th>
<th>Date and Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial analysis of Phase I, Pilot results</td>
<td>Oregon Academy of Science</td>
<td>Heide Island, Lori Engler, Michelle Slusher, Colton, Abby Fiegenbaum, Markam, Dakota Davison, Colin Kanewski</td>
<td>February 24, 2014 University of Oregon Eugene, Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final analysis of Phase I, Pilot results</td>
<td>Western Psychological Association</td>
<td>Heide Island, Lori Engler, Michelle Slusher, Colton, Abby Fiegenbaum, Markam, Dakota Davison, Colin Kanewski</td>
<td>April 26, 2014 Portland Marriot Downtown Waterfront Portland, Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial analysis of Phase II results</td>
<td>Western Psychological Association</td>
<td>Rebecca Klassy, Michelle Smith, Vhana Sabado</td>
<td>May 1, 2015 Red Rock Resort Las Vegas, Nevada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final analysis of Phase II results</td>
<td>American Evaluation Association</td>
<td>Heide Island, Michelle Smith, Vhana Sabado</td>
<td>November 11, 2015 Hyatt Regency Chicago, IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Analysis of Summative Evaluation</td>
<td>Oregon Academy of Science</td>
<td>Heide Island, April Knowlton, Michelle Smith, Vhana Sabado, Hannah Olson</td>
<td>February 27, 2016 Pacific University Forest Grove, Oregon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of Summative Evaluation</td>
<td>Western Psychological Association</td>
<td>April Knowlton, Michelle Smith, Vhana Sabado</td>
<td>April 30, 2016 Long Beach Westin Long Beach, CA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**University Conference Presentation.** Given the program evaluators for all three years were trained undergraduate thesis students from Pacific University, their experiences and the program was also presented every year in April during the Undergraduate Senior Projects (USP) Conference at Pacific University. This was an additional opportunity to share the different phase outcomes with TLDL Board of Directors.

**Board of Directors Updates.** At least one of The Little Dog Laughed Animal-Assisted Therapy Board of Directors attended the annual presentation of the results at the Pacific University USP Conference. In addition, the Director, Linda Keast presented the results of each phase of the program evaluation to the Board annually in the months of June for 2013, July for 2014, July for 2015, and August for 2016. The results were also uploaded to the TLDL online website.
Media Coverage

Monique Balas of the Oregonian wrote a piece about The Little Dog Laughed Animal-Assisted Therapy program and this program evaluation in the online edition of the Oregonian (Balas, August 9, 2013). In 2014, a more detailed explanation of the Program Evaluation was described in The Latham Letters, winter edition (Keast, 2014). This is an important spotlight piece, as The Latham Letters is a clearinghouse for information about humane issues and activities, the human-companion animal bond (HCAB), animal-assisted therapy, and the connections between child and animal abuse and other forms of violence. The program evaluation was discussed as a framework for evaluating other similar programs and the importance of empirical validation in garnering private, federal, state, and municipal funding sources (see Appendix IV).

TARGET POPULATION AND METHOD

Target Population

Evaluators observed TLDL animal-assisted activities at two domestic violence shelters in northwest Oregon, Monika’s House and Raphael House (See Appendix I). TLDL program was delivered to individual children or to groups of two to three children, depending on the shelter. Shelter participants ranged in age from 4 to 17 years (M=7.89; SD=2.90), with an average age of 7.6 years among the girls (SD=3.10) and 8.4 for the boys (SD=2.4). Two clicker-trained Papillon dogs, one male (Eli) and one female (Lili) served as therapy dogs for all site visits. However, most all of the observations occurred with just one of the two therapy animals, Eli. Given the small number of observations with Lili, there was no way to ascertain if the quality of activity programming differed as a consequence of the therapy dog, that said, based on the consistency of the facilitator, the breed, and the training, this is unlikely.

Child confidentiality was maintained, as no names were documented and all observations were conducted in the shelters with no audio or video support. Any necessary identifying information, like the child’s gender and age, was coded by first initial with a brief description of their appearance (e.g., gender, approximate age, hair color and length, ethnic identity, approximate height). Some identifying information was necessary, as some children were in-residence for more than one week. A total of 22 children were observed at Monika’s House and 15 at Raphael’s House from September of 2013 through May of 2015, in a total of 35 DV site visits.

Evaluators

Twelve college, psychology, senior thesis students participated in this three-year formative and summative program evaluation. All student evaluators completed an upper division research methods course, a research methods laboratory, an upper division statistics course, and a directed program evaluation training course, earning a B or better in all courses. The evaluators also completed the National Institute of Health’s Human Participants online certification course, training in the Family Education and Rights to Privacy Act (FERPA), and Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), as well as certifications in CPR, First Aide, and Blood-Borne Pathogens through a weekend course. These trainings allowed all program evaluators to also serve as field observers at two Oregon
Domestic Violence shelters, Monika’s House located in Washington County and Raphael House, located in Multnomah County. Both shelters conducted independent background checks, sensitivity coaching, and site training based on the unique needs of both the staff and the residents at each facility. The Little Dog Laughed, Animal-Assisted Therapy Program Director also provided clicker and volunteer program training for the evaluators, just like any other TLDL volunteer so that the evaluators could better assess the needs on volunteers

**Procedure**

Each animal-assisted activity visit was 15-20 minutes of interaction, with 5-minute, focal naturalistic, focal observations occurring over 4 blocks. Most interactions occurred over 4 blocks total per session. On each data sheet (See Appendix) the site, date, time, and observer initials were coded, as was the therapy dog, the child’s first initial, gender, age, the number of previous visits (if available), and a brief description of their physical appearance, as well as the title or a description of the animal-assisted activity (e.g., clicker training, match-to-sample, move with me, etc.).

**Behavioral Rating Scales.** Behavior within the categories of Engagement, Instructional Compliance, and Concept Recognition were coded on an intensity scale of 0 (e.g., not engaged, does not follow instructions; no concept recognition) to 3 (e.g., eager interest, exceptional instructional compliance, and concept recognition). For example, if a child did not use the clicker in the way the facilitator showed them, their Instructional Compliant would be coded a 0, unless the recognized their mistake and corrected it. Self-correction is typically coded positively, as a 1 or a 2. The emotional behavior categories for verbal and non-verbal emotion coding were also on a scale, but between -3 (e.g., very bad attitude, verbalizing a lot of discontent; frowning, crying, etc.) to 3 (e.g., verbalizing exclusively positive remarks; smiling, giggling, laughter, in some cases jumping up and down). Finally, the Dog Approach and Social Civility categories were coded from -1 to 1, this is a negative (-1, dog avoidance; uncivil or rude behavior) to positive rating scale (1, dog approach; civil or well-mannered) with 0 representing a no change or ambivalent category (see Appendix III).

**Inter-rater Reliability.** All observations occurred with two evaluators both for the pilot and for Phase I of data collection. Observers were paired as a team, they did not change in terms of who they observed with and in which shelter they observed. During focal observations, the evaluators did not talk or discuss their results and sat opposite each other at tables at their corresponding shelter. This was in place to protect the validity of their observations, so no bias could interfere with their own objective assessments of what they observed. During data entry, each observer’s data was entered into the date files but only those behavioral ratings and behavioral categories that were observed by both evaluators were used for analyses. This data was entered with their respective Cohen’s kappa reliability rating. The average inter-rater reliability rating for the pilot was .76. In other words, 76 percent of all observations were in agreement between the four coders (anything over 65% is an acceptable IRR). For the Phase I observers, four different evaluators, again each team assigned to one of the two domestic violence shelters, their IRR was .79 percent, slightly higher than those from the pilot. However, it should be noted that Raphael House was only observed for a four-month period during the Phase I period.
**PHASE I: Pilot (2013 – 2014).** Prior to the pilot, the research team met with the program director to establish how to define efficacy for her program. In other words, we needed to know what kinds of behavioral improvement or change TLDL program hoped would occur among its target population (child residents of the DV shelters) as a consequence of the animal interactions. Based on these discussions, 6 outcome categories were outlined: Engagement (e.g., attention, interest/inquisitive, participation); Instructional Compliance (e.g., recognition of instructions, correcting prompted errors); Concept Recognition (e.g., recognizing conceptual ideas or errors); Attitude (e.g., verbal behavior indicative of emotional affect), Affect (e.g., nonverbal behavior indicative of emotion), and Metacognition (i.e., introspection), as well as two additional categories: Dog Approach (e.g., unafraid, fearful, or neutral) and Social Civility. Social Civility in this evaluation is defined as the ability to recognize appropriate social behavior, understand how civility affects others, and correct behavioral mistakes in manners (i.e., civility), either with a prompt or spontaneously. An example of a Social Civility infraction would be if a child interrupts the facilitator of volunteer. Their rating would be a -1. But if they correct it, either spontaneously or with a prompt and if they persist in refraining from interrupting or self-correct in subsequent blocks, they would receive a 1.

**PHASE II: Formative Evaluation (2014 – 2015).** Following the pilot, one category, Metacognition was eliminated because there were too few opportunities to ascertain whether the children were introspective about their behavior. Additionally, some of the children observed were under 5 years of age, a time in which neural development has not yet fully lateralized, resulting in a limited ability to delay gratification, and little introspection. We also added the constructs of “Dog Approach” and “Social Civility” as part of the main behavioral groupings. Thus for Phase I, a final, vetted set of 7 behavioral categories emerged for observation: Engagement (e.g., attention, interest/inquisitive, participation); Instructional Compliance (e.g., recognition of instructions, correcting prompted errors); Concept Recognition (e.g., recognizing conceptual ideas or errors); Attitude (e.g., verbal behavior indicative of emotional affect), Affect (e.g., nonverbal behavior indicative of emotion), Dog Approach (e.g., unafraid, fearful, or neutral) and Social Civility (e.g., recognition of social norms and socially appropriate behavior).

**PHASE III: Summative Evaluation (2013 – 2016).** The summative evaluation provides a comprehensive analysis and interpretation of all of the data collected from the inception of the program to the present, including effective behavioral constructs originally identified in the pilot and excluding those that were deemed ineffective (e.g., Metacognition). These target variables are as follows: Engagement, Instructional Compliance (renamed from Following Instructions), Concept Recognition, Attitude, Affect, Dog Approach, and Social Civility (renamed from Social Rapport).
PHASE I: PILOT
RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

The empirical questions we attempted to answer during the initial phase of the program evaluation, the pilot pertained to the appropriateness of the evaluators behavioral constructs translated from TLDL mission goals. And to what extent the children's behavior improved across each block for each behavioral category. The questions we used to guide the Pilot, Phase I were:

1.) Do children’s behavioral construct scores significantly improve over the course of the animal-assisted activity session?

2.) Is there behavioral score variability across blocks?

3.) Are the improvements in behavior most significant from the onset (Block 1) of the animal-assisted activity until the conclusion (Block 4) of the session, as might be expected?

4.) Were there between site differences in the children’s behavioral scores for the two shelters?

In an effort to assess significant changes in behavior between the four, 5-minute blocks, we outlined six target behavior constructs:

1. Metacognition
2. Concept Recognition
3. Engagement
4. Follows Instructions
5. Affect
6. Attitude

We conducted a paired samples t-test and found that for five of the six behavioral categories there were significant behavioral improvements from the onset of the animal-assisted activity sessions until the conclusion, 15 to 20 minutes later.

PHASE I: Results

Metacognition. The behavioral construct of Metacognition refers to the processes used to plan, monitor, and assess one’s understanding and performance. This includes an awareness of both one’s thinking and learning and about oneself as a thinker and learner (Larkin, 2010). Metacognition, also referred to as “proto-cognition” and “theory of mind,” involves perspective taking and self-awareness akin to introspection or “thinking about how information is represented to us in terms of beliefs, desires or goals” (Fleming et al., 2010). Although the mean age of the child residents at both Monika and Raphael House was around 8 years; well within the age range cerebral lateralization and by extension, metacognition, is thought to develop, around 5 – 6 years (Fleming and Dolan, 2012), we did not find significantly different Metacognitive scores across any of the behavioral blocks measured.
One explanation for this is the fact that metacognition occurs introspectively. Children do not typically state what they know they know, nor is it reasonable to assume they will verbalize all of their internal learning epiphanies. So although Metacognition was a good cognitive construct to include in this program evaluation in theory, it was not a useful construct in practice. Subsequent phases of this evaluation will not include it.

**Engagement.** Engagement, the cognitive construct reflecting attention, interest, and volition significantly increased from Block 1 to Block 2 and from the onset, Block 1 of the activity session to the conclusion, Block 4. This construct was measured on a scale of 0 (no engagement) to 3 (fully engaged).

- **Block 1** ($M=2.03; SD=.96$) and **Block 2** ($M=2.21; SD=.83$); $t(65)=-2.26, p=.027, \eta^2=.07$
- **Block 1** ($M=2.12; SD=1.02$) and **Block 4** ($M=2.58; SD=0.61$); $t(32)=-2.7, p=.011, \eta^2=.18$

But did not differ significantly between Blocks 2 to 3 and from Blocks 3 to 4.

- **Block 2** ($M=2.27; SD=.77$) and **Block 3** ($M=2.38; SD=.84$); $t(56)=-1.23, p=.224$
- **Block 3** ($M=2.58; SD=.66$) and **Block 4** ($M=2.58; SD=.61$); $t(33)=.00, p=1.0$
- **Block 1** ($M=2.04; SD=.99$) and **Block 3** ($M=2.38; SD=.84$); $t(55)=-3.80, p<.01, \eta^2=.21$

One explanation for this, lies in the fluidity of the animal-assisted activity sessions. The 20-minute session is continuous, starting at time zero and continues until the activity is over, generally around 20 minutes. But, much like a classroom environment, the children can take a little while to settle down at the onset, this can prolong or shorten the block in any one given time block for instruction. It was observed that the last block is sometimes cut short with the early arrival of the next resident appointment, as a result of lost interest when the trainer spends too much time setting up the next activity, or if the dog holds too much appeal. To test this observation, we noted that from Block 1 to Block 3, the effect size was in fact much larger than from Block 1 to 4, suggesting that the last 5-minute session was in fact frequently subsumed into Block 3, even to the extent that the total number of completed Block 3 sessions was higher at 56 opposed to 34 for Block 4.

**Figure 1.**

![Mean Ratings for Engagement](image-url)
Follows Instructions. Follows Instructions as a behavioral construct is analogous to instructional compliance (the name was later changed to reflect this) and represents an important early childhood life skill. Like the Engagement construct, Follows Instructions was measured on a scale of 0 to 3. We found significant improvement over the course of the activity session and from the onset of the activity session to the conclusion, as reflected in the paired-samples t-tests below.

Block 1 (M=2.05; SD=.84) and Block 2 (M=2.33; SD=.76); t(57)=-3.41, p=.001, η²=.17
Block 2 (M=2.29; SD=.83) and Block 3 (M=2.49; SD=.73); t(51)=-2.33, p=.024, η²=.10
Block 1 (M=2.19; SD=.88) and Block 4 (M=2.56; SD=.51); t(26)=-2.29, p=.030; η²=.17

The only exception was from the 3 to 4 Block, reflecting the last five minutes of the animal-assisted activity session. As previously noted, the last five minutes of the AAA is frequently derailed or simply cut short as the children anticipate the conclusion of the activity or early, eager new participants await their turn with the TDL instructor, trainer, and dog. Thus, Block 1 and 3 were evaluated and in fact, this comparison had the largest effect size, demonstrating again that in this case, the 3 Block can be a more meaningful comparator for instructional compliance.

Block 3 (M=2.59; SD=.67) and Block 4 (M=2.50; SD=.51); t(31)=.83, p>.05
Block 1 (M=2.04; SD=.87) and Block 3 (M=2.52; SD=.71); t(47)=-4.65, p<.01, η²=.31

Further, it was anticipated that Follows Instructions would be correlated with Engagement, as Engagement as a cognitive construct is important for encoding information. One must first attend to instruction in order to understand how to comply with directions.

As anticipated, Engagement and Follows Instructions were significantly, positively correlated for Block 1, r(157)=.643; p<.001; Block 2, r(154)=.600; p<.001; Block 3, r(142)=.712; p<.001 and Block 4, r(91)=.515; p<.001.

Figure 2.

Mean Ratings for Following Instruction

Concept Recognition. This behavioral construct measures (scale of 0 to 3) the extent to which the participants understand the concept of each animal-assisted activity. This
can be difficult to measure if the TLDL handler does not articulate the goal of each activity. Although this was not a problem during Block 1, when clicker training was introduced, activity goals were sometimes glossed over in subsequent blocks, this was most apparent from Block 2 to 3, as evident from the paired-samples t-test illustrated below.

**Block 1** ($M=1.74; SD=1.02$) and **Block 2** ($M=1.98; SD=.95$); $t(52)=-2.76, p=.008, \eta^2 = .13$

**Block 2** ($M=2.02; SD=.99$) and **Block 3** ($M=2.19; SD=.98$); $t(42)=-1.55, p>.05$

**Block 3** ($M=2.06; SD=1.15$) and **Block 4** ($M=2.32; SD=.111$); $t(30)=-2.79, p<.01, \eta^2 = .21$

In order to assess if the 15-minute mark was a more compelling concluding block than the 20-minute mark an additional paired samples t-test was calculated of Block 1 to 3, as well as Block 1 to 4. The eta-squared value ($\eta^2$), the value indicating the strength of the difference in the behavioral score was in fact larger for the 1 to 3 Block.

**Block 1** ($M=1.71; SD=1.15$) and **Block 4** ($M=2.36; SD=1.06$); $t(27)=-4.12, p<.01, \eta^2 = .39$

**Block 1** ($M=1.67; SD=1.08$) and **Block 3** ($M=2.07; SD=1.03$); $t(42)=-3.05, p<.01, \eta^2 = .18$

Concept Recognition was a compelling behavioral construct, both for observers’ ability to accurately measure the children’s behavior, but also in terms of providing a litmus for vulnerability in the delivery of the program and the success of the animal-assisted activities (see Figure 3). One thing we learned from this formative evaluation was the importance of repeatedly prompting the children to share what they think the value is for each activity with the dog. This offered both an opportunity for praise but also a way to see if the program delivery was working.

Similar to instructional compliance or Follows Instructions, attention or Engagement was predicted to correlate with Concept Recognition. This was confirmed, Engagement and Concept Recognition were significantly, positively correlated for Block 1 $r(152)=.589; p<.001$; Block 2, $r(144)=.523; p<.001$; Block 3, $r(129)=.425; p<.001$and Block 4, $r(89)=.300; p=.004$.

**Figure 3.**

![Mean Ratings for Concept Recognition](image)

**Attitude.** Attitude, like the Affect construct, reflects the emotional state of the TLDL participants. Attitude for this evaluation is the verbal articulation of the child’s emotive state.
It is rated on a negative (-3) to positive scale (+3) with 0 reflecting a neutral or “flat” affective attitude, no verbalizations or animation pertaining to how the child feels. As is apparent from the paired-samples t-tests data below, most attitude scores, or affective verbalizations were largely positive and improved over the course of the activity session.

**Block 1** \((M=1.90; \ SD=1.00)\) and **Block 2** \((M=2.10; \ SD=.94)\); \(t(50)=-2.64, \ p=.01, \ \eta^2=.12\)

**Block 2** \((M=2.02; \ SD=.95)\) and **Block 3** \((M=2.27; \ SD=.82)\); \(t(43)=-3.79, \ p<.01, \ \eta^2=.25\)

Again, the same issue with the 3 to 4 Block is apparent here as well. Therefore, again an additional paired comparison of Block 1 to 3 was calculated to ascertain if the magnitude of children’s attitude improvement was stronger using the 15-minute mark than the 20-minute mark, it was.

**Block 3** \((M=2.32; \ SD=.98)\) and **Block 4** \((M=2.50; \ SD=.96)\); \(t(27)=-1.15, \ p>.05\)

**Block 1** \((M=2.0; \ SD=1.11)\) and **Block 4** \((M=2.59; \ SD=.84)\); \(t(26)=-3.17, \ p<.01, \ \eta^2=.28\)

**Block 1** \((M=1.87; \ SD=1.06)\) and **Block 3** \((M=2.29; \ SD=.82)\); \(t(44)=-5.22, \ p<.01, \ \eta^2=.38\)

**Figure 4.**

![Mean Ratings for Attitude](image)

**Affect.** Affect, or the affective state, reflects the psycho-physiological expression of emotion and how emotionally engaged or distanced the participant is. The Affect for this evaluation is the non-verbal facial and expression of the child’s emotive state. It is rated on a negative (-3) to positive scale (+3) with 0 reflecting a neutral or “flat” affective state. Consistent with the paired-samples t-test from the Attitude construct, most Affect scores, were positive and improved over the course of the activity session.

**Block 1** \((M=1.54; \ SD=1.40)\) and **Block 2** \((M=2.00; \ SD=1.6)\); \(t(56)=-5.74, \ p<.01, \ \eta^2=.37\)

**Block 2** \((M=1.90; \ SD=1.21)\) and **Block 3** \((M=2.14; \ SD=1.04)\); \(t(43)=-3.95, \ p<.01, \ \eta^2=.24\)

Again, the same issue with the 3 to 4 Block is apparent here.

**Block 3** \((M=2.07; \ SD=1.20)\) and **Block 4** \((M=2.30; \ SD=1.18)\); \(t(29)=-1.65, \ p>.05\)
And again a comparison of Block 1 to 3 yielded a larger effect size than Blocks 1 to 4.

**Block 1** \( (M=1.40; SD=1.69) \) and **Block 4** \( (M=2.30; SD=1.18) \); \( t(29)=-4.27, p<.01, \eta^2=.39 \)

**Block 1** \( (M=1.51; SD=1.47) \) and **Block 3** \( (M=2.14; SD=1.04) \); \( t(48)=-6.34, p<.01, \eta^2=.46 \)

Since both the Attitude and Affect constructs were emotive variables, we anticipated that Attitude and Affect would be correlated for each block. This was confirmed, Attitude and Affect were significantly, positively correlated for Block 1 \( r(142)=.766; p<.001 \); Block 2, \( r(134)=.766; p<.001 \); Block 3, \( r(123)=.793; p<.001 \) and Block 4, \( r(83)=.858; p<.001 \).

**Figure 5.**
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A comprehensive comparison of the paired-samples t-test behavioral construct scores are provided below, some of the constructs are measured on different scales, but the behavioral improvement is illustrated in the graph below relative to each scoring scale.

**Figure 6.**

**Mean Target Behavioral Ratings Within Four 5-Minute Blocks**

![Bar Chart](image)
It should be apparent from Figure 6, that the mean scores on all behavioral constructs improved over the course of the TLDL animal-assisted activity sessions with the exception of Metacognition.

**Between Group Differences.** Child resident behavioral scores varied significantly across the two domestic violence shelters, with the children at Monika’s House consistently scoring below the children at Raphael House, even when age was controlled, this was more apparent for the cognitive variables (i.e., Engagement, Follows Instructions, and Concept Recognition).

**Figure 7.**

![Between Shelter Behavioral Score Differences](image)

**PHASE I: Conclusions**

This outcome of this pilot data demonstrate that brief bouts of animal-assisted activity can be evaluated in a meaningful, clinically relevant way. The within block behavioral improvement can be used to compare differences in both cross-sectional and longitudinal designs and is relevant for further evaluation in subsequent phases of this evaluation. The initial results of the Phase I Pilot suggest that TLDL is effective in guiding behavioral improvement across each animal-assisted activity session. Although the activities are more effective for some behavioral constructs (e.g., Engagement, Follows Instructions, Concept Recognition, Attitude, and Affect) than others (e.g., Metacognition) and across some behavioral blocks (e.g., Block 1 to 2; 2 to 3; and 1 to 4) more than others (e.g., Block 3 to 4).

Based on the behavioral score variability across constructs and blocks, we eliminated the behavioral construct of Metacognition and added two new constructs: Dog Approach and Social Rapport (later named Social Civility). Dog Approach was added to assess if socializing fearful children to the dogs helped with their fear-avoidance behavior over the
course of the 20-minute activity sessions, and in subsequent visits. In order to evaluate both the degree of social civility (i.e., manners, social competence, and conflict resolution) each child started the sessions with relative to their social rapport with the therapy dog, each other, the volunteer facilitator and TLDL handler at the conclusion.

Although the results of the pilot are less for evaluating the efficacy of TLDL programming as it was for measuring the appropriateness of the behavioral constructs and the methodology, several important finding emerged based on the initial questions posed for Phase I:

1.) Do children’s behavioral construct scores significantly improve over the course of the animal-assisted activity session? Yes, based on the data we obtained in the pilot, TLDL programming is promoting behavioral modification for all target behaviors.

2.) Is there behavioral score variability across blocks? The data suggest that the third behavioral block (15-minute mark) is vulnerable to being subsumed in the fourth behavioral block (20-minute mark). The evaluators speculate that this is attributable to a number of factors including: anticipation of the conclusion of the activity session; early resident participants who interrupt the first set of participants; loss of attention as a consequence of handler’s divided attention between the resident, the therapy dog, and the learning tools necessary to deliver the activities. This is most salient at the end of the activity session.

3.) Are the improvements in behavior most significant from the onset (Block 1) of the animal-assisted activity until the conclusion (Block 4) of the session, as might be expected? The behavioral improvement is greatest from the onset to the conclusion of each animal-assisted activity block, sometimes the end block is at Block 3 and sometimes, depending upon the behavioral construct, it is at Block 4.

4.) Were there between site differences in the children’s behavioral scores for the two shelters? The initial answer to this question appears to be yes, at least for cognitive constructs like Engagement, Instructional Compliance, and Concept Recognition. This will be further evaluated in the formative program evaluation.
PHASE II: FORMATIVE EVALUATION
RESULTS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

PHASE II: Results

Similar to the empirical questions we attempted to answer during the pilot, the formative evaluation, Phase II assessment questions pertained less to the appropriateness of the behavioral constructs and more to the efficacy of the program in tapping into the constructs reflecting TLDL mission. We established five primary predictions based on what we learned from the Phase I, Pilot:

1.) If the TLDL programming is effective, children’s behavioral scores would improve significantly across the blocks (i.e., as the animal-assisted activity progressed) across all behavioral constructs.

2.) Children’s behavioral scores would show the greatest improvement from Blocks 1 to 4, or from the onset of the AAA to the end.

3.) Children with prior TLDL experience would demonstrate higher behavioral scores (particularly at the onset of the AAA and especially for Dog Approach) than children naïve to the programming.

4.) Children who had previously interacted with TLDL would demonstrate higher behavioral scores for Social Civility at Block 1 and at Block 4 (i.e., formerly established social manners and structured behavioral norms would provide the framework for how to behave in subsequent visits).

5.) Given Monika’s House has fewer financial resources and tighter staffing than Raphael House, we expect behavioral score variability across residents of the two shelters.

In an effort to assess significant changes in behavior between the four, 5-minute blocks, we outlined seven target behavior constructs, removing “Metacognition” from Phase I and adding two new categories: Dog Approach and Social Rapport (later renamed to Social Civility) for the Formative Evaluation.

1.) Engagement
2.) Instructional Compliance
3.) Concept Recognition
4.) Attitude
5.) Affect
6.) Dog Approach
7.) Social Rapport

In order to evaluate behavioral improvement from block to block, we conducted paired samples t-tests between Blocks 1 to 2; Blocks 2 to 3; Blocks 3 to 4 and finally for the most meaningful improvement, from Block 1 to 4 for all behavioral categories. To estimate the
degree of significance for those paired blocks significant differences \( (p<.05) \) were observed, effect size estimates (eta-squared, \( \eta^2 \) or \( \Sigma^2 \)) were calculated (.04 = small effect; .06 = moderate effect; .14 = large effect).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral Category</th>
<th>Block 1 ( M (SD) )</th>
<th>Block 4 ( M (SD) )</th>
<th>( df )</th>
<th>( t )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>( \Sigma^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>2.31 (.73)</td>
<td>2.69 (.54)</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>-4.12</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows Instructions</td>
<td>2.45 (.73)</td>
<td>2.60 (.50)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-2.28</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept Recognition</td>
<td>2.03 (.05)</td>
<td>2.37 (.98)</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-3.94</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>1.96 (1.29)</td>
<td>2.53 (.87)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-5.43</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>2.30 (.90)</td>
<td>2.68 (.66)</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>-4.13</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Approach</td>
<td>0.67 (.54)</td>
<td>0.85 (.44)</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>-2.99</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Civility</td>
<td>0.88 (.33)</td>
<td>0.94 (.24)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>&gt;.05</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( M = \text{mean}; \) \( SD = \text{standard deviation}; \) \( df = \text{degrees of freedom}; \) \( t = \text{t-value}; \) \( p = \text{p-value}; \) \( \Sigma^2 = \text{eta-squared} \)

**Engagement.** Behaviors associated with Engagement (rating scale ranged from 0 to 3) increased significantly from Block 1 \( (M=2.38; \ SD=0.81) \) to Block 2 \( (M=2.53, \ SD=0.69) \), \( t(173)=3.29, \ p=.001, \ \eta^2=0.06 \) and from Block 2 \( (M=2.53, \ SD=0.65) \) to Block 3 \( (M=2.66, \ SD=0.66) \), \( t(139)=2.25, \ p=.03, \ \eta^2=.04 \). There was however, no change from Block 3 \( (M=2.66, \ SD=0.57) \) to Block 4 \( (M=2.69, \ SD=0.54) \), \( t(80)= -0.39, \ p=.05 \).

Despite a lack of significant improvement in Engagement from Block 3 to 4, Engagement scores for children improved from the onset of the program activity at Block 1 \( (M=2.31, \ SD=0.84) \) to the end of the activity session, at Block 4 \( (M=2.69, \ SD=0.54) \), \( t(80)= -4.12, \ p= .0001, \ \eta^2=.18 \) (See Figure 1). The degree of this significance is very large (i.e., a large effect is typically at .14; the effect size for Engagement between Blocks 1 and 4 is .18).

The results of the paired-samples t-tests provide partial support for the first prediction, that behavior would improve from block to block across all target behaviors and support for the second prediction, that behavior would should the greatest improvement from the onset of the animal-assisted activity to the end.
Instructional Compliance. The degree of instructional compliance among the children from block to block was similar to the pattern described for Engagement. There was a significant increase from Block 1 ($M=2.49$, $SD=0.76$) to Block 2 ($M=2.61$, $SD=0.61$), $t(164)=-2.84$, $p=.027$, $\eta^2=0.05$ and from Block 2 ($M=2.56$, $SD=0.67$) to Block 3 ($M=2.67$, $SD=0.57$), $t(134)=-2.33$, $p=.02$, $\eta^2=0.04$, but not from Block 3 ($M=2.71$, $SD=0.53$) to Block 4 ($M=2.65$, $SD=0.51$), $t(79)=1.15$, $p=.05$.

Again, the largest behavioral improvement was evidenced from the onset of the animal-assisted activity, Block 1 ($M=2.49$, $SD=0.73$) to the last activity, Block 4 ($M=2.68$, $SD=0.50$), $t(74)=-2.28$, $p=.01$, $\eta^2=0.07$ (See Figure 2 below).

Concept Recognition. While Concept Recognition increased significantly between Block 1 ($M=2.03$, $SD=1.05$) and Block 4 ($M=2.37$, $SD=0.98$), $t(75)=-3.94$, $p=.03$, $\eta^2=0.17$. 
But there were no significant changes in behavior between individual blocks, including Block 1 ($M=1.53$, $SD=1.20$) and Block 2 ($M=1.63$, $SD=1.22$), $t(160)=1.70$, $p>.05$, Block 2 ($M=1.86$, $SD=1.15$) and Block 3 ($M=1.97$, $SD=1.15$), $t(125)=1.86$, $p>.05$, and Block 3 ($M=2.29$, $SD=0.99$) and Block 4 ($M=2.36$, $SD=1.01$), $t(78)=0.90$, $p>.05$ (See Figure 3).

**Figure 3. Mean Concept Recognition Ratings by Block**

![Graph showing mean concept recognition ratings by block.

**Attitude.** For Attitude, Block 1 ($M=2.27$, $SD=0.91$) to Block 2 ($M=2.42$, $SD=0.77$), $t(158)=-3.80$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=0.08$. This construct continued to increase significantly from Block 2 ($M=2.47$, $SD=0.70$) to Block 3 ($M=2.47$, $SD=0.76$) to Block 4 ($M=2.64$, $SD=0.73$), $t(75)=-2.41$, $p=.02$, $\eta^2=0.07$. This resulted in an overall increase from Block 1 to Block 4, $t(74)=-4.13$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=0.20$ (See Figure 4).

**Figure 4. Mean Attitude Ratings by Block**

![Graph showing mean attitude ratings by block.

**Affect.** Affect increased from Block 1 ($M=1.52$, $SD=0.99$) to Block 2 ($M=1.64$, $SD=0.73$), $t(163)=-6.09$, $p=.001$, $\eta^2=0.19$, from Block 2 ($M=2.45$, $SD=0.73$) to Block 3 ($M=2.45$, $SD=0.73$), $t(132)=-3.05$, $p=.003$, $\eta^2=0.07$, and from Block 3 ($M=2.64$, $SD=0.73$) to Block 4 ($M=2.64$, $SD=0.73$), $t(77)=-3.04$, $p=.003$, $\eta^2=0.11$. 
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Thus, there was a very large effect from Block 1 to Block 4, $t(77)=-5.43$, $p<.001$, $\eta^2=0.28$ (See Figure 5).

**Social Civility.** Social Civility, on the other hand, increased significantly from Block 1 ($M=0.88$, $SD=0.33$) to Block 2 ($M=0.97$, $SD=0.33$), $t(56)=-2.16$, $p=.03$, $\eta^2=0.06$. It did not, however, change significantly between Block 2 ($M=1.02$, $SD=0.32$) and Block 3 ($M=0.98$, $SD=0.14$), $t(43)=0.81$, $p>.05$, or between Block 3 ($M=0.94$, $SD=0.24$) and Block 4 ($M=0.94$, $SD=0.24$), $t(29)=0.0$, $p>.05$ (see Figure 6).

**Dog Approach.** The category of Dog Approach also had a significant overall increase from Block 1 to Block 4, $t(66)=-2.99$, $p<.01$, $\eta^2=0.12$. It can be inferred from the data that children become more comfortable with the dogs following the initial introduction, this is supported in the between block behavioral improvements from Block 1 ($M=0.68$, $SD=0.58$) and Block 2 ($M=0.76$, $SD=0.53$), $t(130)=-2.55$, $p<.01$, $\eta^2=0.05$, as well as between Block 3 ($M=0.77$, $SD=0.49$) and Block 4 ($M=0.85$, $SD=0.44$), $t(66)=-1.93$, $p=.05$, $\eta^2=0.05$. However,
there wasn’t a significant change between Block 2 \( (M=0.76, SD=0.51) \) and Block 3 \( (M=0.80, SD=0.47) \), \( t(105)=-1.42, p>.05 \). (See Figure 7)

**Figure 7. Mean Dog Approach Ratings by Block**

Children’s behavioral improvements across target categories are visually displayed in Figure 8. All categories with the exception of Concept Recognition and Social Civility demonstrated significant improvement across blocks. However, as noted above, children showed significant behavioral improvement in Concept Recognition from Block 1 to 4.

**Figure 8. Mean Target Behavioral Ratings Within Four 5-Minute Blocks**

The fourth prediction posited that children who had previously interacted with TLDL would demonstrate higher behavioral scores for Dog Approach and Social Civility at Block 1 and
Block 4 (i.e., formerly established social manners and structured behavioral norms would provide the framework for how to behave in subsequent visits). This prediction was true for both behavioral categories for Block 1, Dog Approach \((r=.39 \ (133), \ p<.001)\) and Social Civility \((r=.340 \ (72), \ p=.003)\), but not for Block 4.

Finally, the fifth prediction posited that since the domestic violence shelters are located in two different counties, one with significantly higher property taxes than the other there would be between site differences in baseline behavior among the 7 categories. In order to assess this, we conducted several more paired samples t-tests. Based on these analyses, we found that 3 of the 7 behavioral categories differed between shelters.

Concept recognition ratings were significantly lower at Monika's house \((M=1.20, \ SD=1.18)\) than at Raphael's house \((M=2.36, \ SD=0.82), \ t(167)=-6.23, \ p<.01, \ \eta^2=0.19\). Ratings at Monika’s house were also lower for Attitude \((M=2.12, \ SD=0.98)\) than Raphael's House \((M=2.60, \ SD=0.61), \ t(164)=-3.12, \ p=.002, \ \eta^2=0.05\). This was also true for Affect ratings, Monika’s house residents \((M=1.91, \ SD=1.12)\) had much lower Affect ratings than those children participating in TLDL programming at Raphael’s House \((M=2.24, \ SD=0.83), \ t(169)=-2.04, \ p=.04, \ \eta^2=0.02\). However, Social Civility ratings were higher on average at Monika’s house \((M=0.90, \ SD=0.29)\) than at Raphael’s house \((M=0.60, \ SD=0.55), \ t(76)=2.09, \ p=.04, \ \eta^2=0.02\).

**PHASE II: Conclusions**

The Little Dog Laughed, Animal-Assisted Therapy Program is an non-profit, animal-assisted activity program whose mission is to provide empathy based, behavioral learning opportunities and non-violent problem solving skills. TLDL is unique from other AAA and AAT programs in a number of ways. First, TLDL handlers are S.T.A.R. (See–Tag–And–Reward) trained and certified to allow dogs off leash when serving communities in a “S.T.A.R.” capacity. TLDL dogs are off leash and clicker trained so that participants are able to actively engage with the dogs in a more meaningful, collaborative way. The children, once familiar with clicker and reinforcement training, are provided the opportunity to train the dogs to do tricks, provide food and praise incentives and are encouraged to ‘read’ TLDL dogs’ posture, facial expressions, level of activity, and attention, so they can moderate the reinforcements and task demand to suit the social willingness of the dog. The greater child–dog collaboration teaches empathy, problem-solving and potentially generalizes to the child's social relationships outside of the animal-assisted sessions.

Second, due to their long-term partnership with two local domestic violence shelters, TLDL is also distinctive from other AAA programs because the facilitators and dogs often work with child participants more than once. The value of multiple visits with TLDL dogs and volunteers, is the repetition provides the child an opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge and learning from the previous visit. Repeated visits creates praise-earning opportunities for former participants to demonstrate their knowledge, like clicker training, this translates to recognition of how well they paid attention in former sessions and encourages further participation.
Third, TLDL does not visit DV shelters with leashed, pet companions, they actively engage child residents in a learning language to reinforce and encourage behavior with the clicker trained S.T.A.R. dogs. This is an important way to model the child’s own agency, that they can, through non-violent, positive methods, get what they want from others in a socially responsible, civil way.

This program evaluation was developed to determine if the behavioral outcomes adhered to and supported TLDL Program Mission. For this evaluation, efficacy was defined as behavioral improvements from the first 5-minute block to each subsequent block until the end of the four-block activity session. In order to establish the short-term behavioral improvement as a consequence of TLDL sessions, we observed child DV residents in weekly animal-assisted activity sessions over a two-year period. The empirical questions these observations sought to answer were: 1.) Would behavior improve over the course of each activity session? 2.) Would behavior improve in all seven behavioral categories? It has been suggested that approximately 43 percent of children between the ages of 5 to 12 demonstrate some kind of specific fear, one of which is commonly associated with dogs. Though, the source of this widely cited statistic is inconsistent, it is more likely around 14 to 16 percent (Brewer, 2001; Muris and Merckelbach, 2000), and dog fearfulness would certainly present a challenge for animal-assisted interventions. 3.) Therefore, we also wanted to know if for those child DV residents with prior TLDL participation showed greater Dog Approach scores than those who were first-timers. 4.) We expected this for Social Civility scores as well. We did not anticipate Attitude, Affect, Concept Recognition, Engagement, or Instructional Compliance would necessarily improve with prior TLDL experience, as Attitude and Affect are dynamic and the activities changed across visits and sessions. Based on our observations and DV behavioral data, all four of the empirical questions were statistically supported, most with varying effect sizes.

Since a mission statement is a formal summary of the values and goals of an organization, it was also necessary to evaluate how well the program actually met the objectives of its mission statement. The Little Dog Laughed, Animal-Assisted Therapy mission statement asserts, “Our volunteer dog/handler teams work with therapists/counselors/teachers in their effort to nurture empathy and non-violent problem solving skills in at-risk youths. We offer a carefully structured set of short classes that teach behavioral skills by engaging the children in actively training our dogs using positive training techniques.”

From TLDL’s mission statement, there were essentially three constructs we could measure: 1.) empathy, 2.) nonviolent problem solving, and 3.) teaching behavioral skills through reinforcement. It could be argued that the last construct is the same as the second, non-violent problem solving. But we interpreted the third construct as the effectiveness of reinforcement conditioning in establishing a positive context for learning. For the first construct of TLDL mission, to engender empathy, was addressed through the behavioral categories of Affect, Dog Approach and Social Civility.

The second mission of TLDL was to teach non-violent problem solving this was coded relative to the behavioral categories of Instructional Compliance, Attitude, and Social Civility. Finally, the last component of TLDL mission, engendered behavioral skills through reinforcement conditioning was addressed through Engagement (i.e., no interest, no learning), Attitude, and Social Civility. In all three TLDL mission objectives, Social Civility
was important, however this category in conjunction with Concept Recognition was the weakest of all of the behavioral categories observed.

Concept Recognition showed strong behavioral modification over the course of individual TLDL sessions (Block 1 to Block 4) but not during the sessions (Block 2 to 3 or 3 to 4). This is likely the result forgetting to continue to prompt participants during the activity so that they can show their learning across the entire session. This is no doubt difficult since there is typically only the facilitator and the dogs. The volunteers were part of the program evaluation team, and were in place to make sure children had opportunities to verbally demonstrate their knowledge (e.g., what are you supposed to do when Eli does a trick correctly? Answer: Click and give a treat).

Social Civility, is a difficult category. It essentially captures existing knowledge about manners, civility, and the child’s ability to take the perspective of another, whether it is a person or a dog (e.g., empathy). These behaviors generally emerge organically, when child participants are paired with other children, resulting in impatience, bossiness, derailing an activity on the negative spectrum, and cooperative sharing (e.g., “Here you can have a turn”), praise (e.g., “You’re really good with Eli”), encouragement (E.g., “It’s okay, you can pet him”), and mindful of manners (e.g., “may I please pet Eli?”). These social interactions can occur faster than observers are able to record, particularly if there are other more salient behaviors emerging concurrently. In addition, some of these behaviors may be hard to correct, the facilitator does not necessarily want to come across as a disciplinarian especially for a population that has either directly or indirectly experienced aggressive and/or violent consequences for mistakes.

Based on the observational data, The Little Dog Laughed, Animal-Assisted Therapy Program did appear to achieve behavioral improvements among their target population in all three constructs associated with the mission goals as well as the four empirical questions. TLDL model is adaptable to a number of other contexts and target populations. It is conceivable that the seven behavioral outcome categories for child residents of domestic violence shelters could be modified for a variety of other populations. For example, TLDL model could be adapted for rehabilitation centers, to assist patients with motor damage, assisted living facilities to help residents with attention, memory, and loneliness, and inclusion facilities to help residents with developmental disabilities.

PHASE II: Recommendations

The Little Dog Laughed sought an evidence-based program evaluation with the ultimate goal of garnering grants and funding sources for their activities, handlers, dogs, and services. Given this goal, there are several things that TLDL can do to legitimize their program further.

Manualize TLDL Program

Since animal-assisted activity is difficult to evaluate through a traditional Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART), it is important that the program is manualized. That is, what is the actual program? The only documented material representing TLDL is the website. Although the website has a lot of information it is not clearly organized, and can be difficult to navigate. The value of a formalized manual is that of clarity. Program manuals generally
include the organizational mission, clear expectations and responsibilities for volunteers, handlers, partnering organizations (e.g., domestic violence shelters), and those who hope to evaluate or corroborate TLDL’s results with their own AAA or AAT programs; methodologies; with activity libraries, and outcome goals. Currently there is no TLDL manual.

1.) Organization

i. Advanced Learning Tool Preparation

Place all activity tools for the session at different stations around the activity area before the onset of each session. This allows the trainer to progress clockwise from one station to the next throughout the session, all of the learning props will be there so the trainer’s focus is not forced away from the therapy dog or the participants to fetch more materials for the activities.

**Why is this recommended?**

It was noted that too much activity time is spent going back and forth to the learning materials during the sessions. This pulls the trainer’s attention from the children and the therapy dog, who then lose focus. The trainer must then re-entrain the attention for both the children and the dog to the desired activity. This is inefficient and affects the quality of the program.

ii. Activity Preparation

Plan activities in advance based on the participant age and whether they have already been introduced to TLDL programming. Solicit this information from the site directors in the notification call the day of the visit.

**Why is this recommended?**

This would allow you to better plan your activities prior to arriving at the site.

2.) Activities

i. Purpose – What is the analogy to Real Life?

Remember that the kids need analogies to real life when learning the lessons. After school entertainment is almost always, without exception, educational (e.g., *Dora the Explorer*, *Bill Nye the Science Guy*, *Myth Busters*, *Wiggly Waffle*, *Dogs 101*, *Big Ideas for a Small Planet*, *Dorothy the Dinosaur*, *School House Rock*, *Animal Atlas*, *Where on Earth is Carmen Sandiego?* Etc.)

**Why is this recommended?**

TLDL activities need to match the mission statement. The activities are typically introduced without a clear purpose or learning goal. The problem with this is often the children do not know what they need to do for acknowledgment. This deprives them of the opportunity to show that they’re paying attention or doing a good job.
The observers indicated that they made the suggestion to use real world analogies to the activities, so they can understand how dog training for example can be generalized to the real world and life skills (e.g., clicker training is an example of manners for the dog – it doesn’t matter that this is not really how clickers work, it allows the kids to appreciate why getting it right is important). It was noted there was a reluctance to do this, for fear of the activities feeling too much like school; but an activity without a purpose is simply entertainment and therefore does not address the goals of the TLDL mission statement.

**Activity Library.** An activity library was informally suggested following the pilot. The value of an activity library, regardless of whether the activities are original (i.e., TLDL owns the authorship rights) is that TLDL mission and the outcome categories (e.g., Engagement, Concept Recognition, Social Civility, Dog Approach, etc.) can be assimilated into each activity. Additionally, the activities could be evaluated and compared to see which activities were objectively more successful at achieving the stated goals of the mission statement.

**Social Civility (SC).** The Social Civility outcome category directly addresses all three TLDL mission goals. Social Civility is the behavior in each AAA session that occurs organically. If the participants are rude, the AAA session is an opportunity to reframe the infraction and provide the civil behavior instead. Examples of SC include basic manners, “please” and “thank you,” turn-taking, cooperation, sharing, polite requests, respecting boundaries, etc. Social Civility actions are the pre-existing set of social behaviors that the children bring to TLDL sessions; some of these behaviors may be in conflict with positive, adaptive, life skills. Social Civility also compliments the established method of Applied Behavioral Analysis (ABA), the systematic application of learning theory to improve socially significant behavior and to demonstrate that the employed interventions are responsible for behavioral improvement. TLDL activities can be used as reinforcers for Social Civility behaviors, so that low-probability behaviors (more desirable behaviors) are made contingent upon high-probability behaviors (less desirable behaviors). Thus, the Social Civility behaviors (i.e., low probability behaviors) are more likely to occur (this is the crux of the Premack Principle or Relativity Theory of Reinforcement). Given the importance of this outcome category, we recommend that handlers and volunteers attend to these behaviors when they occur in session; they too are an important part of the outcome goals.

**Volunteer Assistant.** As an aside, it was noted by both the pilot evaluators and the Phase I evaluators that the handler really needs a second person at the DV sites. During the evaluation period, we have been able to provide a volunteer for the Raphael House so that the handler is free to implement the activities, attend to the dog, provide appropriate reinforcements, and manage the props used for each session. However, once the evaluation period is over, the handler needs a volunteer assistant to attend to the children participating in the sessions. It is too much for one person to manage all of the moving parts (activities, learning tools, dogs, participants) in each session. The S.T.A.R. methodology is used for the dogs but is also necessary for the children, a volunteer should help with this, one person for the dog and the activity, one person for the program goals and the children.
PHASE III: SUMMATIVE EVALUATION RESULTS AND CONCLUSIONS

PHASE III: Summative Results

The purpose of this program evaluation was to establish the efficacy of The Little Dog Laughed Animal-Assisted Therapy (TLDL) Program relative to its mission goals. According to TLDL website, their mission lies in the following statement, “Our volunteer dog/handler teams work with therapists/counselors/teachers in their effort to nurture empathy and non-violent problem solving skills in at-risk youths. We offer a carefully structured set of short classes that teach behavioral skills by engaging the children in actively training our dogs using positive training techniques.”

These “behavioral skills” are essentially analogous to life skills, essential competencies that promote developmental success in school, social relationships, conflict resolution, decision-making, self-understanding, and communication. Similar to the empirical questions we answered during the formative evaluation, Phase III assessment questions attempted to establish the efficacy of TLDL programming reflective of TLDL’s mission and the overall goals of this program evaluation which were:

1.) **Short-Term Behavioral Modification**: Does The Little Dog Laughed, Animal-Assisted Therapy program facilitate behavioral improvement over the course of the animal-assisted activity sessions (behavioral comparisons from onset to conclusion)?

2.) **Long-Term Behavioral Modification**: Additionally, do children with prior TLDL programming experience demonstrate greater behavioral scores at the onset of the targeted behavioral constructs than TLDL program naïve children?

Although there are any number of variables that might contribute to behavioral change from one session to another, these variables would contribute equally to program experienced and program naïve children. Additionally, we wanted to know between site differences given the disparity in economic and human resources between the two domestic violence shelters.

3.) The initial results of the formative evaluation demonstrated between site differences in behavioral scores, are these between group behavioral score differences significant?

The same behavioral construct categories were used for the Summative Evaluation as for the Formative Evaluation, however for clarity, we changed the name of “Follows Instructions” to “Instructional Compliance” and “Social Rapport” to “Social Civility.”
These 7 behavioral construct categories are:

1.) Engagement  
2.) Instructional Compliance  
3.) Concept Recognition  
4.) Attitude  
5.) Affect  
6.) Dog Approach  
7.) Social Rapport

We assessed the data using a paired-samples t-test to answer the first question of the summative program evaluation, "does TLDL programming promote behavioral improvement from the onset (Block 1) of each animal-assisted activity session to the conclusion (Block 4)?" Further to estimate the magnitude of significance for significant mean score differences (p<.05), effect size estimates ($\eta^2$) were calculated (.04 = small effect; .06 = moderate effect; .14 = large effect). In fact, there were significant score improvements for all behavioral constructs from the onset of the animal-assisted activity session to the conclusion, at the 20-minute mark. See Table and Figure 1 below for a summary and visual illustration of these paired-sample mean behavioral score differences.

Table 1.  
Behavioral means from the onset (Block 1) of the AAA session to the end (Block 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral Category</th>
<th>Block 1 M (SD)</th>
<th>Block 4 M (SD)</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>2.31 (.81)</td>
<td>2.68 (.57)</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>-6.02</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows Instructions</td>
<td>2.56 (.69)</td>
<td>2.70 (.51)</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>-2.34</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept Recognition</td>
<td>2.13 (1.03)</td>
<td>2.42 (.87)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>-4.67</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>2.01 (1.22)</td>
<td>2.54 (.83)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>-7.10</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>2.22 (.90)</td>
<td>2.55 (.84)</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>-4.69</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Approach</td>
<td>0.85 (.72)</td>
<td>1.02 (.63)</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>-4.40</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Civility</td>
<td>0.84 (.88)</td>
<td>1.01 (.82)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>-2.27</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$M = \text{mean}; SD = \text{standard deviation}, df = \text{degrees of freedom}, t = \text{t-value}, p = \text{p-value}, \eta^2 = \text{eta-squared}$
The second question regarding whether children with prior TLDL programming experience demonstrate greater behavioral scores at the onset of the AAA than TLDL program-naïve children was evaluated using a Pearson’s r-correlational analysis. For the first block, when the difference between program-naïve and program-experienced score differences would most likely emerge, only three behavioral constructs were significantly better for program-experienced children: Concept Recognition, $r(311) = .165, p<.001$; Affect, $r(314) = .178, p<.001$ and Dog Approach, $r(270) = .248, p<.001$ (see Table 2).

The fact that only three categories emerged as significantly different for program-experienced relative to program-naïve does not reflect a program failure but rather a qualitative difference in the kind of behavior that might be most affected by instruction. Concept Recognition is a behavioral construct that relies on memory, as does Dog Approach/Avoidance, this is the extent to which the child is comfortable with the therapy dog. If in the previous session the child learned that the dog is not a threat, will do no harm, and therefore the experience is positive, certainly their willingness to engage the dog will be higher than program-naïve children. This is also true for the construct of Affect. Affect, also known as non-verbal leakage, is the facial and psychophysiological expression we all reflect based on our internal state. This emotional “leakage” is difficult to hide, whereas we can control our verbal expression, as is the case for the behavioral construct of Attitude (not significantly different between program-experienced and program-naïve children).
Table 2.
Correlation Matrix for Age, Prior Visit, and the 7 Behavioral Constructs at the Onset of the Animal-Assisted Activity Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Prior Visit</th>
<th>Blk-1 Eng</th>
<th>Blk-1 IC</th>
<th>Blk-1 CR</th>
<th>Blk-1 Attitude</th>
<th>Blk-1 Affect</th>
<th>Blk-1 Dog App.</th>
<th>Blk-1 Social Civ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prior Visit</td>
<td>.027 (331)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blk-1 Eng</td>
<td>.285** (333)</td>
<td>.081 (331)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blk-1 IC</td>
<td>.319** (318)</td>
<td>.097 (316)</td>
<td>.639** (322)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blk-1 CR</td>
<td>.329** (313)</td>
<td>.165** (311)</td>
<td>.423** (317)</td>
<td>.492** (310)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blk-1 Att</td>
<td>.079 (307)</td>
<td>.097 (305)</td>
<td>.616** (311)</td>
<td>.503** (305)</td>
<td>.398** (303)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blk-1 Affect</td>
<td>-.028 (316)</td>
<td>.178** (314)</td>
<td>.529** (320)</td>
<td>.387** (308)</td>
<td>.303** (303)</td>
<td>.727** (307)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blk-1 Dog Ap</td>
<td>-.008 (272)</td>
<td>.248** (270)</td>
<td>.285** (276)</td>
<td>.085 (272)</td>
<td>.035 (271)</td>
<td>.004 (270)</td>
<td>.259** (273)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blk-1 Social</td>
<td>.077 (192)</td>
<td>.069 (186)</td>
<td>.511** (192)</td>
<td>.389** (191)</td>
<td>.210** (192)</td>
<td>.352** (192)</td>
<td>.280** (192)</td>
<td>.562** (192)</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data reported above: Pearson’s r (sample size); *p-value < .05; **p-value < .01

In an effort to evaluate the between-site differences in behavioral scores initially evident in the formative evaluation analyses, we conducted independent-samples t-test for Monika’s and Raphael House residents. The goal was to find an answer to this summative evaluation’s third question, “are these between-group behavioral score differences significant?”

Table 3 below provides the mean score data for each behavioral construct in the first and last animal-assisted activity blocks. In 6 of the 7 behavioral constructs, Raphael House residents scored higher than Monika’s House residents in both Blocks 1 and 4, with the exception of scores for Affect in Block 1 (Monika House scores were higher only for Block 1). However, the mean scores within the category of Dog Approach were not significantly different between the two houses (see Figure 2).

This begs the question, why are there site differences in scores? Are the two groups largely of different ages? If the mean age of the two groups is significantly different, then developmental maturity is a reasonable conclusion for the score disparity. There is a 1-year
age gap in the mean age between the residents of Monika’s House (7.7 years) and Raphael house (8.6 years), but it is unlikely this is the only explanation for the disparity.

**Table 3.**
**Mean Behavioral Scores Across Sites from the Onset to the End of each AAA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral Category</th>
<th>Monika’s House First Block, M (SD)</th>
<th>Raphael House First Block, M (SD)</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>2.13 (.97)</td>
<td>2.56 (.56)</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>-5.01</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows Instructions</td>
<td>2.26 (0.93)</td>
<td>2.69 (0.52)</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>-5.27</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept Recognition</td>
<td>1.35 (1.10)</td>
<td>2.26 (0.87)</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>-8.22</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>1.67 (1.40)</td>
<td>1.40 (0.80)</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>-4.83</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>1.79 (1.17)</td>
<td>2.40 (0.68)</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Approach</td>
<td>0.76 (0.90)</td>
<td>1.25 (1.01)</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>-4.05</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Civility</td>
<td>0.73 (0.91)</td>
<td>1.23 (1.04)</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>-3.42</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral Category</th>
<th>Monika’s House Last Block, M (SD)</th>
<th>Raphael House Last Block, M (SD)</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>2.46 (0.79)</td>
<td>2.74 (0.45)</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>-3.54</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows Instructions</td>
<td>2.46 (0.72)</td>
<td>2.86 (0.32)</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>-6.01</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept Recognition</td>
<td>1.60 (1.13)</td>
<td>2.44 (0.76)</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>-6.91</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>2.16 (0.95)</td>
<td>2.59 (0.61)</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>-4.33</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>2.11 (0.86)</td>
<td>2.63 (0.54)</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>-5.85</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Approach</td>
<td>0.85 (0.66)</td>
<td>1.08 (0.71)</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>-2.14</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Civility</td>
<td>1.01 (0.39)</td>
<td>1.07 (0.84)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.
Descriptive data for each child resident.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Monika’s House</th>
<th>Raphael House</th>
<th>Both DV Shelters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean Age (SD) Years</strong></td>
<td>8.65 (2.81)</td>
<td>7.95 (2.99)</td>
<td>7.77 (3.20)</td>
<td>8.60 (2.62)</td>
<td>8.20 (2.94)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Range Years</strong></td>
<td>4 – 17</td>
<td>3 – 17</td>
<td>3 – 17</td>
<td>4 – 17</td>
<td>3 – 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mean Number of Prior TLDL Visits</strong></td>
<td>2.05 (1.78)</td>
<td>2.44 (2.22)</td>
<td>2.14 (1.44)</td>
<td>2.5 (2.53)</td>
<td>2.31 (2.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Number Residents</strong></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.

Although the potential effect of gender on intellectual abilities remains controversial (Ardila et al., 2011), one possible explanation for the between-site behavioral score differences may attributable to gender. If we take the position that female cognitive development proceeds earlier among females than males (Halpern, 1992), this might account for higher behavioral
scores among Raphael House residents, 71% of our sample were female (n =126) compared to 29% male (n =52) and Monika’s House male to female breakdown was 40% male (n=65) to 60% female (n =98). To test this theory, we conducted an additional independent-samples t-test across the entire sample and found this explanation is also unlikely. Table 5 and Figure 3 illustrate the data from this analysis, there is no clear or logical pattern to account for differences in behavioral scores from Block 1 to Block 4 for gender. In fact, the only statistically significant difference in mean behavioral scores relative to gender for both Block 1 to 4 was Engagement and the effect size for this was quite small, .02.

Table 5.
Mean Behavioral Scores Across Genders from the Onset of AAA to the End

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral Category</th>
<th>Females First Block, M (SD)</th>
<th>Males First Block, M (SD)</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>2.28 (0.87)</td>
<td>2.50 (0.68)</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>-2.36</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows Instructions</td>
<td>2.45 (0.81)</td>
<td>2.56 (0.69)</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>-1.97</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept Recognition</td>
<td>1.87 (1.09)</td>
<td>1.80 (1.06)</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>1.98 (1.23)</td>
<td>2.03 (0.96)</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>2.12 (1.04)</td>
<td>2.16 (0.84)</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Approach</td>
<td>1.03 (0.85)</td>
<td>1.15 (1.25)</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Civility</td>
<td>0.86 (1.07)</td>
<td>1.35 (0.82)</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>-3.26</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavioral Category</th>
<th>Females Last Block, M (SD)</th>
<th>Males Last Block, M (SD)</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>2.66 (0.60)</td>
<td>2.74 (0.49)</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows Instructions</td>
<td>2.63 (0.55)</td>
<td>2.78 (0.41)</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>-1.49</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept Recognition</td>
<td>2.35 (0.94)</td>
<td>2.54 (0.84)</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>-1.10</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>2.46 (0.91)</td>
<td>2.76 (0.49)</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>-2.00</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>2.45 (0.91)</td>
<td>2.74 (0.76)</td>
<td>242</td>
<td>-1.75</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog Approach</td>
<td>1.01 (0.70)</td>
<td>1.06 (0.35)</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Civility</td>
<td>0.97 (0.78)</td>
<td>1.14 (0.95)</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>-0.70</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The more likely explanation for the behavioral score disparity across the two domestic violence shelters is the availability of financial and personnel resources, as well as the overall availability of space. The activity center for Raphael House is a much larger room, with a common area, peripheral tables, chairs, and storage cabinets. The space for TLDL program support at Monika’s House is not much larger than a very small bedroom or a large closet. With two program evaluation observers, a TLDL handler, the therapy dog and the child, the breadth of activities is constrained.

**PHASE III: Summative Evaluation Conclusions**

The purpose of the summative program evaluation is to determine if The Little Dog Laughed Animal-Assisted Therapy Program meet the goals of their mission. Over the three-year course of this project, each phase of the evaluation assessed TLDL’s mission statement.

“Our volunteer dog/handler teams work with therapists/counselors/teachers in their effort to nurture empathy and non-violent problem solving skills in at-risk youths. We offer a carefully structured set of short classes that teach behavioral skills by engaging the children in actively training our dogs using positive training techniques.”

In order for the mission to be measurable, it necessarily requires those qualities that might be interpreted as ‘traits’ (e.g., empathy) to be translated to behavior, something mutable that can improve. Three qualities of the TLDL mission translated into measurable behavioral categories: 1.) empathy, 2.) nonviolent problem solving, and 3.) teaching behavioral skills through reinforcement. We interpreted the third construct as the success of reinforcement conditioning in establishing a positive context for learning. The first behavioral
quality of TLDL’s mission, “to nurture empathy,” was addressed through the behavioral categories of Affect, Dog Approach and Social Civility.

The second mission of TLDL was “to teach non-violent problem solving,” Instructional Compliance, Attitude, and Social Civility were established to assess this. Finally, the last component of TLDL’s mission engendered behavioral skills through reinforcement conditioning, this was addressed through Engagement (i.e., no interest, no learning), Attitude, and Social Civility.

Efficacy was defined as significant behavioral improvement in all seven of the behavioral constructs (i.e., Engagement, Instructional Compliance, Concept Recognition, Affect, Attitude, Dog Approach, and Social Civility) over the course of the animal-assisted activity sessions (onset to conclusion). In order to establish that the short-term behavioral modification occurred as a consequence of TLDL sessions, we observed child DV residents in weekly animal-assisted activity sessions over a three-year period. The summative empirical questions these observations effectively answered involved both short-term and long-term behavioral modification.

1.) Short-Term Behavioral Modification: Does The Little Dog Laughed, Animal-Assisted Therapy program facilitate behavioral improvement over the course of the animal-assisted activity sessions (behavioral comparisons from onset to conclusion)?

As outlined in the results of the Summative Evaluation, we established that TLDL did contribute to behavioral improvement in all seven of the behavioral constructs reflecting their mission statement from the start to the conclusion of the animal-assisted activity sessions.

2.) Long-Term Behavioral Modification: Additionally, do children with prior TLDL programming experience demonstrate greater behavioral scores at the onset of the targeted behavioral constructs than TLDL program naïve children?

Although long-term intervention is difficult for the domestic violence resident population, TLDL was able to provide repeated support to some residents (no more than 9 repeated visits, with an average of 2 for the entire sample). Among those child residents who had prior experience to TLDL’s programming, their evidenced higher outcomes in the first block for the cognitive constructs of Concept Recognition and Dog Approach, as well as the emotional construct of Affect.

In an effort to eliminate the possibility of intervening variables systematically affecting the behavioral construct results, we assessed the mean differences across gender, as well as age in behavioral scores and found no clear contributing patterns. The mean age for children at both residential facilities was 7 to 8 years, only differing by one year and therefore not a significant contributor to the behavioral construct outcomes. Therefore, we are confident TLDL’s programming is effective in promoting empathy, nonviolent problem-solving and socially competence.
PHASE III: SUMMATIVE EVALUATION
RECOGNITION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

PHASE III: Program Recognition

Financial Resourcefulness. The Little Dog Laughed demonstrates a laudable resourcefulness in engaging stakeholders, garnering grant funding even in light of no prior evidence-based data supporting their efficacy, and in using inventive strategies to network funding and support. A salient example of this is the program evaluation, TLDL garnered three years of institutional support in the form of 12-program evaluators, volunteers and several credible evaluative documents to support the mission of the organization while expending none of their funds in garnering this support. Comparable evaluations from establish consultant groups are generally several thousand dollars. With this project’s 3-year period with more than 200 hours of observation and at least 100 writing hours, the financial burden would be closer to $10,000. TLDL also maintains a Petco Foundation grant and has been the recipient of smaller endowments from IDEXX Laboratories, Fidelity Charitable Grants, and small business support.

Openness to Improvement and Evidence-Based Evaluation. TLDL has consistently sought ways to improve. The Director and Board Members actively pursued evidence-based evaluation in order to meaningfully identify obstacles preventing or obscuring the purpose and mission of organization. Evaluation is essentially an audit, although it can feel more personal and invasive. Program evaluation is not simply an inspection of financial record-keeping and budgets, but a critique of the ideals and values of the organization, the efficacy of the staff, stakeholders, and programming reflecting those values. Program evaluation then provides a judgement of the organization’s value based on the effectiveness of the program in achieving the goals and values of their mission. In spite of earnest attempts to make the process collaborative, positive, and transformative, assessment is uncomfortable. Although recommendations and evaluation is in the best interest of TLDL, all involved were professional, courteous and accommodating. Further, TLDL was receptive to evaluator critiques and suggestions and where appropriate offered clear explanations for why some areas could not be revised (e.g., limitations and constraints of sites, DV site policies, or FERPA protections for the child residents).

Online Platform. TLDL has an excellent online presence. According to media experts (e.g., Michael Hyatt), there are seven core requirements for an effective online platform: 1.) a consistent core message; 2.) memorable and polished branding; 3.) a navigable website; 4.) regular blogging; 5.) an engaged network; 6.) establish a social media presence; and 7.) stay true to the mission. The Little Dog Laughed Animal-Assisted Therapy Program's online platform adheres to all of these requirements with perhaps the exception of a consistent current blog. That said, the website provides professional marketing materials, recognition of current stakeholder and supports, avenues to for providing additional support, released financial data, the core values and mission of the organization, media coverage links, and social media links.
PHASE III: Recommendations

**Blogging.** Non-profit organizations benefit from consistent, current blogs in a number of ways, first they drive traffic to your website and to the organization. Those moved to visit your website are potential contributors, blogging helps both retain and drive interest in the business. Blogging also makes an authority of the blogger, no doubt the Director, Linda Keast is already an expert in her own right, but the blog, furthers this recognition online.

**Stakeholders.** The stakeholders consist of any individual, company, private or public, municipal or federal whose mission, goals or interests overlap, compliment, or are promoted through the mission of The Little Dog Laughed Animal Assisted Therapy Program. Currently those with a stake in the mission of TLDL include: TLDL Board of Directors, the staff and residents of Monika’s House and Raphael House, McKay Elementary School teachers, parents and students, West Hills Village staff, residents and healthcare providers. All of these stakeholders are invested in the outcome of TLDL programming, as they all benefit from effective animal-assisted activities and therapy. Increases the number of stakeholders invested in TLDL also increases the credibility and influence of the program. The ramifications of increasing your stakeholders are: 1.) more funding opportunities; 2.) increased public relations opportunities; 3.) earned media coverage (media interest based exclusively on reputation and word of mouth); 4.) more human capital to help with programming (e.g., facilitators, dog-handler volunteers, board members); and investors.

The strategies for increasing stakeholders are not unlike organizations’ approaches to maximize earned media coverage: capitalize on the program story, that is, share the outcome and conclusions of this program evaluation through social media, in all public relations events, and through grants (much like TLDL currently does). Further, target the audience, the audience most likely receptive to TLDL programming include: health care providers, schools, and organizations whose mission overlaps with deterring domestic violence (e.g., Monika and Raphael House work), supporting children with autism (e.g., common application of animal-assisted activity, therapy), life skills training in elementary education (e.g., McKay Elementary School program); and dementia or Alzheimer’s support (e.g., West Hills Village).

**Revision of Manual and Activity Catalog.** Program evaluators synthesized operations in an example manual (see Appendix VI) as well as some animal-assisted activities with behavioral objectives in an Activity Catalog (See Appendix VII), but this will require continued vigilance and revision. Please be mindful for documents that the question of, “what is the purpose and value of this activity toward TLDL’s mission?” and “How does this activity meet our mission?” should always be in the forefront of the author and handler.

**Programming Organization.** Although this evaluation established the efficacy of TLDL program, one persistent obstacle of improvement was the order and organization of the onsite program delivery. As stated in the Formative Evaluation, a volunteer supporter for the dog handler will mediate the rush associated with learning tool or prop organization during the activity sessions, site set-up and breakdown, as well as in managing the child participants while the handler manages the therapy dog and the activities. A volunteer supporter during site visits will also facilitate concept delivery for each activity. Although the evaluation is over, it is still important to consider each activity’s purpose and how that activity supports TLDL’s mission.
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APPENDIX I: FUNDING SOURCES

Annie E. Casey Foundation  
701 St. Paul St.  
Baltimore, MD 21202  
A private charitable organization, dedicated to helping build better futures for disadvantaged children in the United States.  
https://portal.aecf.org/instructions/

Avon Foundation for Women  
777 Third Avenue  
New York, NY 10017  
(866) 505-AVON  
http://www.avonfoundation.org/grants/grants-database/

Banfield Charitable Trust  
8000 NE Tillamook Street  
P.O. Box 13998  
Portland, OR 97213  
BCT recognizes and promotes the human-animal bond. They understand the benefit this bond has on humans emotionally, physically, and mentally. BCT runs several different programs that benefit animals and people. Through the help of donors, they are able to provide grants to assist those in need and support pet focused organizations.  
http://www.banfieldcharitabletrust.org/nonprofits/program-grants/

Bernice Barbour Foundation  
Awards grants for hands-on animal care projects.  
http://www.bernicebarbour.org/

Build-a-Bear Workshop Bear Hugs Foundation  
Our goal is to provide grants to help many programs that are working hard to make the world a healthier and happier place for kids.  
Children’s Health and Wellness Grants  

Doris Day Animal Foundation  
Their grants do not exceed $5,000  
Doris Day Animal Foundation  
8033 Sunset Blvd  
Ste 845  
Los Angeles CA 90046  
http://www.dorisdayanimalfoundation.org/grants/guidelines-and-faq

Family and Youth Services Bureau  
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services  
370 L’Enfant Promenade, S.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20447  
Funds an array of programs at the state, tribal and community levels.  
http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/fysb/grants
Grants.gov
Most comprehensive resource for finding and applying for all federal grant programs.
http://www.grants.gov

GrantWatch.com
Provides a comprehensive listing of the most current funding opportunities
http://www.grantwatch.com

Laura J. Niles Foundation
c/o Fogarty, Cohen, Selby & Nemiroff LLC
1700 East Putnam Avenue, Suite 406
Old Greenwich, CT 06870
Supports efforts that offer learning and economic growth opportunities for the motivated poor. Of equal importance are charitable initiatives that foster life enrichment through canine and other types of animal companionship.
http://www.ljniles.org/application-process.html

Office of Justice Programs Grants 101
U.S. Department of Justice
810 Seventh Street NW
Washington, DC 20531
Phone: 202-514-2000
Email: askojp@ncjrs.gov
Overview of the grants and funding sponsored through the U.S. Department of Justice (including programs that support children of domestic violence)
http://ojp.gov/grants101/index.htm

Oregon Department of Justice Crime Victim’s Services Division
Provides a list of Oregon grants related to crime, including domestic violence.
Oregon Department of Justice
PO Box 1108
Salem, Oregon 97308
Phone: 503-373-1323
http://www.doj.state.or.us/victims/pages/cami.aspx

Planet Dog Foundation (PDF)
Fund nonprofit: animal-assistance programs, therapy dog programs, other canine service programs
Planet Dog Foundation
85 Bradley Drive
Westbrook, ME 04092
207.761.1515 ext. 101
df@planetdog.com
http://www.planetdogfoundation.org/grantmaking.aspx

PetSmart Charities
Provides limited financial assistance to fund innovative programs, with measurable results, that help accomplish its mission. Nonprofit animal welfare organizations, municipal animal control facilities, and educational establishments are eligible to apply.
http://www.petsmartcharities.org/
PETCO Foundation (current supporter)
7262 North Rosemead Blvd.
San Gabriel, CA 91775
FAX: (858) 909-2618

Rejoice grants through PETCO Foundation support IRS designated non-profit, pet-related groups as well as municipal agencies and educational institutions involved in animal welfare causes, these include animal-therapy programs. PETCO Foundation's direct mission is to: "Support community organizations and efforts that enhance the lives of companion animals while strengthening the bond between people and pets."

U.S. Department of Justice
Office of Violence Against Women
This site provides current, open solicitations of grant applications and their RFPs.
http://www.justice.gov/ovw/grant-programs

VAW net.org
National Online Resources Center on Violence Against Women
3605 Vartan Way, Suite 101
Harrisburg, PA 17110
Voice 1 800 537-2238
http://www.vawnet.org/grants-funding/funding-opportunities.php

WorldCause Foundation
One East Broward Blvd. Suite 700
Ft. Lauderdale, FL 33301
Has funded animal-assisted therapy programs in the past.
http://www.worldcausefoundation.org/newspress/november_5_2012.html

Youth.gov
Resource for more than 1,000 grant opportunities for 26 federal grant-making agencies
http://youth.gov/funding-search
APPENDIX II: SITE DESCRIPTIONS

Monika’s House

Monika’s House was established in 1999 with the support of a Community Development Block Grant. Monika’s House Shelter is Washington County’s only domestic violence shelter, and is named in memory of the late Monika Voits. In January of 1999, Monika’s husband murdered in her sleep while her two sons slept down the hall. Monika’s House is a 24-bed facility (i.e., 6 family units, 3 single-person units) whose mission is to provide confidential emergency residency for families, children and their pets seeking shelter and protection from family members who pose imminent physical danger. Monika’s House is one of five domestic violence shelters in the state that also provide sanctuary to family pets.

The services provided through Monika’s House include the following: emergency accommodation; individual and group domestic violence support; parenting groups and support; children's groups and support; safety planning; resource referrals; advocacy and case management; staffing and a 24-hour crisis line.

Reference: http://www.dvrc-or.org/monikas-house/

Raphael House

Portland’s Raphael House is a multi-faceted domestic violence agency dedicated to fighting the causes and consequences of intimate partner violence. Established in 1977, Raphael House offers emergency shelter, a 24-hour crisis line, transitional residency advocacy, as well as non-residential advocacy in partnership with the Portland Police Bureau, and community outreach and education.

The mission of Raphael House is to engage the community in non-violent living through advocacy, education, and community outreach, and by providing a safe haven from domestic violence. The Raphael House is an IRS 501(c) 3, designated non-profit organization.

Reference: http://raphaelhouse.com
# APPENDIX III: DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENTS

## PILOT BEHAVIORAL RUBRIC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Goal</th>
<th>Descriptors</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Example Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metacognition</strong></td>
<td>Demonstrations of Empathy</td>
<td>Self-identification of how the dog may &quot;feel&quot; or &quot;think.&quot;</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Scale: 0 to 3</td>
<td>Respect for boundaries</td>
<td>Recognizes Eli needs a time out in his kennel</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Engagement</strong></td>
<td><strong>Attention</strong></td>
<td>Volunteer and dog</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Scale: 0 to 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Volunteer only</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dog only</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neither Volunteer or the dog</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Interest/Inquisitive</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Participation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Distractible/Derailed</strong></td>
<td>Engaged to Unengaged (usually b/c of a distraction)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Follows Instruction</strong></td>
<td>Recognition of Instructions</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Scale: 0 to 3</td>
<td>Corrects Prompted Errors</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reminded more than 1x</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Derailed</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Concept Recognition</strong></td>
<td>Recognizes Conceptual Ideas</td>
<td>&quot;I click once for a correct response&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating Scale: 0 to 3</td>
<td>Recognizes Errors</td>
<td>&quot;I clicked too many times&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provides Examples</td>
<td>&quot;Like when I want something I say please&quot;</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cannot Recall Activity Concept</td>
<td>&quot;I don't know&quot;</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attitude</strong></td>
<td>Affective Verbalizing</td>
<td>Name-calling</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale = -3 to 3</td>
<td>Affective Nonverbal Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affect</strong></td>
<td>Affective State Rating Scale</td>
<td>Pouty</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale = -3 to 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Smiling/Enthusiastic</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 = Joyful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 = Positive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 = Content</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 = Neutral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-1 = Withdrawn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-2 = Discontent, Pouty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-3 = Hostile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# PILOT DATA SHEET: RAPHAEL HOUSE

## OBSERVATION SHEET: Raphael House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Block 1</th>
<th>Block 2</th>
<th>Block 3</th>
<th>Block 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Metacognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating: 0 to 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating: 0 to 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating: 0 to 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating: 0 to 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating: -3 to 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating: -3 to 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTES**

---

Observer Initials: Date: Onset Time: Concluding Time:

Subject Initial: Description: Sex: Age: # Prior Sessions:

Subject Initial: Description: Sex: Age: # Prior Sessions:
Subject Initials

**Behavior toward Eli or Lilli** [-1=aggressive, fearful; 0 = neutral/ambivalent; 1 = Approach, Unafraid]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unafraid</td>
<td>Unafraid</td>
<td>Unafraid</td>
<td>Unafraid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social Rapport** [-1=Uncooperative, Non-empathetic, Unhelpful, unkind; 0 = Neutral; 1 = Cooperative, Empathic, Helpful, Kind]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>Kind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:

---

Subject Initials

**Behavior toward Eli or Lilli** [-1=aggressive, fearful; 0 = neutral/ambivalent; 1 = Approach, Unafraid]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>Approach</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unafraid</td>
<td>Unafraid</td>
<td>Unafraid</td>
<td>Unafraid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Social Rapport** [-1=Uncooperative, Non-empathetic, Unhelpful, unkind; 0 = Neutral; 1 = Cooperative, Empathic, Helpful, Kind]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td>Cooperation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td>Helpful</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>Kind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
# FORMATIVE EVALUATION BEHAVIORAL RUBRIC

## Target Behaviors and Rating Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attentive to both facilitator and the dog</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentive toward the facilitator exclusively</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focused attention toward the dog exclusively</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed or unable to focus their attention to Linda or the dog</td>
<td>0 to 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks relevant questions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asks irrelevant questions</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willing to participate in all the activities</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctant to participate in specific activity</td>
<td>1 to 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refuses to participate (different from instructional Compliance)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrects behavior spontaneously</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrects behavior under prompt</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent instructional compliance with no correction</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not follow instructions, does not correct errors</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbally states the concept (prompted or spontaneously)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbally recognizes an error</td>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviorally recognizes an error</td>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides examples of the concept in other contexts</td>
<td>1 to 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot recall activity concept</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive comments during activities</td>
<td>3 to 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No comments during activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative comments during activities</td>
<td>Range: -3 to -1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive emotional affect during activities</td>
<td>3 to 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral or flat affect during activities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative affect during activities</td>
<td>Range: -3 to -1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates cooperation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates sharing or turn-taking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses polite manners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is receptive to corrections in manners</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is unreceptive to corrections in manners</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argumentative</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to share</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unwilling to cooperate</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaches the dog</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmoved by the dog</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoids contact with the dog</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### FINAL DATA SHEET: MONIKA’S HOUSE

#### OBSERVATION SHEET: Monika House

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Initial:</th>
<th>Description:</th>
<th>Sex:</th>
<th>Age:</th>
<th># Prior Sessions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Lesson Abbreviations:**
- INTRO = Introduction
- C = Clicker training
- MTS = Match-to-sample
- MWM = Move with me
- OM = Olfactory mapping
- PTIT = Put this into that
- SE = Stationary exercises
- T = Targeting
- TD = Teach dancing

**Approach toward Ellie or Lilli**
- [-1 = aggressive, fearful; 0 = neutral/ambivalent; 1 = Approach, Unafraid]

**Social Rapport**
- [-1 = uncooperative, empathic, unhelpful, unkind; 0 = neutral; 1 = cooperative, empathic, helpful, kind]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Block 1 Lesson:</th>
<th>Block 2 Lesson:</th>
<th>Block 3 Lesson:</th>
<th>Block 4 Lesson:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Dog Approach**
RATING: -1 to 1 |
| **Social Civility**
RATING: -1 to 1 |
| **Engagement**
RATING: 0 to 3 |
| **Follows Instruction**
RATING: 0 to 3 |
| **Concept Recognition**
RATING: 0 to 3 |
| **Attitude**
RATING: -3 to 3 |
| **Affect**
RATING: -3 to 3 |
### FINAL DATA SHEET: RAPHAEL HOUSE

### OBSERVATION SHEET: Raphael House

**Observer Initials:**

**Date:**

**Onset Time:**

**Concluding Time:**

**Subject Initial:**

---

**Description:**

---

**Sex:**

---

**Age:**

---

**# Prior Sessions:**

---

**Subject Initial:**

---

**Description:**

---

**Sex:**

---

**Age:**

---

**# Prior Sessions:**

---

**Lesson Abbreviations:**

INTRO = Introduction; C = Clicker training; MTS = Match-to-sample; MWM = Move with me; OM = Olfactory mapping; PTIT = Put this into that; SE = Stationary exercises; T = Targeting; TD = Teach dancing

**Approach toward Ell or LIII** [-1=aggressive, fearful; 0 = neutral/ambivalent; 1 = Approach, Unafraid]

**Social Rapport** [-1=uncooperative, empathic, unhelpful, unkind; 0 = neutral; 1 = cooperative, empathic, helpful, kind]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Block 1 Lesson:</th>
<th>Block 2 Lesson:</th>
<th>Block 3 Lesson:</th>
<th>Block 4 Lesson:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dog Approach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating: -1 to 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Civility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating: -1 to 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating: 0 to 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follows Instruction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating: 0 to 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concept Recognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating: 0 to 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating: -3 to 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rating: -3 to 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX IV: Media Coverage of the Program Evaluation

Why was The Little Dog Laughed AAT created?

Because of two scary statistics:

1. Most perpetrators of domestic violence are also harming the family pets. One study reported that 48 percent to 71 percent of battered women reported that their pets had also been threatened, harmed, or killed by their partners.

2. The most statistically reliable predictor for determining if a child will grow up to be a violent offender of any kind is witnessing animal abuse as a child. What a child sees he is likely to repeat. Early intervention is critical.

Oregon’s award-winning Washington County Animal Protection Multidisciplinary Team (MDT), dealing with the strong link between domestic violence and animal abuse, needed a “stop the cycle” component for affected children. We decided to offer at-risk children an attractive alternative to violence — a fun, coercion-free method of “getting what you want” which also allowed them to experience a healthy, trust-based relationship. The Little Dog Laughed Animal-Assisted Therapy, and its clicker-training-based STAR (See, Tag And Reward) program was born.

STAR teams of dog/handler pairs offer a carefully structured set of short classes that introduce in an empowering, entertaining way concepts that are naturally inherent in positive dog training:

- How to build a positive relationship based on empathy, shared communication, and trust.
- Effective, non-violent methods of problem solving.
- Safe, respectful treatment of animals.
- How to break down large problems into manageable bits.

What exactly does a STAR team DO?

In the first visit, the primary focus is on safe and respectful conduct around dogs and learning to “understand what dogs are trying to say.” Subsequent sessions move swiftly through:

- Introducing STAR terminology (See, Tag And Reward) and modeling how this works by teaching the therapy dog something totally new in five minutes using a clicker and without speaking a word.
- Demonstrating the process by training the children’s counselor/teacher to do something silly.
- Practicing as a group the motor skills needed (both clicking/tagging and rewarding).
- Practicing teaching each other without using a single word except for the sound of the “click” (using M&M/Skittles/etc. rather than dog treats).
- Picking a good, preferably silly, game/skill for the students to teach the dog. Note: our handlers have colorful props that suggest specific behaviors (e.g., a tiny basketball goal, a skateboard, etc.) but the kids are encouraged to put their personal stamp on the end product.
- Reviewing the “Trainer’s Promise” (see page 18).
- Discussing how a complex problem (e.g., teaching a dog how to play basketball) is handled by breaking it down into much smaller, easier to train steps/skills that can be worked on one at a time. (“How do you eat an elephant? One bite at a time.”) Example: To play basketball, we may decide the dog needs to be able to (1) hold a ball in its mouth, (2) retrieve a ball that is thrown, (3) locate the basketball hoop, (4) put the ball in the hoop, and (5) go to its mat to start the game again.

Reprinted from The Latham Letter / Winter 2014
• Coaching the children as they teach the therapy dog each of the needed skills individually.
• Overseeing the “assembly process” of putting those learned skills together in longer and longer sequences (behavior chains) until we reach the final complete behavior.

What might be some of the reasons the STAR program has been successful with at-risk children?

• Positive, marker-based training is 100% about building a relationship based on earned trust and clear, timely communication between two different entities – humans on one side, monkeys, chickens, dogs, etc. on the other side. There is something both exhilarating and empowering about having a dog not only do what we ask, but also be clearly enjoying itself.
• We learn/remember best if we are actively rather than passively involved in what is being presented. Because STAR engages the kids in the training process, they are (unknowingly) active participants in their own therapy.
• We all tend to feel more positively about a situation if we feel we have choices and that they will be honored. STAR builds in opportunities for participants to make choices, and to recognize that right in others.
• Dogs have been bred for centuries to interact intelligently with humans. The have very readable emotional reactions to stimuli – they provide real-time feedback on interactions. STAR participants are taught to “read” what the dog is saying and adjust their own behavior accordingly. Having the “little dog laugh” provides a sincere and unambiguous signal to children training a dog that they are doing a good job.

How are your STAR teams different from more traditional therapy dog teams that we see?

It is the active nature of our engagement with the children that distinguishes us from other groups:

1. We actively engage the children in thinking up and teaching our dogs an amazing assortment of games. This does not sound unusual until you recognize that traditional therapy organizations (Pet Partners and TDI, for example) do not allow animals off-leash, do not allow clickers, and the children are not allowed to train. Of course, when our teams are representing Pet Partners, we abide by their rules. But when we put on our Little Dog Laughed suits, the fun begins!
2. Traditional therapy dogs are specifically screened to gently tolerate ANY behavior on the part of the child. Our dogs are encouraged to safely but clearly react to a child’s behavior. One of our goals is for the children to learn to “read” what the dog is telling them so they can begin to understand how their behavior impacts others.

Why are you using therapy dogs instead of shelter dogs, as some programs do?

Washington County human services, school districts, and animal services prohibit the use of shelter dogs. The use of registered, seasoned therapy dogs answers their safety concerns and enables us to move more quickly to the “fun stuff.” Our handlers do not think of the dogs as pets. As I tell the kids, “Eli is my partner – I do things WITH him, not TO him.” This mindset allows us to talk honestly about what it means to be a friend.

Who are your clients?

- Domestic Violence Shelters: Throughout 2013 we’ve made weekly visits to two DV shelters (Raphael House of Portland and Monika’s House in Washington County), working closely with their juvenile counselors. We work with up to six children a visit, one child at a time, so that we can support what each particular child needs without distractions. To stay in sync with each facility’s intervention strategies, the visiting handler joins...
the shelter staff in all relevant training so that goals and language used with the children is kept consistent.

- **Elementary Schools:** What started as “test of concept” series at McKay Elementary School has blossomed into a strong, ongoing relationship. In this more structured environment, a team works with the counselor and a group of four to six kids selected for behavioral issues. The focus is less intensely on the individual in this setting. In a four-session series we work on themes identified by the counselor. After each STAR session, the counselor picks up a thread introduced while working with the dog and weaves it into a further discussion on how that concept applies to people:
  - **Learning empathy:** how to read signals from the dogs and also from people so as to understand and get along with others.
  - **Positive Influence:** training the dog in positive ways helps the students learn how to get along with others without bossing or bullying.
  - **Social Skills:** students will try new skills with the dogs, such as assertiveness, that are difficult to try with people, since the dogs are non-judgmental.

### How is the STAR program being evaluated?

As part of Pacific University’s five-year commitment to the program, we are working with a group of seniors under the guidance of Dr. heide Island, Associate Professor in Behavioral Science, Pacific University Psychology Department. Beginning in September 2013, these students have accompanied our STAR teams to physically assist, and to act as non-participating Field Observers who impartially collect data for outcome assessment. The collected data will be used to create a program evaluation that will be used for grants, government certifications, and of course for their senior thesis presentations. In Spring 2014 their findings will be presented orally at multiple levels, from Pacific University to the Western Psychological Association Conference. Equally important has been the weekly feedback provided by these scholars on pacing, terminology, and props. They are valued allies in moving the program forward.

### What are your goals for 2014?

Since 2011 we have tried to grow the program at a safe and sustainable rate, working to create the infrastructure and resources that would support expansion.

In 2014 we want to:

1. Recruit and train more volunteer dog/handler teams so that we can meet existing demand in the Portland Metro area, and expand into surrounding areas. For this we need to:
   - Design and publish our own dog/handler registration procedures and qualification test.
   - Design and offer workshops to help potential handlers meet the criteria for that test, both to be offered at least twice a year.
   - Design and identify presenters for two-three continuing education workshops per year to help STAR teams stay on top of their game.
   - Define what is needed for a strong support system for STAR handlers.
2. Identify and qualify for funding sufficient to help us prepare, deploy, and support at least five new STAR teams over the next year. This will enable us to meet existing demand in Oregon, and to expand into the Vancouver Washington school system.
3. Continue to capture all forms, procedures, expenses, guidelines — EVERYTHING needed to replicate the program elsewhere.

### LINKS:

www.thelittleDogLaughed.org

www.facebook.com/thelittleDogLaughedAAT

November 21, 2013
“The Little Dog Laughed Animal Assisted Therapy program has been such a positive addition to the weekly calendar of activities we can offer kids living in our domestic violence shelter. I have seen youth participants gain confidence and a better understanding and respect of personal boundaries while having fun at the same time. I would definitely recommend the program to other settings that serve youth and families affected by domestic violence.”

Lindsey Vold, Youth Program Coordinator

November 12, 2013
“The Little Dog Laughed program provides the children in our program with a reliable, positive relationship to tether them through a sea of change. The youth who participate learn valuable skills and gain a sense of accomplishment and capability through their work with Linda and Eli.”

Evanna Bradley-Tschirgi, MA
Children’s Advocate, Monika’s House Shelter
Domestic Violence Resource Center, www.dvrc-or.org

November 2011
“Working with Eli has helped our students learn skills in getting along with others, such as being respectful and influencing others in positive ways. It has been a unique opportunity to teach social skills in a new way, adding to the school’s anti-bullying and violence prevention curriculum.”

Gillian Dyall MS, Clinical Psychology
School Counselor, McKay Elementary, Beaverton Oregon

“I just wanted to let you know that the dog training was a big hit. N. learned how to be more aware of our dog’s actions and how he was reacting to her. She learned how to command and how to follow through with our dog. She is simply able to do better as well with humans. She has learned how to read people and their reactions to situations and has been able to stand up and get her information out to the other person.

“I hope this will continue next year. N. was not aware that she was learning while she was teaching the dog the commands. Thank you for allowing N. to be in this class – it was a winner!!”

Parent of a participating child
Trainer's Promise

What does a S.T.A.R. Trainer DO?
SEE what you want
TAG it with a click,
And
REWARD

How does a S.T.A.R. Trainer DO it?
With a CLICKER!
Remember that a clicker isn’t a remote control –
it’s our voice when we talk to critters that don’t "speak human".

With TRUST! The dogs trust us to keep our promises:

Trainer's Promise #1:
Every click = a reward, no matter what.

Trainer's Promise #2
I will never ask you to do something you can't.

Trainer's Promise #3
I will never ask you to do anything that is dangerous
or that will get you in trouble later.

Trainer's Promise #4
I will never scold you if you try and don’t succeed.
I will be proud of you for trying!

Trainer's Promise #5
It's OK for you to say no.
Get to Know the New Model Citizens of the CCE

Model Citizens integrate passions, skills, and responsibilities by working as a team on civic engagement programs and preparing for lives as active citizens in their profession and community. Through their engagement in the community, work in the CCE, dialogue in staff meetings, and reflection at retreats, participants learn what it means to be a model citizen in their workplace and communities.

Hello! I am Alex Chambers and I am so excited to be a part of the Civic Engagement team this semester! I am from Eagle Point, Oregon which is a small town in Southern Oregon. Some things I enjoy doing in my free time include playing guitar, going to the beach, playing sports and volunteering. I am a freshman this year and plan on majoring in elementary education. I was involved with the two elementary schools in my hometown and my goal is to become involved with the elementary schools around the Forest Grove area.

Hey guys! My name is Kristen Kawai and I am from Hood River, Oregon! I am a senior here at Pacific and working on my exercise science major and psychology minor. I have worked for the Center for Civic Engagement for 3 years now and am looking forward to my last year here! I have helped coordinate a few events here on campus such as the Community Collaboration Celebration and Paws for a Cause. I enjoy volunteering, especially with elderly and can’t wait to start up again this year! I look forward to meeting all of you!

Hey there! My name is Jason Nguyen and this is my first year at Pacific. I am thinking toward majoring in Chemistry, but I still have four more years to decide. For the past 18 years of my life, I have lived in three different countries: Vietnam, Canada and America. Hence, I have a strong international background and a wide perspective of the world. I love organizing events, helping people in need and chilling with my friends n weekends. I am so stoked to be a CCE Model Citizen this year. I am looking very forward to all the fun that I will have and CCE will bring to all the Boxers.

New AmeriCorps Pump It Up! Coordinator

Talofa! My name is Irae Hosea and I am honored to be a part of the CCE Staff here at Pacific. I believe that in order to achieve bigger dreams you need better plans. I majored in Film and Video production during my time at Pacific. Before that, I was in Modesto, California. Growing up, my family taught me what it means to show one love to those around you. That lesson of compassion has pulled me through some of the hardest times in my life. I use that compassion to try and help others find what helps them. I look forward to all the experiences ahead. One Love.

For more info:
Email pumpitup@pacificu.edu or go to the website http://www.pacifcu.edu/about-us/centers/civic-engagement/tutoring-and-mentoring.

Check us out at www.pacificuccce.wordpress.com OR www.facebook.com/pacificuccce
The Civic Scoop

Service Saturdays

By: Kelsi Gammon
Be on the lookout for Service Saturdays this semester! Service Saturdays will include projects both on and off campus brought to you by the Center for Civic Engagement or done in conjunction with other service organizations. Activities could range from a day trip to the coast for a beach clean-up or an international fair here on campus. For updates, check the CCE blog or Facebook page. With ideas or questions, please email cce@pacificu.edu. Have suggestions? Want to help lead your own Service Saturday? Send us an email or drop by our office in Scott Hall!

SOLVE Beach Cleanup

By Alex Chambers
On Saturday, September 27th, ten Pacific University students went to team up with SOLVE at Cannon Beach for their 30th Anniversary Beach and Riverside Cleanup. There were about 4,700 volunteers in Oregon who worked on over 60 inland projects and volunteered at 47 different beach locations. As a result of everyone’s effort, an estimated 52,200 pounds of trash and recyclable material were removed. Also, 286 native trees and shrubs were planted, as well as about three acres of invasive non-native vegetation were removed. A big thank you goes to SOLVE for providing this great opportunity and for keeping Oregon clean!

Upcoming Events

This month, check out:
- **Forest Grove Community School**: Become a tutor with the afterschool Tree House homework club at the Forest Grove Community School!
- **Fall Festival**: The Forest Grove School District is seeking Boxer volunteers to help run their Fall Festival in shifts on Friday, October 17th.
- **Light the Night**: A Portland walk to help fight against Leukemia and Lymphoma. Volunteer your time to help the event happen, or participate in the walk to show support on October 25th.
- **Middle School Tutors Needed**: Tutor the AVID class at Brown Middle School in Hillsboro to help prepare students for high school.
- **Valley Art Association Volunteer**: Spend some time helping run the Gallery and selling art work.

Contact the CCE in Scott Hall 110
Email us at cce@pacificu.edu

Animal Assisted Therapy

By: Kathryn Orley
Most students do not have the opportunity of combining their senior thesis research with a civic engagement opportunity. However Dr. Heide Island, the Comparative Neuroscience professor within the Department of Psychology, began a senior thesis class last year with a local animal-assisted therapy program called The Little Dog Laughed. The students undertook a program evaluation to establish if the goals of a given program are met through the implementation of it. The Little Dog Laughed is an animal-assisted activity program which involves brief bouts of interaction between the population served, in this case children of domestic violence shelters, and two Papillion therapy dogs, Elia and Lilli. The goal of each dog therapy visit is to teach the kids how to interact respectfully with others, how to practice good life skills (e.g., please and thank you, modeled through clicker training), and how to implement positive problem-solving. A session would consist of one child teaching the two therapy dogs a new trick in about 15 to 30 minutes.

Director of The Little Dog Laughed, Linda Keast, showing how to train a dog.
Pet Talk: Nonprofit organization uses clicker training to teach kids communication skills

By Monique Balas | For The Oregonian/OregonLive
Email the author | Follow on Twitter
on August 09, 2013 at 6:00 PM, updated August 09, 2013 at 6:17 PM

When dog trainer Linda Keast came up with the idea for an animal-assisted therapy program to teach kids positive communication skills, you might say something clicked.

Keast is a webmaster and volunteer for Animal Aid, one of the participating organizations in the Washington County Animal Protection Multi-Disciplinary Team.

Made up of social service agencies, law enforcement and animal-welfare groups, the task force investigates the link between domestic violence and animal abuse and identifies tangible ways to protect victims and animals.

"These kids are in a highly volatile state, they’re hyper-vigilant, they’re not ready to trust anyone because they’ve been betrayed by people that they trusted, and they start closing down," Keast says. "What you need to work with somebody in this vulnerable state is calmness and a carrot that they’re willing to work for."

So Keast, who has been using clicker training for years, came up with a unique concept: Why not apply those skill sets toward teaching healthy communication?

She developed age-appropriate curriculum and content with her own dog, Eli, and created the "STAR" program, for "See, Tag and Reward."

Participants use their voice and body to help the dog understand what they want it to do. When the dog responds appropriately, the trainer marks, or tags, that behavior with a click and then rewards it with a treat or favorite toy.

Program participants learn problem-solving skills by breaking complex behaviors down into bite-sized pieces.

"We have a phrase for it: ‘How do you eat an elephant?’" Keast says. "One bite at a time."

For instance, they can start by training Eli to push a ball with his nose. Once he’s achieved that, he can push the ball through a "soccer goal," and then learn to jump through a hula hoop before pushing the ball through the goal.

The Little Dog Laughed Animal-Assisted Therapy launched in 2011 with pilot programs at McKay Elementary School in Beaverton and Harkins House Juvenile Shelter in Hillsboro.

The group has also worked at a summer camp for Latina girls called Adelante Chicas and with teens in foster care through Chehalem Youth and Family Services.

The "STAR" program is now offered at domestic violence shelters Raphael House of Portland and Monika’s House and continues at McKay Elementary School.

On Tuesdays, Keast and Eli work with school children at Raphael House of Portland, which runs a domestic violence shelter and advocacy center.
"It's been amazing to see how interacting with Linda and Eli has helped our kids come out of their shells, learn how to set boundaries and have empathy," says Lindsey Vold, youth program coordinator at Raphael House.

As they work with the dogs, the kids learn important lessons about personal boundaries, taking cues from others and adjusting their behaviors accordingly.

"Linda talks a lot about how Eli has ownership of his own body, so it's about watching Eli's body cues to see whether he wants to be touched by a kid," Vold says. "The kids start to think about that."

Because some of the children must leave the shelter suddenly, Keast also created a "goodbye kit" for them to take with them, containing a flashlight, sticker and temporary tattoo.

"It's the idea of keeping a connection," Vold says. "Our kids have gone through homelessness and trauma and have a lot of loss in their life."

Keast brings a host of props along with her to the sessions, including kazoois.

"The kazoo is a way for the kids to try to visualize what human language sounds like to dogs," says board member Tina Arth. "It's like the adult in a Charlie Brown cartoon."

Currently, there are three dogs in the program: Keast's own two Papillons, Eli and Lili, and another rescue dog named Robert. A fourth rescue dog is in training.

Participating dogs need to meet only a few criteria: they must be safe around children, familiar with the clicker and registered with a national therapy organization.

The "Star" dogs have very different jobs than therapy dogs, however. Dogs in programs such as Pet Partners provide comfort to people in schools, nursing homes and other facilities by allowing people to hug them and be physically affectionate.

"We're addressing an entirely different set of needs," Keast says. "We are teaching specifically that you can get another living being to cooperate with you through positive means."

The kids first practice on each other, learning to convey what they want the other person to do by rewarding them with M&Ms.

The Little Dog Laughed is the only organization of its kind, Keast says.

In the fall, Pacific University psychology students will begin collecting data and come up with objective ways to measure the program's effectiveness.

As for where the nonprofit got its name? It was inspired from the nursery rhyme "Hey diddle diddle," but it also underscores the importance of reading an animal's body language - the crux of the program.

When they see that unmistakable "doggie grin," the kids will know that they're doing a good job.

"It is from the kids' rhyme," Keast says, "but the fact of the matter is, dogs that are really having a good time all have those smiles."

If you want to get involved: The Little Dog Laughed welcomes people who are interested in volunteering with the organization. They can use volunteer grant writers and people who can help with planning and evaluating the curriculum, as well as prop donations and financial contributions.

For more information, send an e-mail to STAR@theLittleDogLaughed.org or call 971-266-1505.

If you want to participate as a dog-handler team, your pet should be:
- Safe with children
- Familiar and comfortable with clicker training
- Certified as a therapy dog by a national therapy organization

--Monique Balas

### Related Stories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pet Talk: Small animals can make great pets with proper care</th>
<th>Happening this weekend: Pet-related events you can attend</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACRONYMS</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TLDL</td>
<td><em>The Little Dog Laughed</em>, Animal-Assisted Therapy Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAT</td>
<td>Animal-Assisted Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>Animal-Assisted Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAE</td>
<td>Animal-Assisted Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STAR</td>
<td>See-Tag-And-Reward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBIS</td>
<td>Positive Behavioral Intervention Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DV</td>
<td>Domestic Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASD</td>
<td>Autism Spectrum Disorder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHO IS TLDL?

Animal-assisted interventions compliment virtually all forms of contemporary therapy, in a variety of contexts and with a myriad of populations. One common form of intervention, Positive Behavioral Intervention Support (PBIS), is a particularly common behavioral modification methodology for children with development disability, geriatric populations with dementia or Alzheimer’s, adults and children with neuromuscular problems, and for children of domestic violence. This project reflects a longitudinal program evaluation of an animal-assisted activity program that works specifically with this latter population, child residents of short-term domestic violence shelters. Most animal-assisted interventions are part of an individualized education or therapy program, the interactive sessions are long-term, goal-directed, and outcome driven.

The Little Dog Laughed, Animal-Assisted Therapy Program is a nonprofit organization that engages dog training as a model for non-violent problem solving, psychosocial, and life skills education. In conjunction with behavioral therapy professionals, this program gives opportunities for children of domestic abuse to interact with the dogs in short, 20-minute training sessions once a week. The children are introduced to a learning goal, provided guidelines for respectfully working with the dog, as well as tools (e.g., clickers and hand signals) to promote clear communication between the child and the trained dog model. The opportunities to train and observe outcomes are limited both in terms of the length of each visit as well as the number of visits each residence receives. Therefore, evaluating individual outcomes for a program of this kind can be challenging. Behavioral improvement was evaluated through focal observation every 5 minutes for the 15 to 20-minute training sessions over a 12-week period. Improvement was evaluated using seven categorical learning and behavioral domains: 1.) Engagement (e.g., paying attention); 2.) Instruction Compliance; 3.) Concept Recognition; 4.) Attitude (verbalized emotional response to the activities, dog, or the facilitator), 5.) Affect (e.g., non-verbal emotional expression); 6.) Dog Approach/Avoidance; and 7.) Social Civility as well as the goals of TLDL mission statement.

Based on the observational data, The Little Dog Laughed, Animal-Assisted Therapy Program child residents of the two domestic violence shelters achieved significant behavioral improvements in all three constructs associated with the mission goals as well as the four empirical questions. TLDL model is adaptable to a number of other contexts and target populations. Certainly the 7 behavioral outcome categories for child residents of domestic violence shelters could be modified for a variety of other populations (e.g., schools, assisted living communities, etc.).
TLDL MISSION AND GOALS

“Our volunteer dog/handler teams work with therapists/counselors/teachers in their effort to nurture empathy and non-violent problem solving skills in at-risk youths. We offer a carefully structured set of short classes that teach behavioral skills by engaging the children in actively training our dogs using positive training techniques.”

TLDL Mission Statement

Animal Assisted Interventions Background

Since the early 1970s, animal-assisted programs have been an important part of the corpus of therapeutic options available to both medical patients and mental health clients (Pichot, 2012). Animal-assisted intervention (AAI) is an umbrella term for the inclusion of animals as part of any number of therapeutic protocols. These interventions describe a variety of animal-assisted programs including: Animal-assisted therapy (AAT), Animal-Assisted Education (AAE), and Animal-Assisted Activity (AAA).

Kruger and Serpell (2006) reported 20 different definitions of animal-assisted therapy (AAT) within the current psychological literature. The ambiguousness of the language defining the scope of animal-assisted interventions lead the Delta Society to publish a standardized rubric for terms and definitions (Delta Society, 1999). As such, Animal-assisted therapy (AAT) is defined as a goal-oriented intervention that uses animals as a fundamental part of the treatment procedure (Palley, O'Rourke, and Niemi, 2010). The typical AAT program is managed and directed by mental health professionals who, through an initial intake assessment, establish individualized therapeutic goals for their clients. Those goals may be achieved in part through the use of animal-assisted therapy. In this context, the term “therapy” broadly refers to any healing, empirically supported, treatment for mental, physical, and behavioral conditions, disorder or injuries. The primary aim of AAT is to foster growth in social, cognitive, behavioral, emotional, and physical functioning (Palley, et. al., 2010). The programs are accomplished in a variety of settings, including residential communities like in-residence hospitals, rehabilitation centers, or outpatient clinics. Although in the cases of larger animals with special environmental needs like horses (e.g., equine-assisted therapy; Berget, Ekeberg, Pedersen, Braastad, 2011) and dolphins (e.g., dolphin-assisted therapy; Nathanson, 1998), patients are taken to farms, petting zoos, aquaria, marine rehabilitation and research centers. The established success of these programs extends to a number of populations including those with: dementia; psychiatric conditions; heart disease; cancer; developmental disabilities; speech and fluency conditions, and attachment disorders (Palley, et. al., 2010). Regardless of the setting or population, for most all AAT the care is outcome-oriented, therefore progress is documented and longitudinal, occurring over a specific period of time, and tailored to each client or patient’s needs (Delta Society, 2015).
In contrast to animal assisted therapy, animal-assisted activities (AAA) are more flexible and less individualized. Animal-assisted activities are often referred to as the “meet and greet” of AAI, with therapy animals, in most cases dogs, visiting hospitals, senior centers, domestic violence shelters, client homes, and schools for the purpose of education, recreation, entertainment, or simply to improve the quality of life for the participants (Souter and Miller, 2007). Although trained professionals or volunteers also facilitate the animal-assisted activities, AAA does not necessarily have a predetermined treatment outcome, the same activity may involve more than one participant, progress is not necessarily recorded, and the participants’ enthusiasm or interest generally drives the length of the visit (Souter and Miller, 2007). The goal of AAA is to improve quality of life, provide life skills training, or simply to assist in education (i.e., Animal-Assisted Education; AAE). The populations AAA serves is however, often the same as those served through AAT: clients or patients with cognitive conditions (e.g., aphasia; Macauley, 2006; Attention deficit hyperactivity disorder; Schuck, Emmerson et al., 2015); adults or children with development disabilities (e.g., autism spectral disorder; Bass, Duchowny, Llabre, 2009); children of sexual abuse (Dietz, Davis, and Pennings, 2012); patients with Alzheimer’s disease (Mossello, Ridolfi et al., 2011); persons with psychiatric conditions (e.g., depression, Souter and Miller, 2007; anxiety, addictions, depression, and schizophrenia, Berget, Ekeberg et al., 2011); patients with a terminal illness or debilitating motor conditions (Caprilli and Messeri, 2006; Serpell, 2012), children of in-patient care (Caprilli and Messeri, 2006); nursing home residents (Kawamura, Niiyama and Niiyama, 2009), and adjudicated populations (e.g., Jasperson, 2010).
TRAINING PROGRAMS

See. Tag. And. Reinforce (S.T.A.R.) Program

What Is S.T.A.R. Training?
A clicker-based training program that was developed to offer at-risk children an alternative to violence by providing them with a fun, coercion-free method of getting what they want, as well as allow them to experience a health, trust-based relationship. S.T.A.R. came about while Washington County Multidisciplinary Team (MDT) was searching for ways to stop “the cycle of violence” and evaluating the strong link between domestic violence and animal abuse.

What is the purpose of S.T.A.R. Training?
STAR teams of dog.handler pairs offer a carefully structured set of short classes that communicate in an empowering, entertaining way concepts that are naturally inherent in positive dog training:

- How to build a positive relationship based on empathy, shared communication, and trust.
- Effective, non-violent methods of problem solving.
- How to break down large problems into manageable bits
- Safe, respectful treatment of animals

What a S.T.A.R. Trainer Does:
S ee the behavior you want.
T ag it with a “click”
A nd
R eward the target behavior with reinforcement
A Trainer’s Promises

Promise 1: Every “Click” must be rewarded

Promise 2: I will never ask you to do something you cannot

Promise 3: I will never ask you to do something dangerous or will get you in trouble.

Promise 4: I will never scold you if you try and do not succeed. I will be proud of you for trying.

Promise 5: It is okay for you to say “no.”

Process of Training: What exactly does a S.T.A.R. Team do?

The first visits primary focus is on safe and respectful conduct around dogs and learning to understand the dog’s body language. Subsequent sessions move swiftly through:

- Introducing S.T.A.R. team terminology (See, Tag And Reward) and modeling the process by teaching the therapy dog something new in five minutes using a clicker and without speaking a word.

- Demonstrating the process by training the children’s counselor/teacher to do something silly.

- Practicing as a group the motor skills needed (clicking/tagging and rewarding)

- Practicing teaching each other without using a single word except for the sound of the “click”, and using candy as incentive, rather than dog treats.

- Picking a good, preferably silly, game/skill for the students to teach the dog. Note: our handlers have colorful props that suggest specific behaviors (e.g., a tiny basketball goal, a skateboard, etc.) but the kids are encouraged to put their personal stamp on the end product.

- Reviewing the “Trainer’s Promise” (see illustration).

- Discussing how a complex problem (e.g., teaching a dog how to play basketball) is handled by breaking it down into much smaller, easier to train steps/skills that can be worked on one at a time. Example: To play basketball, we may decide the dog needs to be able to (1) hold a ball in its mouth, (2) retrieve a ball that is thrown, (3) locate the basketball hoop, (4) put the ball in the hoop, and (5) go to its mat to start the game again.
Coaching the children as they teach the therapy dog each of the needed skills individually. Overseeing the “assembly process” of putting those learned skills together in longer and longer sequences (behavior chains) until we reach the final complete behavior.

ZONE 1: “What’s the best way to eat an elephant? One bite at a time”

Thinking:
- BREAK DOWN what you want the dog to do into tiny “bites”.
- FIGURE OUT the dog’s favorite things – Treats? Balls? Squeaky toys?

Action:
- WORK ON ONE BITE AT A TIME..
- KEEP EACH SESSION SHORT – 3-5 minutes, then a break.
- WITH YOUR VOICE AND YOUR BODY SILENT help the dog understand what it can do to get a reward. (CLICK! TREAT! )
  But how do we get it to do something we can reward?
  - CAPTURE something it already does (yawn, lie down, etc.)
  - LURE it with a treat
  - Use a TARGET object (touch with your nose/paw) to lure instead of a treat
- TWO FAILURES IN A ROW? Simplify the task so that animal is successful.
- FIVE SUCCESSES IN A ROW? Time to make it slightly harder.
- ALL BITES LEARNED? Chain them together.
Zone 2: “By George, I think I’ve got it!” – Transitioning to real life

- GRADUALLY START TAGGING USING “YES!” instead of the clicker.
- GRADUALLY STOP REWARDING EVERY SINGLE TRY and switch to rewarding only the very best tries, or every 3rd or 5th tries. BUT STILL SAY “YES!” to let them know they did it right. (Is this breaking the “every click = a treat” rule? No, you are not using a clicker.)
- ADD THE NEW COMMAND/SIGNAL only after the animal clearly understands the whole “elephant” and can do it again and again without lures or targets.

Zone 3: Green Eggs and Ham: “Can you do it in the rain? Can you do it on a train?”

- START ALL OVER IN A NEW LOCATION. Until they are very, very practiced at “the game”, dogs don’t realize that “sit” in the kitchen before mealt ime = “sit” in the park in the rain = “sit” in the front hall when guests arrive.
FACILITATOR AND VOLUNTEER DESCRIPTIONS

TLDL and Domestic Violence Shelters

The Little Dog Laughed delivers programming in brief bouts of guided activity (AAA), rather than long-term interactions where the child and the dog are able to establish a bond (AAT). The transitional nature of residents of domestic violence shelters provides a limited window for behavioral improvements to occur. Rather than frequent, extended, and ongoing therapy over a period of months or years, the interaction with the therapy dog may be as constrained as one visit and no more than four for a single residential stay. Further, those interactions are limited to a 20 to 25-minute period. On any given visitation day, the participants vary. Given the emotional vulnerability of child residents of domestic violence shelters, children elect to participate in the animal-assisted activities. This means that TLDL program facilitators have little advance notice to prepare age-appropriate or child-specific activities prior to the visit participation. Both the dogs and their facilitators must be exceedingly flexible in the kinds of programming and activity provided. That said, the narrow activity window may also offer some advantages, for one, the child participants know the opportunity to interact with the therapy dog and their facilitator is only offered once a week. A reserved child may recognize the opportunity cost of not choosing to participate when TLDL visits. Further, the interaction period of 20-minutes is sensitive to the attention span of young to very young children. The brief bout of activity during the program session encourages sustained attention and learning within the timeframe that the children are best able to assimilate information.

Among child residents of domestic violence shelters, their schedules, security, and emotional, behavioral, and cognitive resources are transitional at best. There is very little stability outside of their routine in attending school, therefore one major concern among the staff at the DV shelters and among the facilitators of TLDL program is that none of the activities feel overtly school-like. TLDL program is designed to be didactic, both instructive and flexible without feeling like homework or overtly instructive and pedantic. The idea is that all activities feel both entertaining as well as instructive. TLDL uses dog training as a model to impart nonviolent problem solving, empowerment, and motivational tools when faced with overwhelming challenges that may feel unmanageable. These skills are imparted by presenting each child participant with a problem (i.e., “Teach Eli to Dance”), then through the Socratic method, the facilitator, the child and the dog work toward solving the problem by breaking the solution down into individual elements. Through shaping each of the dog’s successive behavioral approximations toward the target outcome with positive reinforcement using clicker training and food reinforcers (e.g., See-Tag-And-Reinforce) the dog achieves the desired goal. By emphasizing gentle, safe, and respectful interactions with animals, children are afforded the opportunity to see how to find and approach the solution to what might appear at first, an unmanageable task.
The S.T.A.R. methodology is similar to the Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) model, an empirically supported, evidence-based platform for behavior change. PBIS, an extension of operant conditioning (Skinner, 1938) was designed to reduce problem behaviors as well as increase adaptive, socially appropriate behaviors within academic settings (Reynolds, 2012). The model requires the program administrator and participant to establish behavioral expectations together, which are then taught rather than assuming they arrive in possession of all necessary behavioral skills. It contrasts with standard practices that monitor and exact punishment which create a “bottom-line” consequence for failure to correct behaviors and instead rewards children for appropriate behavior. PBIS is flexible in goal setting, yet operant in immediacy, reinforcing good behavior on the spot. The STARS model used in dog training is analogous to PBIS and offers a behavioral framework for long-term behavioral modification, despite the brief bouts of animal interaction indicative of animal-assisted activity.
Key Concepts Conveyed in S.T.A.R. Sessions in D.V. Shelters

Clicker Training Concepts: How much is stressed varies with age level
(the top 3 are required)
Why: Training is the vehicle for all other concepts – it provides quick feedback to the training child, requires focus, problem solving and empathy to be successful. Children view becoming a dog trainer as a positive thing, and worth working for.

- The clicker is not a remote control – it is a signal that marks what you want
  EXACTLY at the moment that it happens

- Every click = a treat, even if you goofed

- It’s not a contest – if the dog is having trouble understanding what to do, a good
  trainer makes the problem just a little easier.

- Practice sessions for a particular thing are short, but you can repeat it later

- Stop while the dog is successful.

Personal Empowerment

Why: DV kids have not had much control over what happens to them. They need
practice in making choices confidently.

- There are always choices.
  - Safe choices are provided throughout the session, and the child’s choice is honored.
  - If a child chooses an action that violates the Trainer’s Promise, the action is stopped and the child is asked which of the promises this breaks, and what could we do instead.

- It’s OK to say no
  - When training a new game, a good trainer always gives the dog a choice to do it or not to do it. AND the trainer can tell when the dog says “no, that makes me scared”, or “no, we’ve done that too much and I don’t want to do that anymore”, or “no, I don’t feel good right now.”

- Nobody likes to be touched without permission – not you, not the dog, not anyone.
  - “A good trainer asks the dog’s permission before petting – and then let’s the dog show him what kind of petting it likes.”

- You don’t get to pick what someone else likes, and they don’t get to pick what you like
- One of Eli’s favorite things is cauliflower
- Which would you like to be your “puppy treat”, ______ or ________?
- Using a clicker may feel weird, let’s do some warm-ups!
  - Silly drills develop dexterity, attention, speed—and ultimately self-confidence in using the clicker.

**Clear Communication**

*Why*: Reinforce good eye contact, clear voice when speaking.

- Everyone gets confused when there are too many bosses – know when to back off
- You can get a good idea what a dog or a person is feeling by watching their body language for clues
- Sometimes your how you move or speak can make others (dogs, humans) think you mean something that you don’t.
  - “Not all dogs have had a happy life – what might the dog be thinking when it sees this big hand coming down toward his head?”
  - “We think we’re showing love when we give a dog a hug, but do you know what that means in dog-language? I AM THE BOSS OF YOU! Why would we ever want to say that?”
  - Description of what hard eye contact means to a dog vs. to a human.
- A good trainer makes sure that all signals they give the dog (either with their voice or their body) are clear and easy to understand.
  - Let’s practice on each other first, so we don’t confuse Eli.

**Safety Planning**

*Why*: DV kids IN PARTICULAR need to have an escape plan. Most women return to their abuser several times before making a final break. This means that the DV staff tries to make sure that everyone has a safety plan for if/when things go wrong.

- Dogs don’t have to love you to know you’re a good trainer and to happily work with you.
  - You listen to what they are trying to tell you
  - You are careful to talk clearly with your mouth and your body.
  - You never break the Trainer’s Promises
  - **Kids need “good trainers” too** – sometimes this is your teacher, sometimes it’s someone in your family.
• Everyone needs a safe place to go when they are confused or scared or just need time to think.
  - “This is Eli’s ‘safe place’ – he knows to go there when he needs a break or gets confused

Empathy
• A good trainer pays attention to what his dog is telling him.
• You can get a good idea what a dog or a person is feeling by watching their body language for clues
  - Here’s what Eli’s signals are that he is happy/worried/confused
  - What is Eli telling us right now? What should we do when we see that?
  - You already know people body language, I bet. What am I thinking when I do this?
  - Show me how someone would look if they felt _____?
• Everyone needs a safe place to go when they are confused or scared, or just need time to think.
  - “This is Eli’s ‘safe place’ – he knows to go there when he needs a break or gets confused. What should we do if he chooses to go into his ‘safe place’?

Problem Solving Skills

*Why:* DV kids have overwhelming problems, and need to learn skills to work through them in a way that does not include use of force:
• Big problems/projects can be solved if you turn it into small bits that you can tackle one at a time
  - “How do you eat an elephant? One bite at a time”
• Some problems need more than one person, working together as a team
  - “This is complicated – it’s going to take you guys/us working together as a team”.
• Let’s teach Eli to _________ (some interesting but complicated sequence of skills)
  - “This is pretty complicated – let’s make it easier for Eli. Let’s pretend that this game is a giant puzzle, and break it down into pieces that he can learn one at a time. Then we can put everything together into the whole game! One piece he would need is ______.
  - What’s another piece of the puzzle?
  - “How is he feeling about this piece of the puzzle?”
  - “Can we put any of these puzzle pieces together yet?”
Non-Violence

*Why:* DV kids have had recent (and will likely continue to have) exposure to VIOLENT treatment of humans and dogs

- A good trainer does not make his dog afraid.
- A good trainer keeps the TRAINERS PROMISE so the dog trusts him/her
  - You will never ask it to do something dangerous or that will get it in trouble later
  - You will never ask it to do something it can’t
  - You don’t scold it if it tries and doesn’t succeed – just let it try again
  - You make sure your voice and body are giving calm and clear signals
- If a child chooses an action that violates the Trainer’s Promise, the action is stopped and the child is asked which of the promises this breaks, and what could we do instead.
- It is not necessary to use violence to get what you want – there are better ways that are fun for everyone
  - “Training with a clicker is fun for you and fun for the dog – it thinks it’s training you to give it treats!”
  - “A good trainer knows that if the dog is afraid of him or doesn’t trust him he won’t be able to concentrate on learning.”
  - “A good trainer never makes his dog afraid.”

Respect and appreciation for diversity

*Why:* DV shelter kids are squeezed into a very close living situation with people they don’t know with unfamiliar clothes, languages, tastes in food, religious beliefs, etc.

- You don’t get to pick what someone else likes, and they don’t get to pick what you like
- Dogs are not little people – they are different and isn’t it cool!
  - Different sensory input
  - Different strengths and weaknesses
  - Different concept of “manners”
  - Different ways of communicating

Self-Control and respect for others’ personal boundaries:

*Why:* Frequently an issue in DV environments

- Dogs don’t know WHY you feel things, but they do know WHAT you feel – and they start feeling the same way. A good trainer knows that no matter what else is going on outside the training room, when they are with the dog they need to be calm and happy so that the dog is calm and happy and ready to play.
- Sometimes you/others need to be calm, and sometimes you/others need help to calm down
  - “Eli is getting a little wound up – let’s help him calm down a bit.”
  - “All games have rules so it doesn’t get too crazy -- Let’s help Eli learn to go to the mat before we throw him the ball”
- Nobody likes to be touched without permission – not you, not the dog, not anyone.
• Respect the other members of your team
  – “This is complicated – it’s going to take us working together as a team”.
• We take turns
  – “Let’s decide who goes first with Paper/Scissors/Rocks”
HOW WE ESTABLISHED EFFICACY

Efficacy was measured as a statistically significant improvement in behavior over the course of the animal-assisted interaction. Ideally, the behavior observed and recorded at the end of TLDL session would be significantly higher than at the onset for all 7 behavioral categories.

TLDL mission statement asserts, “Our volunteer dog/handler teams work with therapists/counselors/teachers in their effort to nurture empathy and non-violent problem solving skills in at-risk youths. We offer a carefully structured set of short classes that teach behavioral skills by engaging the children in actively training our dogs using positive training techniques.”

In order to evaluate the efficacy of their mission we essentially dissected the mission statement into component parts so we could identify what behavioral categories addressed the goals of their mission. Not all of the 7 evaluated behavioral categories are represented in TLDL’s mission statement, based on our interpretation of their mission, 6 of the 7 categories either directly or indirectly addressed the goals of their mission statement. These are identified in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mission Statement Goals</th>
<th>Behavior Evaluated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Nurture empathy”</td>
<td>Attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dog Approach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Civility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Non-violent problem solving skills”</td>
<td>Concept Recognition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional Compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Civility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach behavioral skills…using positive training techniques.</td>
<td>Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Social Civility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pacific University conducted a program evaluation from 2013 through 2015, through their evaluation efficacy was defined as any behavioral change in a positive direction between blocks and more importantly from blocks 1 (onset of the activity) to 4 (end of the activity).

5.) Children’s behavior would show significant behavioral improvements within all behavioral categories

6.) Children’s behavior would show the greatest improvement in all behavioral categories from blocks 1 to 4.

7.) Children who had previously interacted with TLDL would demonstrate higher behavioral scores for Dog Approach during the first block (i.e., they became less fearful of the dogs following previous interactions) and the last block.

8.) Children who had previously interacted with TLDL would demonstrate higher behavioral scores for Social Civility at block 1 and at block 4 (i.e., formerly established social manners and structured behavioral norms would provide the framework for how to behave in subsequent visits).
TRAINING

S.T.A.R. Teams

All S.T.A.R. teams are volunteer dog/handler pairs recruited from the Portland Metro area’s vibrant dog community. They are ably assisted by people without dogs who “share the vision”.

Dog Handler Basic Requirements:

- Handler must be comfortable having children interact with their dog.
- Use ONLY positive training methods during S.T.A.R. sessions.
- Absolutely forgo behavior and language associated with violence or punishment during S.T.A.R. sessions.
- Be sensitive to the emotional and mental state of the young people they meet, carefully following the lead of the teacher/counselor/therapist.
- Pass the criminal background check required in most of the facilities we will be visiting.
- Have a good sense of humor!

Handler Training

All S.T.A.R. handlers will be screened, and will be asked to attend orientation activities. This level handler must be comfortable having children interact with their dog, and must be calmly adept at making sure that interactions remain safe and controlled for all parties.

There are several levels of S.T.A.R. training with increasing requirements:

Novice S.T.A.R. Trainer

- Has passed a basic 1+ hour Qualification Test assessing the basic skills needed by a S.T.A.R. team; includes one part written and one-part interaction with children and adults.
- Is not ready for field work yet.

Apprentice S.T.A.R. Trainer

- Has completed the program specific training, which is a four-workshop series covering material specific to the S.T.A.R. program.
1. Building Games
2. The Effects of Trauma on Children, and Domestic Violence Shelter Environment and Rules
3. Working with Children- Keep Calm and Carry On
4. Lessons Learned Part 2

• Will be working in the field under the supervision of an assigned mentor.

**Approved S.T.A.R. Trainer**
• May work alone, but may always benefit from further education and an occasional “refresher”.

**S.T.A.R. Dog Requirements**
• Applicant dogs must have earned their AKC Canine Good Citizen (CGC) certificate, but they DO NOT need prior registration with another animal therapy organization. Incoming dogs (with their human) will go through multi-stage, program-specific training and testing, and will serve a monitored apprenticeship in the field. Please visit our Web site for the full training plan.
• Applicant dogs must be currently licensed in their county of residence, and must be current on any vaccinations specifically required for licensing.
• Applicant dogs must be rock-solid around children, and interact with them without stress
• Bonus points for dogs who have participated in canine sports – the more the better!

**Apprentice S.T.A.R. Dogs**
• MUST thoroughly understand what the clicker means.
• MUST have an acceptable “polite greeting” for humans, and be able to maintain self-control around other dogs.
• MUST be able to take treats gently.

**Approved S.T.A.R. Dogs**
• MUST have a reliable sit and/or down, under both verbal and hand signals.
• MUST have a reliable emergency recall signal.
• MUST have at least one behavior that can be the starting point for fun variants as designed by the kids. Examples that have been useful for existing teams:
- Targeting, with nose, paw or whole body – creating a “target stick” out of some random object within 3 clicks is an excellent visual for kids;

- “Pick this up and put it there” becomes basketball, put the socks in the basket, the shoes in the shoebox, the litter in the wastebasket, etc.

Behavior Outcome Facilitator Requirements

Behavior Outcome Facilitators assist the S.T.A.R. Team in both ensuring that the desired concepts are understood by the children and encouraging behavioral change throughout each session.

Requirements:

- Must attend orientation or training in order to fully understand S.T.A.R. training and how it works.

- Must fulfill all training required for volunteers at each specific domestic violence residential house.
Our Risk Management Plan

No meaningful endeavor is without risk, but we feel that with careful forethought, risks can be both minimized and have an appropriate response in place if they do occur.

The following plan is divided into four groups identified as at-risk for some form of harm during our therapy sessions: Children, the visited facility (may be referred to as “the client”), the S.T.A.R. handlers, and the S.T.A.R. dogs. Risk mitigation strategies may affect more than one group, and so may appear in multiple sections.

Important: All parties need to be very clear that S.T.A.R. Team handlers are not psychotherapists – our teams are trained to support professionals working with at-risk youths.

Children:

1. All sessions will begin with a review of dog safety, including safe reward delivery.
2. No child will be compelled to interact with a S.T.A.R. dog. They will be allowed to choose when and how they are ready for interaction or physical contact. Tiny foldable fences are available for space management if needed.
3. Therapists/Counselors will determine in advance of the visit if there are food allergies to plan for, and will communicate this to the handler.
4. All treats for children to be in single-visit-size (~1 oz) packages that will be first opened in view of the counselor/teacher. Any leftovers that are not eaten by the handler are to be thrown away.
5. Anyone (child, handler, teacher) who dispenses treats will use handi-wipes or hand sanitizers to make sure their hands are clean. Handler to provide.
6. Children will be offered choice of hand sanitizers as they leave. Handler to provide.
7. All dogs will be clean and will be thoroughly brushed immediately before the visit to minimize shedding.
8. The path of the dog to the session location in a visited facility will be by the most direct route with as little contact to other rooms or non-participating students as possible.
   - Example: McKay Elementary – entry and exit with the dog is through a basement door on the same floor as the counseling room. Greeting children in the hall is kept to a minimum.
9. All S.T.A.R. dogs will have passed a proficiency test demonstrating their ability to interact safely with children from 4-years old and up, and to deal well with novel environments and activities.
10. All S.T.A.R. dogs will have demonstrated a safe and respectful greeting behavior to be used when meeting children.
11. Toys may be used as a reward, but not toys that stimulate the dog to potentially dangerous behavior: e.g., tuggies, (examples will be added as identified)

12. Although all children will be coached on safe conduct around dogs, all dogs will ALSO be counter-trained to perform an alternate behavior for signals that could lead to dangerous result.
   - Example: child dangles a treat far above the dog’s head, enticing it to jump up and grab it.
     Counter-training: That dandle motion becomes a “sit” signal.
   - Examples to be added as they are identified, and included in all handler training.

The Facility:

1. In arranging S.T.A.R. team visits, the handler and the teacher/counselor/therapist will mutually decide and abide by:
   - Arrival time and length of visit
   - How EXACTLY changes in schedule will be communicated in a timely fashion (e.g., dog sick, handler sick, children sick, no children present that day to work with)
   - What, if any, additional training the handler will need to best support the facility (e.g., approved class on the effects of domestic violence on a child’s brain)
   - What, if any, additional screening is required by the facility (e.g., background checks, fingerprinting)
   - How (or if) information pertaining to a visit should be recorded by the handler for communication to the teacher/counselor/therapist.
   - Whether the S.T.A.R. team can store routinely used props at the facility.
     - Example: Eli and Lili have a soft hassock (to raise them off the floor) and a “safe place” (see “Concepts” document) stored out of the way at each client.

2. The handler will comply with all visitor/volunteer protocols required by the facility, including but not limited to signing in/out and wearing an identifying badge.
   - Example: DV shelter A – handler is buzzed in by staff, signs in and out in two logs, and wears a facility badge
   - Example: Elementary School – handler without dog signs in and out at the office, wears a disposable facility badge, enters with dog through a side door.
   - Example: DV shelter B – handler and dog are buzzed in and escorted down to the playroom. No facility badge, no sign in/out.

3. The handler will have an ID badge issued by The Little Dog Laughed AAT on their person at all times during a visit. This badge will include their photo on one side and basic insurance information on the other.
4. Liability insurance will be maintained by The Little Dog Laughed AAT covering handlers, dogs, and client facilities.

5. Prior to any activity in which a S.T.A.R. dog(handler) team will be representing our organization (including but not limited to classes, demos, workshops and therapy visits), The Little Dog Laughed AAT will secure a certificate of insurance coverage for that location and provide it to the host/client.

6. Included in the handler’s travel kit for all visits:
   - Poop pick-up bags – the S.T.A.R. handlers will be entirely responsible for any clean-up activities.
   - A small towel to be placed under the dog’s water bowl.
   - A small spray bottle of Nature’s Miracle – in the event of an indoor accident, the S.T.A.R. handler will make sure the area is thoroughly clean and de-scented.
   - Hand sanitizers (small travel size, more than one scent) and Handi-wipes.

Handlers:
1. All handlers are strongly encouraged to stay up-to-date on flu vaccines.
2. S.T.A.R. teams will pass a certification test before they go into the field.
3. All handlers will receive training by Little Dog staff and professionals engaged for that purpose, both in preparation for the certification test, in preparation for field work once the test is passed, and as a “refresher” course at least twice a year.
4. The handler will have an ID card issued by The Little Dog Laughed AAT on their person at all times during a visit. This card will include relevant insurance information.
5. Handlers will always have a teacher/counselor/therapist either in the room or readily available to manage the children.
6. UNLESS IN A SESSION SPECIFICALLY DESIGNED AND MONITORED BY THE TEACHER / COUNSELOR / THERAPIST the handler will work with no more than two children at a time, preferable only one at a time.
7. S.T.A.R. teams will not work with children who have actively abused an animal – that is a different specialty altogether.

Dogs:
1. All dogs will stay up-to-date on vaccines as recommended by their veterinarian, and will be tested for worms annually.
2. S.T.A.R. dogs will be on-leash unless working in an approved location.
3. S.T.A.R. dogs will be licensed as required by their county of residence, but the handler may choose to use an alternate form of ID during visits (eg, a collar embroidered with contact information) to eliminate problems caused by dangling tags.
4. All props and toys will be appropriately sized for the dog, clean and stoutly constructed.
   Guideline: If it is designated as safe for a 3-year-old human child (e.g., A Fisher-Price toddler toy), it is a candidate for a prop.
5. Toys and props are CUES for specific behaviors, and need to be removed from the dog’s sight as soon as the activity is complete.
6. To avoid creating conflict with existing training for competitive sports, the handlers are strongly advised to create a parallel set of instructions that are more intuitive to a child and less rigorous in compliance restrictions.
   - Example: “Front” is frequently used in Obedience for a very specific action and body placement by the dog. Recognizing that a child (a) has no recognition of that use of the word, and (b) has little interest in maintaining the same rigor that the handler needs in the ring, we recommend an alternate cue like “here!” accompanied by the physical cue of slapping the front of the legs.
   - Safety Example: Knowing that it is very common for a child to dandle a treat far above the dog’s head, enticing it to jump up and grab it, the handler should counter-train their dog so that dandle motion becomes a “sit” signal.

7. Playing with the dog with their “special” ball or other toy is an acceptable reinforcement, but tuggy-type toys should be used with extreme caution if at all.

8. All S.T.A.R. dogs will be given the opportunity to thoroughly relieve themselves before entering the building. The handler is responsible for packing out any poop (if there is no external garbage can, put the bag in the car. Do not take it inside.)

9. If the dog is stressing, the handler MUST deal with the problem immediately. Training will be provided on how dogs show stress, and ways to safely manage the situation.

10. Included in the handler’s travel kit for all visits:
   - Water in a wide-mouthed container (make no assumptions about availability of water) – pack in, pack out.
   - A water bowl and a small towel to go under it.
   - Suitable treats + extras
   - A “safe place” – this can be a crate, a dog bed, etc. where the dog can be safely confined if the dog is stressing or is getting confused (note – this may be kept at the facility if visits are regular).
### BUDGET

#### 2016 Budget: The Little Dog Laughed Animal-Assisted Therapy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Starting Balance January 1, 2016</strong></td>
<td>$3409.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct Public Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidelity Charitable Grant (final year)</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petco Foundation Grant (confirmed)</td>
<td>1,500.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts in Kind - Goods &amp; Services</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kroger Community Rewards, iGive, amazonsmile</td>
<td>450.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual, Organizational, Business Contributions</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Direct Public Support</strong></td>
<td>3,650.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Operational Income: Handler Training</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handler Training Class Fees</td>
<td>900.00</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of Handler Training Income</strong></td>
<td>900.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Income</strong></td>
<td>$4,550.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of Beginning Balance + Income</strong></td>
<td>$7,959.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bank/paypal charges</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liability Insurance (Hartford)</td>
<td>425.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td>214.00</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal, Accounting</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charity Status Renewal OR Dept Justice</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P.O. Box</td>
<td>80.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies (stationery, printer ink)</td>
<td>350.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporation Status Renewal (OR)</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing: Tri-fold Brochures</td>
<td>220.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Business Expenses</strong></td>
<td>-1,634</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Expenses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Consumable Program Supplies</td>
<td>1,000.00</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumable Program Supplies</td>
<td>550.00</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handler Recruitment &amp; Training</td>
<td>1,400.00</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handler Training Scholarship Fund</td>
<td>400.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Program Expenses</strong></td>
<td>-3,350.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total of All Expenses</strong></td>
<td>-4,984.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash Reserves (Money Market Account)</td>
<td>-1,500.00</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net</strong></td>
<td>1475.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
1. Individual, Organizational, Business Contributions – does not rely on the amazing level of windfall donations received in 2015; does include donations for good-bye kits and trading cards
3. Renewal with privacy for 7 domain names + site back-up and restore for one year. (corrected 3/6/16)
4. Non-Consumable Program Supplies includes props, “safe places”, supplies, storage
5. Consumable Program Supplies includes Goodbye Kits (50 @ $5.00 each), "kiddo treats", trading cards, stickers, and all printed materials used during sessions
6. Handler Recruitment and Training Expenses includes costs for the Try-It-Out, the full training sequence leading to certification, additional workshops and training events, and lending library.
7. Cash Reserve created in compliance with 2015 goals.
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APPENDIX VII
The Little Dog Laughed Animal-Assisted Therapy
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ACTIVITY CATALOG

Compiled by,

Jhoevhana Sabado and Heide Island, Ph.D.

Pacific University
Forest Grove, OR
January 18, 2016
Behavioral Outcome (BO) Categories

What are the Behavioral Outcomes?

1. **Concept Recognition (CR):** Signs of a socially receptive dog.

2. **Engagement (E):** Are children intellectually interested and curious in the task?

3. **Instructional Compliance (IC):** Do the participants immediately comply with the instructions and use the skills they learn during this interaction to safely play with the therapy dog?

4. **Social Civility (SC):** Is the child using appropriate social civility when interacting with the dog, the handler, the facilitator and their peers in the activities? For example, are they sharing, taking turns, saying please and thank you and otherwise engaging in socially appropriate and civil behavior?

5. **Affect (AT):** The child’s facial expressions communicate their internal state, or they mask their internal state with a neutral facial expression. Attending to their affect and asking them to attend to their affect (e.g., “are you having a good time?” “Don’t be afraid to smile, a smile shows Eli you are having a good time too”).

6. **Attitude (AD):** What are the child’s verbal expressions communicating about their emotional or cognitive experience during each session? Obviously, positive attitudes are most desirable and are an important life skill.

7. **Dog Approach (DA):** This BO category addresses the level of comfort the child evidences around the S.T.A.R. dog. Are they immediately willing to approach the dog as soon as they are introduced to the S.T.A.R. dog? If not, how can the facilitator help the child cope with their reticence and reassure them of how to interact with the dog?

Why Are the Behavioral Outcomes Important?

The behavioral outcomes are important because it indicates the efficacy of TLDL’s program, especially in their mission to use dogs as a resource to “nurture empathy and non-violent problem solving skill” to children who have experienced domestic violence in their home. The skills the child participant learns while in the program extends to life skills, that is, where the child uses these mannerisms when interacting with others and overcoming conflicts that they might encounter in the playground.
I. LIFE SKILL OBJECTIVES
The learning objective for this Should I Stay or May I Play? Activity includes:

1. teach children how to interact with dogs in an appropriate and safe manner.

2. to illustrate when it is safe to “play” with a dog and what is acceptable play and when dog’s nonverbal behavior suggests that they “stay away,” including what to do when a dog approaches the child (e.g., “be a tree”).

II. REQUIRED RESOURCES

A. Team
- S.T.A.R. Dog Handler
- S.T.A.R. Trained Dog
- Behavioral Outcome Facilitator (Recommended)

B. Materials
- One pet-appropriate plush toy (e.g., small, KONG™ Cozie Dog Squeaky Toy)

III. ACTIVITY
- Facilitator shows child participants what to look for in a socially receptive dog (e.g., eye gaze, tail position, ear/head position, facial expression, shoulder hair, body posture, etc.)

- Facilitators show child participants what they should do when they first come in contact with a dog (e.g., Stand still, avert eye gaze)

- Once approach is deemed safe, facilitators show children participants how to interact with dogs (e.g., slow strokes, areas of the body dogs don’t like to be touched, correct touch pressure, etc.)

IV. ADDRESSING BEHAVIORAL OUTCOMES


   Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Concept Recognition
   The facilitator will want to ask the child participant questions about concepts that they have learned during the lesson (e.g., “If you hear the dog growling, do you think you should play or stay away?”), praise him or her when they
have correctly demonstrated the previously learned concept (e.g., “Yes, that’s right!”), and correct the child participant when he or she incorrectly performs the task.

2. **Engagement (E):** Are children intellectually interested and curious in the task?

   **Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Engagement**
   The facilitator will want to assess the child participant’s engagement (e.g., the amount of questions being asked, whether he or she is answering questions asked by the facilitator, and/or his or her desire to execute the task). For child participants who do not exhibit the previously mentioned behaviors, the facilitator will want to ask the child participant if he or she would like execute the task or act as the volunteer for the facilitator to demonstrate the concept that was previously learned.

3. **Instructional Compliance (IC):** Do the participants immediately comply with the instructions and use the skills they learn during this interaction to safely play with the therapy dog?

   **Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Instructional Compliance**
   The facilitator will want to assess the child participant’s instructional compliance by observing the child participant when he or she is executing the task. The facilitator must be aware of what the child participant is being asked to do to properly assess if the child participant is complying with the instructions when asked to execute the task. Additionally, the facilitator’s role is to praise the child participant when the task is executed correctly and to correct the child participant when task is incorrectly carried out.

4. **Social Civility (SC):** Is the child using appropriate social civility when interacting with the dog, the handler, the facilitator and their peers in the activities?

   **Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Social Civility**
   The facilitator will want to aid in teaching the child participant the importance of mannerisms (e.g., “please” and “thank you”), tone of voice (e.g., mad versus happy), and awareness of self and other (e.g., how their actions can cause emotion to the other person, which in this case the dog).

5. **Affect (AT):** What do the child’s facial expressions communicate during this session?

   **Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Affect**
   The BO Facilitator will want to examine the child’s facial expression. If the facilitator notices the child participant displaying expressions of distress, confusion, or exhaustion, the he or she will want to address this issue with the facilitator in the form of a question (e.g., “That was a little confusing, do you
think you can explain that to us again?” or “That lesson was really tiring! Do you think we need to take a break?”).

6. **Attitude (AD):** What are the child’s verbal expressions communicating about their emotional or cognitive experience during each session?

   **Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Attitude**
   The facilitator will want to verbalize his or her emotional or cognitive experience (e.g., “This is exciting!”) and invite the child participant to share his or her experience as well. Asking questions can be helpful for child participants who are not vocal.

7. **Dog Approach (DA):** This Behavioral Outcome category addresses the level of comfort the child evidences around the S.T.A.R. dog.

   **Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Dog Approach**
   The facilitator will want to assess if the child participant’s level of comfort (e.g., S.T.A.R. or petting). If child participant is having difficulty approaching the dog, the facilitator will demonstrate to the child participant the friendliness of the dog.
I. LIFE SKILL OBJECTIVES

To teach children the purpose of the clicker.

The learning objective for this Clicker Training activity includes:

1. to recognize that the clicker is not a “please and thank you,” but a tool that is used as a signal that marks exactly what you want the dog to do.

2. to teach the children to be patient when the dog is unable to understand the task that it is being asked to perform and how to solve problems accordingly in order for the dog to better understand what it is being asked to do.

II. REQUIRED RESOURCES

A. Team

- S.T.A.R. Dog Handler
- S.T.A.R. Trained Dog
- Behavioral Outcome Facilitator

B. Materials

- Standard Clicker (e.g., StarMark® Clicker Dog Training System)
- Dog treats (e.g., BLUE Wilderness® Trail Treats Grain Free Wild Bites Dog Treat)
- Crate (e.g., Pet Gear Travel Lite Octagon Pet Pen)

III. ACTIVITY

- Facilitator shows child participants when it is appropriate to use the clicker by demonstrating at what moment of the performed task the tool must be clicked.

- Facilitators may show child participants how and when to use the clicker by using props (e.g., rubber ball, cards, etc.) and having them practice clicking when the correct task is performed.

- Once approach is deemed safe, facilitators ask children participants to take on the role of the clicker.

IV. ADDRESSING BEHAVIORAL OUTCOMES

Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Concept Recognition
The facilitator will want to ask the child participant questions about concepts that they have learned during the lesson (e.g., “If you hear the dog growling, do you think you should play or stay away?”), praise him or her when they have correctly demonstrated the previously learned concept (e.g., “Yes, that’s right!”), and correct the child participant when he or she incorrectly performs the task.

2. Engagement (E): Are children intellectually interested and curious in the task?

Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Engagement
To help the child to feel engaged, the facilitator may want to:

a. frequently use the child’s name when addressing the in the activity.

b. reiterate the instructions, so there is no question for the child what they are asked to do.

c. let the child know the dog (by name) enjoys playing with them.

3. Instructional Compliance (IC): Do the participants immediately comply with the instructions and use the skills they learn during this interaction to safely play with the therapy dog?

Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Instructional Compliance
The S.T.A.R. method, See (the behavior) Tag the targeted behavior with an acknowledgment (e.g., “That click you just gave Eli is exactly what we want you to do”) And Reward (e.g., “Nice job!”) is absolutely essential for garnering the instructional compliance behavioral outcome.

The facilitator should remind the child repeatedly what is expected of them, and reiterates the instructions of the dog handler.

4. Social Civility (SC): Is the child using appropriate social civility when interacting with the dog, the handler, the facilitator and their peers in the activities?

Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Social Civility
Use the S.T.A.R. method for acknowledging socially appropriate behavior and for reminding the child to use etiquette in this context as well.

5. Affect (AT): What do the facial expressions of the child communicate during this session?
Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Affect
The facilitator will want to examine the child’s facial expression. If the facilitator notices the child participant displaying expressions of distress, confusion, or exhaustion, the he or she will want to address this issue with the facilitator in the form of a question (e.g., “That was a little confusing, do you think you can explain that to us again?” or “That lesson was really tiring! Do you think we need to take a break?”).

6. Attitude (AD): What are the child’s verbal expressions communicating about their emotional or cognitive experience during each session?

Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Attitude
The facilitator will want to verbalize his or her emotional or cognitive experience (e.g., “This is exciting!”) and invite the child participant to share his or her experience as well. Asking questions can be helpful for child participants who are not vocal.

7. Dog Approach (DA): This BO category addresses the level of comfort the child evidences around the S.T.A.R. dog.

Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Dog Approach
The facilitator will want to assess if the child participant’s level of comfort (e.g., S.T.A.R. or petting). If child participant is having difficulty approaching the dog, the facilitator will demonstrate to the child participant the friendliness of the dog.
I. LIFE SKILL OBJECTIVES

The learning objective for this *Match-to-Sample* Activity includes:

1. To teach children that dog’s see the world, where different senses are heightened (e.g., perspective-taking).

2. To recognize when the dog is struggling to find the to-be-found object and be able to think of ways to help the dog reach their goal.

II. REQUIRED RESOURCES

A. Team

- S.T.A.R. Dog Handler
- S.T.A.R. Trained Dog
- Behavioral Outcome Facilitator (Recommended)

B. Materials

- Standard Clicker (e.g., [StarMark Clicker Dog Training System](#))
- Dog treats (e.g., [BLUE Wilderness® Trail Treats Grain Free Wild Bites Dog Treat](#))
- Crate (e.g., [Pet Gear Travel Lite Octagon Pet Pen](#))
- Dog-appropriate Cones (e.g., [Champion Sports Indoor/Outdoor Flexible Cone Set, Vinyl, Assorted Colors, 6/Set](#))
- Spot Markers (e.g., [School Smart Spot Markers -10 Diameter – Set of 6 – Assorted Colors](#))

III. ACTIVITY

- Facilitator shows child participants the object that the learner must find and explains how the dog will reach the goal.

- Facilitators asks child participants to aid with placing objects on the ground, while she sets the to-be-found object among the scattered ones.

- Once all the objects are set in place, they come up with a catch phrase to cue the dog to find the object.
IV. ADDRESSING BEHAVIORAL OUTCOMES

1. **Concept Recognition (CR):** Signs of a socially receptive dog.

   **Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Concept Recognition**
   The facilitator will want to ask the child participant questions about concepts that they have learned during the lesson (e.g., “If you hear the dog growling, do you think you should play or stay away?”), praise him or her when they have correctly demonstrated the previously learned concept (e.g., “Yes, that’s right!”), and correct the child participant when he or she incorrectly performs the task.

2. **Engagement (E):** Are children intellectually interested and curious in the task?

   **Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Engagement**
   The BO Facilitator will want to assess the child participant’s engagement (e.g., the amount of questions being asked, whether he or she is answering questions asked by the facilitator, and/or his or her desire to execute the task). For child participants who do not exhibit the previously mentioned behaviors, the BO Facilitator will want to ask the child participant if he or she would like to execute the task or act as the volunteer for the facilitator to demonstrate the concept that was previously learned.

3. **Instructional Compliance (IC):** Do the participants immediately comply with the instructions and use the skills they learn during this interaction to safely play with the therapy dog?

   **Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Instructional Compliance**
   The BO Facilitator will want to assess the child participant’s instructional compliance by observing the child participant when he or she is executing the task. The BO Facilitator must be aware of what the child participant is being asked to do to properly assess if the child participant is complying with the instructions when asked to execute the task. Additionally, the BO Facilitator’s role is to praise the child participant when the task is executed correctly and to correct the child participant when task is incorrectly carried out.

4. **Social Civility (SC):** Is the child using appropriate social civility when interacting with the dog, the handler, the facilitator and their peers in the activities?

   **Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Social Civility**
   The BO Facilitator will want to aid in teaching the child participant the importance of mannerisms (e.g., “please” and “thank you”), tone of voice (e.g., mad versus happy), and awareness of self and other (e.g., how their actions can cause emotion to the other person, which in this case the dog).
5. **Affect (AT):** What do the child’s facial expressions communicate during this session?

   **Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Affect**
   The BO Facilitator will want to examine the child’s facial expression. If the BO Facilitator notices the child participant displaying expressions of distress, confusion, or exhaustion, the he or she will want to address this issue with the facilitator in the form of a question (e.g., “That was a little confusing, do you think you can explain that to us again?” or “That lesson was really tiring! Do you think we need to take a break?”).

6. **Attitude (AD):** What are the child’s verbal expressions communicating about their emotional or cognitive experience during each session?

   **Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Attitude**
   The Facilitator will want to verbalize his or her emotional or cognitive experience (e.g., “This is exciting!”) and invite the child participant to share his or her experience as well. Asking questions can be helpful for child participants who are not vocal.

7. **Dog Approach (DA):** This BO category addresses the level of comfort the child evidences around the S.T.A.R. dog.

   **Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Dog Approach**
   The Facilitator will want to assess if the child participant’s level of comfort (e.g., S.T.A.R. or petting). If child participant is having difficulty approaching the dog, the BO Facilitator will demonstrate to the child participant the friendliness of the dog.
I. LIFE SKILL OBJECTIVES
The learning objective for this Move with Me Activity includes:

1. To teach children the importance for clear verbal and body cues.
2. To help children’s ability to piece prior activities learned into a larger whole.

II. REQUIRED RESOURCES

A. Team
- S.T.A.R. Dog Handler
- S.T.A.R. Trained Dog
- Behavioral Outcome Facilitator (Recommended)

B. Materials
- Standard Clicker (e.g., StarMark Clicker Dog Training System)
- Dog treats (e.g., BLUE Wilderness® Trail Treats Grain Free Wild Bites Dog Treat)
- Crate (e.g., Pet Gear Travel Lite Octagon Pet Pen)
- Age-appropriate Music (e.g., Life is a Highway – Rascal Flatts) (Recommended)

III. ACTIVITY
- Facilitator shows child participants various commands (e.g., bringing the dog to their side).
- Facilitator shows child participants how to use their body to communicate in an appropriate and safe manner with the dog.
- Once approach is deemed safe, facilitators show children participants how to interact with dogs by demonstrating the task first, then having the child participant repeat (e.g., pass the puppy).

IV. ADDRESSING BEHAVIORAL OUTCOMES

Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Concept Recognition
The facilitator will want to ask the child participant questions about concepts that they have learned during the lesson (e.g., “If you hear the dog growling, do you think you should play or stay away?”), praise him or her when they have correctly demonstrated the previously learned concept (e.g., “Yes, that’s right!”), and correct the child participant when he or she incorrectly performs the task.

2. Engagement (E): Are children intellectually interested and curious in the task?

Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Engagement
The facilitator will want to assess the child participant’s engagement (e.g., the amount of questions being asked, whether he or she is answering questions asked by the facilitator, and/or his or her desire to execute the task). For child participants who do not exhibit the previously mentioned behaviors, the facilitator will want to ask the child participant if he or she would like execute the task or act as the volunteer for the facilitator to demonstrate the concept that was previously learned.

3. Instructional Compliance (IC): Do the participants immediately comply with the instructions and use the skills they learn during this interaction to safely play with the therapy dog?

Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Instructional Compliance
The facilitator will want to assess the child participant’s instructional compliance by observing the child participant when he or she is executing the task. The facilitator must be aware of what the child participant is being asked to do to properly assess if the child participant is complying with the instructions when asked to execute the task. Additionally, the facilitator’s role is to praise the child participant when the task is executed correctly and to correct the child participant when task is incorrectly carried out.

4. Social Civility (SC): Is the child using appropriate social civility when interacting with the dog, the handler, the facilitator and their peers in the activities?

Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Social Civility
The facilitator will want to aid in teaching the child participant the importance of mannerisms (e.g., “please” and “thank you”), tone of voice (e.g., mad versus happy), and awareness of self and other (e.g., how their actions can cause emotion to the other person, which in this case the dog).

5. Affect (AT): What do the child’s facial expressions communicate during this session?
Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Affect
The facilitator will want to examine the child’s facial expression. If the facilitator notices the child participant displaying expressions of distress, confusion, or exhaustion, the he or she will want to address this issue with the facilitator in the form of a question (e.g., “That was a little confusing, do you think you can explain that to us again?” or “That lesson was really tiring! Do you think we need to take a break?”).

6. Attitude (AD): What are the child’s verbal expressions communicating about their emotional or cognitive experience during each session?

Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Attitude
The facilitator will want to verbalize his or her emotional or cognitive experience (e.g., “This is exciting!”) and invite the child participant to share his or her experience as well. Asking questions can be helpful for child participants who are not vocal.

7. Dog Approach (DA): This BO category addresses the level of comfort the child evidences around the S.T.A.R. dog.

Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Dog Approach
The facilitator will want to assess if the child participant’s level of comfort (e.g., S.T.A.R. or petting). If child participant is having difficulty approaching the dog, the facilitator will demonstrate to the child participant the friendliness of the dog.
I. LIFE SKILL OBJECTIVES
The learning objective for this *Touch this Thing* Activity includes:
1. To teach children to be patient.
2. To challenge the children to problem solve.

II. REQUIRED RESOURCES

A. Team
- S.T.A.R. Dog Handler
- S.T.A.R. Trained Dog
- Behavioral Outcome Facilitator (Recommended)

B. Materials
- Standard Clicker (e.g., [StarMark Clicker Dog Training System](#))
- Dog treats (e.g., [BLUE Wilderness® Trail Treats Grain Free Wild Bites Dog Treat](#))
- Crate (e.g., [Pet Gear Travel Lite Octagon Pet Pen](#))
- Any desired object that a dog may touch with his or her nose (e.g., [Toys "R" Us® Pets Giant Feather Teaser Cat Toy](#), [Crayola Washable Marker](#), [Hape Mighty Shovel](#))

III. ACTIVITY
- Facilitator explains to child participants that the dog is expected to touch props (e.g., soccer ball, toy car, plush sword, etc.) with its nose.
- Facilitators show child participants how this task is accomplished by demonstrating how to use the tools provided (e.g., props, clicker, and treats) to accomplish the goal.
- Once approach is deemed safe, facilitators have children participants to engage in the task by taking on the role of clicker, treater, or the person who holds the prop.

IV. ADDRESSING BEHAVIORAL OUTCOMES
1. **Concept Recognition (CR):** Signs of a socially receptive dog.
Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator's Role for *Concept Recognition*
The facilitator will want to ask the child participant questions about concepts that they have learned during the lesson (e.g., “If you hear the dog growling, do you think you should play or stay away?”), praise him or her when they have correctly demonstrated the previously learned concept (e.g., “Yes, that’s right!”), and correct the child participant when he or she incorrectly performs the task.

2. **Engagement (E):** Are children intellectually interested and curious in the task?

Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator's Role for *Engagement*
The BO Facilitator will want to assess the child participant's engagement (e.g., the amount of questions being asked, whether he or she is answering questions asked by the facilitator, and/or his or her desire to execute the task). For child participants who do not exhibit the previously mentioned behaviors, the BO Facilitator will want to ask the child participant if he or she would like execute the task or act as the volunteer for the facilitator to demonstrate the concept that was previously learned.

3. **Instructional Compliance (IC):** Do the participants immediately comply with the instructions and use the skills they learn during this interaction to safely play with the therapy dog?

Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator's Role for IC Outcome
The facilitator will want to assess the child participant’s instructional compliance by observing the child participant when he or she is executing the task. The facilitator must be aware of what the child participant is being asked to do to properly assess if the child participant is complying with the instructions when asked to execute the task. Additionally, the facilitator’s role is to praise the child participant when the task is executed correctly and to correct the child participant when task is incorrectly carried out.

4. **Social Civility (SC):** Is the child using appropriate social civility when interacting with the dog, the handler, the facilitator and their peers in the activities?

Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator's Role for Social Civility
The facilitator will want to aid in teaching the child participant the importance of mannerisms (e.g., “please” and “thank you”), tone of voice (e.g., mad versus happy), and awareness of self and other (e.g., how their actions can cause emotion to the other person, which in this case the dog).

5. **Affect (AT):** What do the child’s facial expressions communicate during this session?
Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Affect
The facilitator will want to examine the child’s facial expression. If the facilitator notices the child participant displaying expressions of distress, confusion, or exhaustion, the he or she will want to address this issue with the facilitator in the form of a question (e.g., “That was a little confusing, do you think you can explain that to us again?” or “That lesson was really tiring! Do you think we need to take a break?”).

6. Attitude (AD): What are the child’s verbal expressions communicating about their emotional or cognitive experience during each session?

Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Attitude
The facilitator will want to verbalize his or her emotional or cognitive experience (e.g., “This is exciting!”) and invite the child participant to share his or her experience as well. Asking questions can be helpful for child participants who are not vocal.

7. Dog Approach (DA): This BO category addresses the level of comfort the child evidences around the S.T.A.R. dog.

Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Dog Approach
The facilitator will want to assess if the child participant’s level of comfort (e.g., S.T.A.R. or petting). If child participant is having difficulty approaching the dog, the facilitator will demonstrate to the child participant the friendliness of the dog.
“Put This Into That”  
(i.e., Sink It!)

I. LIFE SKILL OBJECTIVES
   The learning objective for this Put This Into That Activity includes:

   1. To teach children to be patient.

   2. To recognize when the learner is having difficulty figuring out the action being asked to employ.

   3. To teach children how to problem solve to aid the learner.

II. REQUIRED RESOURCES

   A. Team
      ▪ S.T.A.R. Dog Handler
      ▪ S.T.A.R. Trained Dog
      ▪ Behavioral Outcome Facilitator (Recommended)

   B. Materials
      ▪ Standard Clicker (e.g., StarMark Clicker Dog Training System)

      ▪ Dog treats (e.g., BLUE Wilderness® Trail Treats Grain Free Wild Bites Dog Treat)

      ▪ Crate (e.g., Pet Gear Travel Lite Octagon Pet Pen)

      ▪ Dog-appropriate Basketball hoop and basketball (e.g., Step2 Floor to Door Basketball)

      ▪ Dog-appropriate Goal and Soccer Ball (e.g., VTech Smart Shots Sports Center)

      ▪ Dog-appropriate Laundry Basket and “Dirty Clothes”

      ▪ Dog-appropriate Grocery Basket and Groceries (e.g., Small World Toys Living – Get to the Grocer Shopping Basket Playset)

      ▪ May include other pet-appropriate items to put into the basket

III. ACTIVITY

   Facilitator shows child participants props that which this activity can be employed with such as a basketball and basketball hoop, a basket and various grocery items, or laundry basket with “dirty clothes”. 

- Facilitators explain what the dog is expected to perform, when it is appropriate to click and give the treat, and what happens if the dog does not execute the task correctly.

- Once approach is deemed safe, facilitators ask the child participant which prop they would like to use to train the dog to "put this into that."

IV. ADDRESSING BEHAVIORAL OUTCOMES

1. **Concept Recognition (CR):** Signs of a socially receptive dog.

   **Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Concept Recognition**
   The facilitator will want to ask the child participant questions about concepts that they have learned during the lesson (e.g., "If you hear the dog growling, do you think you should play or stay away?"), praise him or her when they have correctly demonstrated the previously learned concept (e.g., "Yes, that’s right!"), and correct the child participant when he or she incorrectly performs the task.

2. **Engagement (E):** Are children intellectually interested and curious in the task?

   **Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Engagement**
   The facilitator will want to assess the child participant’s engagement (e.g., the amount of questions being asked, whether he or she is answering questions asked by the facilitator, and/or his or her desire to execute the task). For child participants who do not exhibit the previously mentioned behaviors, the facilitator will want to ask the child participant if he or she would like execute the task or act as the volunteer for the facilitator to demonstrate the concept that was previously learned.

3. **Instructional Compliance (IC):** Do the participants immediately comply with the instructions and use the skills they learn during this interaction to safely play with the therapy dog?

   **Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Instructional Compliance**
   The facilitator will want to assess the child participant’s instructional compliance by observing the child participant when he or she is executing the task. The facilitator must be aware of what the child participant is being asked to do to properly assess if the child participant is complying with the instructions when asked to execute the task. Additionally, the facilitator’s role is to praise the child participant when the task is executed correctly and to correct the child participant when task is incorrectly carried out.

4. **Social Civility (SC):** Is the child using appropriate social civility when interacting with the dog, the handler, the facilitator and their peers in the activities?
Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Social Civility
The facilitator will want to aid in teaching the child participant the importance of mannerisms (e.g., “please” and “thank you”), tone of voice (e.g., mad versus happy), and awareness of self and other (e.g., how their actions can cause emotion to the other person, which in this case the dog).

5. Affect (AT): What do the child’s facial expressions communicate during this session?

Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Affect
The facilitator will want to examine the child’s facial expression. If the BO Facilitator notices the child participant displaying expressions of distress, confusion, or exhaustion, the he or she will want to address this issue with the facilitator in the form of a question (e.g., “That was a little confusing, do you think you can explain that to us again?” or “That lesson was really tiring! Do you think we need to take a break?”).

6. Attitude (AD): What are the child’s verbal expressions communicating about their emotional or cognitive experience during each session?

Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Attitude
The facilitator will want to verbalize his or her emotional or cognitive experience (e.g., “This is exciting!”) and invite the child participant to share his or her experience as well. Asking questions can be helpful for child participants who are not vocal.

7. Dog Approach (DA): This BO category addresses the level of comfort the child evidences around the S.T.A.R. dog.

Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Dog Approach
The facilitator will want to assess if the child participant’s level of comfort (e.g., S.T.A.R. or petting). If child participant is having difficulty approaching the dog, the BO Facilitator will demonstrate to the child participant the friendliness of the dog.
I. LIFE SKILL OBJECTIVES
The learning objective for this Stationary Exercise Activity includes:
1. To teach children that games have rules.
2. To recognize their behavior in a social setting, where there are situations that require them to be calm and quiet (i.e., self-regulation).
3. To understand that it is acceptable to ask for help when they are unable to calm down on their own.

II. REQUIRED RESOURCES
A. Team
   - S.T.A.R. Dog Handler
   - S.T.A.R. Trained Dog
   - Behavioral Outcome Facilitator (Recommended)

B. Materials
   - Standard Clicker (e.g., StarMark Clicker Dog Training System)
   - Dog treats (e.g., BLUE Wilderness® Trail Treats Grain Free Wild Bites Dog Treat)
   - Crate (e.g., Pet Gear Travel Lite Octagon Pet Pen)

III. ACTIVITY
   - Facilitator shows child participants a series of exercises that can be executed using body movements and verbal cues, such that, each cue is different for every dog.
   - Facilitators explains to child participants the importance of body movements compared to verbal cues relative to communication.
   - After demonstrating one stationary exercise, the facilitator will ask the child participant to interact with the dog, mimicking the gesture that the facilitator had just performed, where the cycle repeats and new exercises are taught.

IV. ADDRESSING BEHAVIORAL OUTCOMES
Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Concept Recognition
The facilitator will want to ask the child participant questions about concepts that they have learned during the lesson (e.g., “If you hear the dog growling, do you think you should play or stay away?”), praise him or her when they have correctly demonstrated the previously learned concept (e.g., “Yes, that’s right!”), and correct the child participant when he or she incorrectly performs the task.

2. Engagement (E): Are children intellectually interested and curious in the task?

Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Engagement
The facilitator will want to assess the child participant’s engagement (e.g., the amount of questions being asked, whether he or she is answering questions asked by the facilitator, and/or his or her desire to execute the task). For child participants who do not exhibit the previously mentioned behaviors, the facilitator will want to ask the child participant if he or she would like execute the task or act as the volunteer for the facilitator to demonstrate the concept that was previously learned.

3. Instructional Compliance (IC): Do the participants immediately comply with the instructions and use the skills they learn during this interaction to safely play with the therapy dog?

Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Instructional Compliance
The facilitator will want to assess the child participant’s instructional compliance by observing the child participant when he or she is executing the task. The BO Facilitator must be aware of what the child participant is being asked to do to properly assess if the child participant is complying with the instructions when asked to execute the task. Additionally, the facilitator’s role is to praise the child participant when the task is executed correctly and to correct the child participant when task is incorrectly carried out.

4. Social Civility (SC): Is the child using appropriate social civility when interacting with the dog, the handler, the facilitator and their peers in the activities?

Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Social Civility
The facilitator will want to aid in teaching the child participant the importance of mannerisms (e.g., “please” and “thank you”), tone of voice (e.g., mad versus happy), and awareness of self and other (e.g., how their actions can cause emotion to the other person, which in this case the dog).

5. Affect (AT): What do the child’s facial expressions communicate during this session?
Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Affect
The facilitator will want to examine the child’s facial expression. If the facilitator notices the child participant displaying expressions of distress, confusion, or exhaustion, the he or she will want to address this issue with the facilitator in the form of a question (e.g., “That was a little confusing, do you think you can explain that to us again?” or “That lesson was really tiring! Do you think we need to take a break?”).

6. Attitude (AD): What are the child’s verbal expressions communicating about their emotional or cognitive experience during each session?

Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Attitude
The facilitator will want to verbalize his or her emotional or cognitive experience (e.g., “This is exciting!”) and invite the child participant to share his or her experience as well. Asking questions can be helpful for child participants who are not vocal.

7. Dog Approach (DA): This BO category addresses the level of comfort the child evidences around the S.T.A.R. dog.

Behavioral Outcome: Facilitator’s Role for Dog Approach
The facilitator will want to assess if the child participant’s level of comfort (e.g., S.T.A.R. or petting). If child participant is having difficulty approaching the dog, the BO Facilitator will demonstrate to the child participant the friendliness of the dog.
HELPFUL RESOURCES

**Reading**


**Websites**
Animal Behavior Associates, Website: www.animalbehaviorassociates.com

Animal Behavior Society, Website: www.animalbehaviorsociety.org/web/index.php

Animal Therapy Net, Website: http://animaltherapy.net/

CHAMP Assistance Dogs, Website: www.champdogs.org/animal-assisted-therapy-vs-animal-assisted-activities

Dog Play, Website: www.dogplay.com/Activities/Therapy/therapyl.html

Dog-Wise, Website: www.dogwise.com/index.cfm

Quick and Dirty Tips for Dog Training, Website: www.quickanddirtytips.com/dog-trainer

Paws for Healing, Website: www.paws4healing.info/about_aaa_aat.htm

Touch Assisted Clicker Training (TACT), Website: www.tactdogs.com/recommended_websites.html

Animal Behavior, Website: www.tactdogs.com/recommended_websites.html

Animal Behavior Institute, Website: www.animaledu.com/Careers/Internship-Opportunities?d=1

PetPartners, Website: https://petpartners.org/learn/aat-professionals/