Project TRIP Best Practices Check List Tip Sheet

Before the Intergenerational Activity

1. Collaboration between program staff to plan IG activities
   Time was set aside for adult and child program partners to plan this activity.
   • Adult and child program partners had time away from regular care tasks to plan this activity together.
     This plan was documented beforehand so any staff member could implement the activity.
     • Activity plans or notes were made or printed out or emailed and accessible to other facilitators.
   Participants helped to shape this IG activity.
   • Adults and/or children together or separately were invited to make decisions that shaped this activity
     (e.g., deciding what snack to prepare or how to share a chosen story).

2. Participant involvement before the IG activity
   The activity was described to participants ahead of time.
   • Participants were told in advance that they would see their IG partners and what the activity would involve.
     Expectations for behaviors were explained ahead of time.
   • Participants were told what role they would be invited to play in the activity. Participants may have been
     reminded about appropriate IG behaviors (e.g., inside voices, working with an IG neighbor).

3. IG activities reflected participant backgrounds and social histories
   This IG activity was chosen because it reflected participants’ interests, backgrounds, and/or social histories.
   • Staff used knowledge of participants’ experiences, interests, or racial/ethnic/cultural backgrounds to inform
     the choice of this activity and/or how it was implemented

4. Prior to this IG activity, physical barriers to participant engagement were considered
   Adaptations to equipment were made.
   • Equipment and materials were modified or acquired, if needed, to enable full engagement of participants
     regardless of physical limitations (e.g., easy-grip items)
   Adaptations to the physical space were made (e.g., seating)
   • Activity space was comfortable and supportive for adults and children (e.g., furniture, temperature, lighting,
     and noise were considered and adapted if needed).
   Distractions were minimized (e.g., noise, foot traffic)
   • Activity, materials, sensory input were arranged or adapted to enhance attention to the activity (e.g.,
     locating activity in a quiet area, turning off music, or putting out materials only as needed).

During the Intergenerational Activity

5. Participation in this IG activity was voluntary
   For adult participants
   • Adults were given a choice of whether or not to join the activity. Participation was not required.
   For child participants
   • Children were given a choice of whether or not to join the activity. Participation was not required.

6. Age- and role- appropriateness of IG activities
   • The activity was appropriate for the child participants because they engaged in the activity as they would
     with age peers (e.g., singing with peers songs that appeal to that age group).
   • The activity was appropriate for the adults because they engaged in the activity as they would with age
     peers (e.g., singing with peers songs that appeal to that group) OR because of the role they took in an
     activity (e.g., helping a child to build with blocks)

7. This IG activity supported interaction among intergenerational participants
   Ratio of adult and child participants was equal or near equal
   • Number of child and adult participants was identical with the rare exception of 1-2 extra children or adults.

See http://www.intergenerational.clahs.vt.edu/trip/index.html for the BP Checklist scale and training video.
Contact Shannon Jarrott (jarrott.1@osu.edu) with questions or feedback.
Activity was conducted with IG pairs or small IG groups.
• Participants were grouped into IG pairs (i.e., one elder and one child) or small IG groups (e.g., two adults and two children).

Arrangement of materials was paired between IG participants.
• IG pairs shared materials rather than each member having their own or sharing with the group.

Facilitators guided the activity to promote IG interaction.
• The facilitators encouraged verbal and non-verbal interactions between partners with varied communication techniques (e.g., prompts or questions, such as “Mr. Jim, can you hand Alex the baking soda?”).

8. **Facilitators of this IG activity considered the social environment, including the staff role**

Staff avoided over-facilitation
• Facilitators supported without controlling or inhibiting participant actions. Facilitators can step back from the activity without participant engagement dropping off.

Staff were responsive to both generations of participants.
• Staff communicated with, responded to, and supported elder and child participants, rather than attending only to their program’s participants.

Staff moved around the activity area.
• Staff were mobile, rather than stationed in one place standing at, sitting at, or doing the activity.

Staff matched children and adults intentionally (e.g., based on shared interest, abilities, or previous interactions)
• Staff used knowledge of participants to create compatible child and older adult pairs or small groups.

Facilitators encouraged IG interaction between participants by discussing the activity in relation to participant interests or experiences.
• With the group, facilitators talked about participants’ experiences, interests or backgrounds as they relate to the activity (e.g., to share information or encourage exchange of information).

9. **Participant involvement after the IG activity**

Participants were encouraged to provide feedback about this IG activity afterwards.
• Participants were asked to share ideas about the IG activity with facilitators afterwards (e.g., right after activity ended or later in the day; it could involve spoken, written, or other feedback).

10. **Documentation of IG activities**

This IG activity was documented (e.g., through photographs, work samples, or transcripts of conversations)
• Staff or participants documented the activity with photo, video, audio, or written records of the activity and people’s experiences.

This documentation will be shared with parents and caregivers.
• Staff share documentation with parents and caregivers. This may be done through daily records sent home, annual teacher or caregiver meetings, shared photos, center displays, or social media.

This documentation will be shared with center staff.
• Staff share documentation with other staff and administrators. This may be done through staff meeting updates, documentation collected at the center, or informal communication.

This documentation will be shared with potential center funders.
• Selected documentation is shared with the grant makers, donors, or the general public (e.g., sharing satisfaction survey results, photos, or testimonials from IG participants and family members).

11. **Reflection on the completed IG activity**

Immediately following this IG activity, the adult and child program staff reflected on the IG activity together.
• Staff representing the child and adult programs share their thoughts on the activity’s success and potential modifications for improvement. Reflections may be documented (e.g., on the BP checklist or a reflection journal) or simply shared in conversation to support and sustain quality IG programming.

See [http://www.intergenerational.clahs.vt.edu/trip/index.html](http://www.intergenerational.clahs.vt.edu/trip/index.html) for the BP Checklist scale and training video.
Contact Shannon Jarrott ([jarrott.1@osu.edu](mailto:jarrott.1@osu.edu)) with questions or feedback.