



Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

PR/Award # (11 characters): _____

SECTION A - Performance Objectives Information and Related Performance Measures Data (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

1. Project Objective Check if this is a status update for the previous budget period.

One hundred schools will offer 60 minutes of daily physical activity through participation in the 30/20/10 initiative.

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------|--------------------------------|--------------|----------|
| 1.1a. Performance Measure: The percentage of students served by the grant who engage in 60 minutes or more of daily physical activity. | Measure Type | Quantitative Data | | | | | |
| The percentage of students served by the grant who engage in 60 minutes or more of daily physical activity –baseline data | GRPA | Target | | | Actual Performance Data | | |
| | | Raw Number | Ratio | % | Raw Number | Ratio | % |
| | | NA | / | | 26 | 26/210 | 12.4 % |
| 1.1b. Performance Measure | Measure Type | Quantitative Data | | | | | |
| The percentage of students served by the grant who engage in 60 minutes or more of daily physical activity –year one data | GRPA | Target | | | Actual Performance Data | | |
| | | Raw Number | Ratio | % | Raw Number | Ratio | % |
| | | NA | / | | 46 | 46/184 | 25.0% |
| 1.1c. Performance Measure | Measure Type | Quantitative Data | | | | | |
| The percentage of students served by the grant who engage in 60 minutes or more of daily physical activity –year two data | GRPA | Target | | | Actual Performance Data | | |
| | | Raw Number | Ratio | % | Raw Number | Ratio | % |
| | | | | | | | |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|----|---|--|-----|---------|-------|
| | | NA | / | | 156 | 156/488 | 32.0% |
|--|--|----|---|--|-----|---------|-------|

Project objective 2: One hundred schools will conduct fitness testing using Fitnessgram through the 30/20/10 initiative.

| | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------|--------------------------------|--------------|----------|
| 1.2.a. Performance Measure: The percentage of students served by the grant who meet the standard of a healthy fitness zone as established by the assessment for the Presidential Youth Fitness Program (PYFP) in at least five of the six fitness areas of that assessment. | Measure Type | Quantitative Data | | | | | |
| The percentage of students served by the grant who meet the standard of a healthy fitness zone as established by the assessment for the Presidential Youth Fitness Program (PYFP) in at least five of the six fitness areas of that assessment –baseline data | PYFP measures | Target | | | Actual Performance Data | | |
| | | Raw Number | Ratio | % | Raw Number | Ratio | % |
| | | NA | / | | 60 | 60 /186 | 32.3% |
| 1.2b. Performance Measure | Measure Type | Quantitative Data | | | | | |
| The percentage of students served by the grant who meet the standard of a healthy fitness zone as established by the assessment for the Presidential Youth Fitness Program (PYFP) in at least five of the six fitness areas of that assessment –year one data | PYFP measures | Target | | | Actual Performance Data | | |
| | | Raw Number | Ratio | % | Raw Number | Ratio | % |
| | | NA | / | | 82 | 82/223 | 36.8% |
| 1.2.c. Performance Measure | Measure Type | Quantitative Data | | | | | |
| The percentage of students served by the grant who meet the standard of a healthy fitness zone as established by the assessment for the Presidential Youth Fitness Program (PYFP) in at least five of the six fitness areas of that assessment –year two data | PYFP measures | Target | | | Actual Performance Data | | |
| | | Raw Number | Ratio | % | Raw Number | Ratio | % |
| | | NA | / | | 199 | 30/165 | 18.2% |

Project Objective 3: One hundred schools will conduct healthy eating education through the 30/20/10 initiative.

| 1.3a. Performance Measure: The percentage of students served by the grant who consume fruit two or more times per day and vegetables three or more times per day. | Measurement type | Quantitative Data | | | | | |
|--|------------------|-------------------|-------|---|------------|---------|-------|
| The percentage of students served by the grant who consume fruit two or more times per day and vegetables three or more times per day –baseline data. | GRPA | Raw Number | Ratio | % | Raw Number | Ratio | % |
| | | / | | | 30 | 30 /165 | 18.2% |
| 1.3b. Performance Measure | Measurement type | Quantitative Data | | | | | |
| The percentage of students served by the grant who consume fruit two or more times per day and vegetables three or more times per day –year one data. | GRPA | Raw Number | Ratio | % | Raw Number | Ratio | % |
| | | / | | | 40 | 40/231 | 17.3% |
| 1.3c. Performance Measure | Measurement type | Quantitative Data | | | | | |
| The percentage of students served by the grant who consume fruit two or more times per day and vegetables three or more times per day year two data. | GRPA | Raw Number | Ratio | % | Raw Number | Ratio | % |
| | | / | | | 128 | 128/579 | 22.1% |

Explanation of Progress (Include Qualitative Data and Data Collection Information)

Data time points included:

For baseline data collection, data were collected in two visits to each of the 48 participating schools. Baseline data collection took place from April 21st to June 6th, 2014.

Year one data collection took place in September 2014. For year one data collection, data were collected in two visits to each of the 41 participating schools.

For year two data collection, data were collected in two visits to each of the 57 participating schools. The first wave of data collection took place from October 14 to December 19, 2014. The second wave of data collection took place March 16 through June 10, 2015. Year two data presented are combined for the two data collection waves to present a singular year one data point.

Year three data will be collected in two visits to each participating school. The first wave of data collection will take place October-December 2015. The second wave of year three data collection will take place from March to June 2016.

Sample selection:

The evaluation received permission from DOE to sample students. The sample was pulled using the following methods: A list of all enrolled K-12 students for all schools participating in the PEP initiative was compiled and alphabetized. Using the DOE excel sampling spreadsheet a sample of students for evaluation participation was pulled by CPS staff. The sample included 800 students enrolled in 53 schools in baseline year, 800 students enrolled in 53 schools in year one, and 1277 students enrolled in 110 schools in year two.

Evaluation enrollment process:

The same evaluation enrollment process was used in each data collection wave. This included providing students and their parents/guardians with a declination of consent form. If no form was returned within at least seven days students were approached for enrollment. Students under 18 years of age were asked to provide their assent to participate (verbally for students under 12 years of age, written for students 12-18 years of age). Students 18 years of age or older who did not want to participate provided written declination of consent. A total of 251 students were enrolled in baseline year and 294 in year one. A total of 623 students were enrolled in year two. Prior to student enrollment several schools opted out of the evaluation and several were unable to schedule data collections or did not distribute declination forms within the study time frame. In the baseline year, no schools opted out and 5 schools were unable to schedule data collection. In year one, 1 school opted out and 11 schools were unable to schedule data collection. In year two, 4 schools opted out, 11 schools were unable to schedule one of the rounds of data collection, and 3 schools were unable to schedule either of the rounds of data collection.

Data collection:

For each wave of data collection, at the first data collection visit, students selected for the sample without a declination form on file in the office were called to the office. Next, a room where data collection could take place was located. Students, CPS personnel and evaluators gathered in the room for data collection.

Project personnel then informed students about the evaluation and provided an opportunity for assenting to participate (written assent if aged 12 or older; declination of consent if aged 18 or older). Those that refused assent or declined to participate were dismissed back to class.

Next, Fitness testing was conducted by CPS personnel and results recorded by evaluator. Students were assigned a pedometer (Fitbug Orb, London, UK) and given instructions as to how and when to wear it. Instructions included: to wear on right hip using clip, and wear 24 hours a day except for bathing and watersports. Students were informed about the date of a return visit where they would complete one or two surveys (depending on grade), return the pedometer and complete any outstanding fitness testing.

At the return visit for each data collection time point, seven days later, students were called to the office and a room was located in the same manner as the first visit. Pedometers were collected. Next surveys were completed individually by students. For students in K-8th grade the surveys were read aloud by CPS personnel. If any fitness testing was unable to be completed in the first visit it was completed at this time. After student fitness testing was completed, students were dismissed back to class.

Issues in evaluation enrollment and participation:

Low response rate. In the baseline year response rates were 44.3%, 39.2%, and 34.8%, respectively for performance measures 1a, 1b, and 1c. In year one, response rates were 23.1%, 28.0%, and 29.0% respectively for performance measures 1a, 1b, and 1c. In year two, response rates were 38.2%, 50.2%, and 45.3% respectively for performance measures 1a, 1b, and 1c.

We believe that these relatively low response rates are due to the way the sample is selected without regard to school and classroom grouping. Typically when classrooms within schools are selected for participation in an evaluation, we generally have much higher participation rates. For example, in the Healthy CPS pro-

ject, which sampled on schools and classrooms we had a participation rate of 76%. Grouping in this way allows us to work with classroom teachers to plan for data collection so that students are available for the scheduled data collection vs. in testing or a field trip as we encountered with the PEP sample. Inter-class correlation adjustment allows us to account for the clustering by school and classroom and to retain the integrity of data. However, given the parameters required for this project's sample, these processes are not allowable and as a result we expect to continue the evaluation with response rates similar to these. We did propose introducing student incentives to encourage the return of pedometers (non-return of pedometers is a frequent reason for non-response). However these strategies were not approved by DOE.

High pedometer loss rate. In the baseline year, 108 pedometers out of 251 deployed were lost (a loss rate of 43%). In year one, 118 pedometers out of the 294 deployed were lost (a loss rate of 40%). In year two, 222 pedometers out of 663 deployed were lost (a loss rate of 33.4%).

Lost means that students did not return the pedometer at the second data collection visit and staff was unable to retrieve the pedometers at subsequent follow up visits to schools. Many of the students were absent on the second visit and so were unable to turn in their pedometer. The majority of students who did not return their pedometer forgot it at home. A minority admitted to losing it during the week. We asked all students to bring their pedometer back to school in the following days and turn it in to the main office or their PE teacher. Research staff contacted the main offices and PE teachers to check to see if any pedometers were turned in. While some pedometers were able to be retrieved in this manner a large number remain missing and therefore pedometer data for those students is also missing.

The loss rate for pedometers in year two was much lower than at baseline (43%). This is encouraging and we hypothesize that deeper relationships with school staff and increased familiarity with the evaluation requirement may be reasons we have been able to recover more pedometers. We hope this trend continues in year 3. Though the loss rate is lower than at baseline, we still have a high loss rate. We think that the large number of unreturned pedometers was partially due to the structure of the sample, with individual students enrolled in the study there wasn't an efficient way to contact them to remind them to wear the pedometer and bring it back to school with them. Typically, when entire classrooms are enrolled the teacher can remind the group as a whole not to forget their pedometers and this was not possible with the sample structure of this project.

Findings:

At baseline we found that 32.3% of students had healthy fitness zone scores in the desired range. Only 12.4% of participating students obtained 60 minutes or more of physical activity daily and 18.2% for healthy eating. This indicates room for improvement in the health habits measured including physical activity, fitness and healthy eating. The area with the largest potential for improvement at baseline was physical activity. .

At year one, we found about a third (31.0%) of students had healthy habits and healthy fitness zone scores in the desired range. The overall change was not statistically significant from baseline to year one measurement points. This indicates continued room for improvement in the health habits measured including physical activity, fitness and healthy eating.

There was, however, a statistically significant improvement from baseline to year one in the proportion of students which obtained 60 minutes or more of moderate/vigorous physical activity, increasing from 12.4% at baseline to 25.0% in year one ($p < 0.001$). Similarly, the proportion of students which obtained 60 minutes or more of moderate/vigorous physical activity was higher at year two, compared to baseline (from 12.4% to 32.0%; $p < 0.00001$). This finding that the proportion meeting the physical activity goal is higher after the initiative is an encouraging outcome for the intervention which targets increased PE time and quality. The proportion of students with Healthy Fitness Zone scores was not significantly different between baseline and year one or year two ($p = 0.34$ from

baseline to year one; $p=0.75$ from baseline to year two). Changes in healthy eating habits were not significant ($p=0.92$ from baseline to year one; $p=0.28$ from baseline to year two). This indicates continued room for improvement in student fitness and healthy eating.

PR/Award # (11 characters): _____

SECTION B - Budget Information (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)

SECTION C - Additional Information (See Instructions. Use as many pages as necessary.)