



U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Executive Summary

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 02/28/2011

PR/Award # (11 characters): Q215F00081

Upon receiving approval of the PEP grant award in October 2010, we accomplished and completed many of the timeline tasks. The following have either been completed and/or are in the process of finalizing in order to meet the goals of the grant.

- Submitted the paperwork for the Board approval of the grant.
- Participated in the required conference call with the PEP Manager, all web trainings and meeting for the Project Director
- Started our search for a part time budget/data clerk and hired him
- Met with the community partners who committed to assisting with the grant to review their roles and responsibilities
- Developed Memorandum of Agreement with the University for the part time resource teachers to assist with the grant (will be board approved at the July 11th board meeting)
- Developed a requirements document for the nine participating schools to sign and finalized which schools would participate
- Started developing the expanded and enhanced version of the Y5210 from a 6 week to a 12 week program in collaboration with the YMCA to implement in the 2011-12 school year
- Creating the new and enhanced lesson plans for the Go Healthy Nutrition program to use in the 2011-12 school year
- Working with the pedometer web based programmers to develop and enhance the site for schools to use more easily and our evaluator to access data in a better format
- Collected the GPRa measurement data required for the PEP grant (which is included in the remainder of this report)

Our data reported does not always meet the 80% requirement. During the 2011-12 year we will conduct all of our interventions and will have a full year's implementation along with the data. Next year, all necessary steps will be taken in finalizing our enhancements with our community partners and producing a quality program.

Nine JCPS elementary schools participated in the PEP program during the 2010-2011 school year. The number of participants for each PEP component is listed below. While program interventions for the PEP grant will not be implemented until the 2011-2012 school year, the required data were collected for all measures. Program interventions were not delivered due to the short timeframe available to collect the required baseline and four additional sets of data for most measures. This data collection for nine schools occurred over a two month period; leaving no time to develop or deliver interventions. Measures without pre-existing baseline data (i.e., pedometers, 3DPAR, and Y5210) required five data collection windows; extending the data collection timeframe to the end of the school year. The contract with the University of Louisville to provide assistance was approved by the JCPS Board of Education on June 13, 2011 and will help facilitate implementation of all facets of the program in the upcoming year.

GPRa MEASURE 1.1a and GPRa MEASURE 1.1b: The percentage of students who engage in 60 minutes of daily physical activity.

The data for Performance Measure 1.1 reflect the outcomes for students in grades four and five (N=1448). PEP fourth and fifth grade teachers received professional development (PD) on PEP grant components and evaluation requirements; while, technology and fifth grade teachers received additional training on administration of the 3DPAR survey using Survey Monkey to students in 50 minute sessions. Survey Monkey is an on-line survey tool that allows for automatic input of data into an Excel or SPSS compatible spreadsheet for analysis. Permission was given by the Program Officer to administer an on-line version of the 3DPAR to PEP students.

Fourth and fifth grade students wore uploadable pedometers. The pedometer is an Advanced Professional Pedometer, model H215-D. Pedometers were purchased from Core Health Technologies. According to the manufacturer, it features sensor technology that can detect movement from direction and angle, allowing for recording of valid movement in more activities; a "damper" to filter out inefficient movement; USB for uploading the stored data to computer; records distance; counts calories burned; counts step taken; calculates the walk speed from; LCD automatically powers-off when no input is sensed; and there is a low battery indicator. Accuracy testing is also performed, verifying reliability to within a 1% threshold. Accuracy testing verified that less than 3% of pedometers exhibit a variance of more than 1% in steps, making the H215 one of the most accurate pedometers in the marketplace. Reliability is further increased by the digital tracking functionality and USB computer integration, which prevents overlogging or other inaccuracies that can occur with manual steps entry. Pedometer data was uploaded into a program known as the "Funtastic Fitness Pedometer Program". The Funtastic Fitness Pedometer Program is an on-line tool that allows students to join class teams, track steps, participate in challenges, and set goals. The site was developed for the Child Advocacy Department of Norton Kosair Children's Hospital by Core Health Technologies which maintains and upgrades the site. Students most frequently uploaded their pedometer data in the school technology lab.

Year 1 findings showed that the participation rate requirement was not met for any of the weeks, including the baseline week. With fourth and fifth grades combined, the highest participation rate was 74% for the baseline week. Disaggregation of the data revealed that both fourth and fifth grade students had less than 80% participation for pedometers for all weeks; though the fifth grade had a higher participation rate overall. Had fourth and fifth grade performance rate been reported separately, data for the 3DPAR would have met the 80% participation rate requirement for weeks 1-4; baseline participation rate for fifth grade on the 3DPAR was 76%. Fifth grade (N=732) would have met goal 54%, 36%, 36%, 29%, and 27% of the time for Baseline through Week 5, respectively.

GPRA MEASURE 1.2a and GPRA MEASURE 1.2b: The percentage of students who achieve age-appropriate cardiovascular fitness levels. The data for Performance Measure 1.2 reflect the outcomes for students in kindergarten through fifth grade (N=4303). One of the requirements for the PEP schools is to administer the Walk/Run component of the Physical Best Program which was developed by the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance (AAHPERD) to kindergarten through fifth grade students. The Walk/Run component of the Physical Best was administered to all PEP students four times this year to assess cardiovascular fitness. Students can walk or run the one mile distance; typically kindergarten through second grade students complete a half-mile course. Length of course is documented for all students by the Physical Education (PE) teacher or appropriate staff member and accounted for in the analysis. All students participate in the assessment; however, some students (mostly those who have severe physical handicaps) are not held to the AAHPERD performance standards or included in the “met goal” analysis. Parent/guardians receive two reports (pre and post) showing how individual students are doing compared to age/gender-appropriate national health standards. Each school is responsible for distributing both reports to parents. The post-test report also contains the pre-test results for comparison. Schools also receive pre and post reports that are reviewed with an assigned specialist. Year 1 findings show that of the students who completed the walk/run for the baseline—22% of students met the goal while an average of 14% of students met the goal for the remaining data collection weeks. If the number of PEP participants are included in the calculation as required for the Section B Program Objectives Tables of this report, the outcomes are 19% and 12%, respectively. The participation rate met the 80% participation requirement rate for all weeks. Next year, the less compressed data collection timeframe (i.e., entire school year) will allow schools and PEP support personnel to better allocate resources and provide alternative test dates in the case of severe weather. This should lead to increased participation for each test window.

GPRA MEASURE 1.3a and GPRA MEASURE 1.3b: The percentage of students served by the grant who consumed fruit two or more times per day and vegetables three or more times per day. The data for Performance Measure 1.3 reflect the outcomes for students in grades two through five (N=2854). The Y5210 pilot program is currently a 12 week program with six weeks in the fall and the second six weeks in the spring. The expanded 24 week Y5210 program was not delivered prior to baseline data collection or during the remaining school year; however, these programs will benefit JCPS students in grades 2 – 5 next year. Students in grades 2 – 5 completed the Y5210 survey five times (including baseline) to measure vegetable and fruit consumption. The survey was on a scannable bubble sheet and contained two items “How many servings of fruits do you eat each day?” and “How many servings of vegetables do you eat each day?”. Response options for both items ranged from 0 servings (a) to 5+ servings (e). Year 1 findings show that of the students who took the Y5210 survey for the baseline—47% of students met the goal while an average of 49% of students met the goal for the remaining data collection weeks. If the number of PEP participants are included in the calculation as required for the Section B Program Objectives Tables of this report, the outcomes are 43% and 40%, respectively. The participation rate for week 1 was 74% which represented data for 2109 students but did not meet the 80% participation requirement rate. Next year, the less compressed data collection timeframe (i.e., entire school year) will allow schools and PEP support personnel to better allocate resources to ensure that the participation requirement for each test window will be met.

GPRA MEASURE 1.4 and GPRA MEASURE 1.4b: The percentage of students who have an age-appropriate BMI using the CDC’s BMI-for-age growth charts. The data for Performance Measure 1.4 reflect the outcomes for students in kindergarten through fifth grade (N=4303). The BMI component of the Physical Best is administered to all PEP students twice each year (i.e., fall pre-test and spring post-test) to assess age appropriate weight to height ratios for a given age and gender. All students participate in the assessment. Data is collected by the PE teacher or appropriate staff member who is instructed to weigh and measure each student twice (taking the average if the measurements differ). Height is measured using a stadiometer while weight is measured using a digital scale. Parent/guardians receive two reports (pre and post) showing how individual students are doing compared to age/gender-appropriate national health standards. Each school is responsible for distributing both reports to parents. Parents with children who belong to or exceed the 85th percentile (or are in the 5th percentile) are encouraged to contact their healthcare provider. The post-test report also reflects the pre-test results for comparison. Schools also receive pre and post reports that are reviewed with an assigned specialist. Year 1 findings show that of the students who completed the BMI assessment for the baseline—55% of students had an age appropriate BMI while 56% had an age appropriate BMI on the post-test. If the number of PEP participants are included in the calculation as required for the Section B Program Objectives Tables of this report, the outcomes are 51% and 51% respectively. The participation rate exceeded the 80% participation requirement rate for the baseline (i.e., pre-test) and post-test.

All data have been reviewed by the Evaluator, Project Director, and Specialists. All schools will review their data during PD session held this summer. The Project Director and Specialists will use the data to assist with planning for next year. The Evaluator will use the data to identify data collection improvements or recommendations to improve program participation and implementation. Additionally, PEP school personnel completed a survey at the end of the school year that measured overall awareness of the program and requested suggestions for improvements. Responses are being studied now and will be the springboard for discussions with school personnel during the summer PD.



**U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart**

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 02/28/2011

PR/Award # (11 characters): Q215F100081

SECTION 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.

| | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------|-------|---|-------------------------|-----------|---|
| 1.1a. Performance Measure | Measure Type | Quantitative Data | | | | | |
| <p>The percentage of students who engage in 60 minutes of daily physical activity – baseline data.*</p> <p>*The guidance states to not report data that falls below the 80% participation requirement.</p> | GPRA | Target | | | Actual Performance Data | | |
| | | Raw Number | Ratio | % | Raw Number | Ratio | % |
| | | | | | | | |
| 1.1b. Performance Measure | Measure Type | Quantitative Data | | | | | |
| <p>The percentage of students who engage in 60 minutes of daily physical activity – current-year data.*</p> <p>*The guidance states to not report data that falls below the 80% participation requirement.</p> | GPRA | Target | | | Actual Performance Data | | |
| | | Raw Number | Ratio | % | Raw Number | Ratio | % |
| | | | | | | | |
| 1.2a. Performance Measure | Measure Type | Quantitative Data | | | | | |
| <p>The percentage of students who achieve age-appropriate cardiovascular fitness levels –baseline data</p> | GPRA | Target | | | Actual Performance Data | | |
| | | Raw Number | Ratio | % | Raw Number | Ratio | % |
| | | | / | | | 836 /4349 | |
| 1.2b. Performance Measure | Measure Type | Quantitative Data | | | | | |
| <p>The percentage of students who achieve age-appropriate cardiovascular fitness levels –current –year data</p> | PROJECT | Target | | | Actual Performance Data | | |
| | | Raw Number | Ratio | % | Raw Number | Ratio | % |
| | | | / | | | 512/4303 | |

| | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-------|---|-------------------------|-----------|---|
| 1.3a. Performance Measure | Measure Type | Quantitative Data | | | | | |
| The percentage of students served by the grant who consumed fruit two or more times per day and vegetables three or more times per day –baseline data | GPRA | Target | | | Actual Performance Data | | |
| | | Raw Number | Ratio | % | Raw Number | Ratio | % |
| | | | / | | | 1221/2854 | |
| 1.3b. Performance Measure | Measure Type | Quantitative Data | | | | | |
| The percentage of students served by the grant who consumed fruit two or more times per day and vegetables three or more times per day –current-year data | GPRA | Target | | | Actual Performance Data | | |
| | | Raw Number | Ratio | % | Raw Number | Ratio | % |
| | | | / | | | 1147/2854 | |
| 1.4a. Performance Measure | Measure Type | Quantitative Data | | | | | |
| The percentage of students who have an age-appropriate BMI using the CDC’s BMI-for-age growth charts-baseline data | COMPETITIVE PRIORITY | Target | | | Actual Performance Data | | |
| | | Raw Number | Ratio | % | Raw Number | Ratio | % |
| | | | / | | | 2200/4303 | |
| 1.4b. Performance Measure | Measure Type | Quantitative Data | | | | | |
| The percentage of students who have an age-appropriate BMI using the CDC’s BMI-for-age growth charts-current-year data | COMPETITIVE PRIORITY | Target | | | Actual Performance Data | | |
| | | Raw Number | Ratio | % | Raw Number | Ratio | % |
| | | | / | | | 2173/4303 | |

PERFORMANCE MEASURES:

Nine JCPS elementary schools participated in the PEP program during the 2010-2011 school year. However, program interventions for the PEP grant will not be implemented until the 2011-2012 school year. The required data were collected for all measures. Measures without pre-existing baseline data (i.e., pedometers, 3D PAR, and Y5210) required five data collection windows; extending the data collection timeframe to the end of the school year. The data collection windows for all measurements are shown below in Table 1:

Table 1. JCPS PEP Data Collection Windows

| DATA COLLECTION INSTRUMENT | 2010 APRIL 12-16 | 2010 SEPTEMBER 13-16 | 2011 MARCH 21 - 25 | 2011 APRIL 11 - 15 | 2011 MAY 2 - 6 | 2011 MAY 9 - 13 | 2011 MAY 16 - 19 | 2011 MAY 23 - 26 | GRADES |
|----------------------------|------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| PEDOMETERS | | | | X | X | X | X | X | 4 TH AND 5 TH |
| 3D PAR | | | | X | X | X | X | X | 5 TH |
| Y5210 | | | | X | X | X | X | X | 2 ND – 5 TH |
| WALK/RUN | X | X | X | X | | X | | | K – 5 TH |
| BMI | | X | X | | | | | | K – 5 TH |

GPRA MEASURE 1.1a and GPRA MEASURE 1.1b: The percentage of students who engage in 60 minutes of daily physical activity. PEP 4th and 5th grade teachers received professional development (PD) on PEP grant components and evaluation requirements; while, technology and 5th grade teachers received additional training on administration of the 3D PAR survey using Survey Monkey to students in 50 minute sessions. Survey Monkey is an on-line survey tool that allows for automatic input of data into an Excel or SPSS compatible spreadsheet for analysis. Permission was given by the Program Officer to administer an on-line version of the 3D PAR to PEP students.

Fourth and fifth grade students wore uploadable pedometers. The pedometer is an Advanced Pedometer, model H215-D. The pedometers were purchased from Core Health Technologies. According to the manufacturer, it features sensor technology that can detect movement from direction and angle, allowing for recording of valid movement in more activities; a "damper" to filter out inefficient movement; USB for uploading the stored data to computer; records distance; counts calories burned; counts step taken; calculates the walk speed from; LCD automatically powers-off when no input is sensed; and there is a low battery indicator. Accuracy testing is also performed, verifying reliability to within a 1% threshold. Accuracy testing verified that less than 3% of pedometers exhibit a variance of more than 1% in steps, making the H215 one of the most accurate pedometers in the marketplace. Reliability is further increased by the digital tracking functionality and USB computer integration, which prevents overlogging or other inaccuracies that can occur with manual steps entry.

Pedometer data was uploaded into a program known as the “Funtastic Fitness Pedometer Program”. The Funtastic Fitness Pedometer Program is an on-line tool that allows students to join class teams, track steps, participate in challenges, and set goals. The site was developed for the Child Advocacy Department of Norton Kosair Children’s Hospital by Core Health Technologies which maintains and upgrades the site. Students most frequently uploaded their pedometer data in the school technology lab. Students were allowed to take the pedometers home during the week and over the week-ends.

GPR MEASURE 1.2a and GPR MEASURE 1.2b: The **percentage of students who achieve age-appropriate cardiovascular fitness levels.** One of the requirements for the PEP schools is to administer the walk/run component of the Physical Best Program which was developed by the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance (AAHPERD) to kindergarten through fifth grade students. The walk/run component of the Physical Best is administered to all PEP students four times each year (plus baseline this year) to assess cardiovascular fitness. Students can walk or run the one mile distance; typically kindergarten through second grade students complete a half-mile course. Length of course is documented for all students by the Physical Education (PE) teacher or appropriate staff member and accounted for in the analysis. All students participate in the assessment; however, some students (mostly those who have severe physical handicaps) are not held to the AAHPERD performance standards or included in the “met goal” analysis. Parent/guardians receive two reports (pre and post) showing how individual students are doing compared to age/gender-appropriate national health standards. Each school is responsible for distributing both reports to parents the post-test report also reflects the pre-test results for comparison. Schools also receive pre and post reports that are reviewed with an assigned specialist.

GPR MEASURE 1.3a and GPR MEASURE 1.3b: The **percentage of students served by the grant who consumed fruit two or more times per day and vegetables three or more times per day.**

The Y5210 pilot program is currently a 12 week program with six weeks in the fall and the second six weeks in the spring. The expanded 24 week Y5210 program was not delivered prior to baseline data collection or during the remaining school year; however, these programs will benefit JCPS students in grades 2 – 5 next year. Students in grades 2 – 5 completed the Y5210 survey five times (including baseline) to measure vegetable and fruit consumption. The survey was on a scannable bubble sheet and contained two items “How many servings of fruits do you eat each day?” and “How many servings of vegetables do you eat each day?”. Response options for both items ranged from 0 servings (a) to 5+ servings (e).

GPR MEASURE 1.4 and GPR MEASURE 1.4b: The **percentage of students who have an age-appropriate BMI using the CDC’s BMI-for-age growth charts.**

The BMI component of the Physical Best is administered to all PEP students twice each year (i.e., fall pre-test and spring post-test) to assess age appropriate weight to height ratios for a given age and gender. All students participate in the assessment. Data is collected by the PE teacher or appropriate staff member who is instructed to weigh and measure each student twice (taking the average if the measurements differ). Height is measured using a stadiometer while weight is measured using a digital scale. Parent/guardians receive two reports (pre and post) showing how individual students are doing compared to age/gender-appropriate national health standards. Each school is responsible for distributing both reports to parents. Parents with children who belong to or exceed the 85th percentile (or are in the 5th percentile) are encouraged to contact their healthcare provider. The post-test report also reflects the pre-test results for comparison. Schools also receive pre and post reports that are reviewed with an assigned specialist.

PRELIMINARY FINDINGS:

Performance Measure 1.1: *The percentage of students who engage in 60 minutes of daily physical activity (3D PAR and Pedometer).*

The data for Performance Measure 1.1 (see Table 2) show that the participation rate requirement was not met for any of the weeks, including the baseline week. With fourth and fifth grades combined, the highest participation rate was 74% for the baseline week. Disaggregation of the data revealed that both 4th and 5th grade student had less than 80% participation for pedometers for all weeks; though the 5th grade had a higher participation

rate overall. Had 4th and 5th grade performance rate been reported separately, data for the 3D PAR would have met the 80% participation rate requirement for weeks 1-4; baseline participation rate for 5th grade on the 3D PAR was 76%. Fifth grade (N=732) would have met goal 54%, 36%, 36%, 29%, and 27% of the time for Baseline through Week 5, respectively.

Table 2. PEP Performance Measure 1.1 Data

| | Window number | The number of students served by the grant who engaged in 60 minutes of daily activity. | The number of students participating in the program during that window |
|-----------------------------|---------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Baseline | 637 | 1448 |
| | 1 | 595 | 1448 |
| | 2 | 403 | 1448 |
| | 3 | 314 | 1448 |
| | 4 | 200 | 1448 |
| Totals (excluding Baseline) | | No window met 80% requirement | |
| Divide by Number of Windows | | | |
| Average (rounded) | | | |

| Window number | Number of participating students who completed 60 minutes of daily activity assessment during that window. | Number of students participating in the PEP program during that window | That window's response rate |
|---------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Baseline | 1076 | 1448 | 74% |
| 1 | 872 | 1448 | 60% |
| 2 | 852 | 1448 | 59% |
| 3 | 829 | 1448 | 57% |
| 4 | 688 | 1448 | 48% |

Performance Measure 1.2: *The percentage of students who achieve age-appropriate cardiovascular fitness levels (Walk/Run)*

Participation rate for the walk/run data met the 80% requirement for each test week. Of the students who were tested, 14.4% met or exceeded the AAHPERD standards. If the number of PEP participants are included in the calculation as required for the Section B Program Objectives Tables of this report, the outcomes are 19% and 12%, respectively. Participation rates were a bit lower than expected due to unexpected severe winter and spring weather which constrained opportunities for outdoor testing (see Table 3).

Table 3. PEP Performance Measure 1.2 Data

| | Window number | The number of students served by the grant who achieved age-appropriate cardiovascular fitness levels. | The number of students participating in the program during that window |
|-----------------------------|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Baseline | 836 | 4349 |
| | 1 | 472 | 4303 |
| | 2 | 527 | 4303 |
| | 3 | 416 | 4303 |
| | 4 | 634 | 4303 |
| Totals (excluding Baseline) | | 2,049 | 17212 |
| Divide by Number of Windows | | 512.3 | 4303 |
| Average (rounded) | | 512 | 4303 |

| Window number | Number of participating students who completed walk/run assessment during that window. | Number of students participating in the PEP program during that window | That window's response rate |
|---------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Baseline | 3863 | 4349 | 89% |
| 1 | 3547 | 4303 | 82% |
| 2 | 3474 | 4303 | 81% |
| 3 | 3495 | 4303 | 81% |
| 4 | 3717 | 4303 | 86% |

Performance Measure 1.3: *The percentage of students served by the grant who consumed fruit two or more times per day and vegetables three or more times per day.*

Table 4 shows that just under half (47%) of the PEP students responded that they consumed two or more fruits and three or more vegetables each day for the baseline data. Baseline data also indicate that 84% of students responded that they eat two or more servings of fruit each day while 50% of students responded that they ate three or more servings of vegetables each day. PEP Schools did not meet the 80% participation rate requirement for Week 2; thus, that data is not included in any of the summary calculations for this measure. Data for the remaining weeks indicated that of the PEP students who participated in the Y5210 component of the program, 49% met the goal. If the number of PEP participants are included in the calculation as required for the Section B Program Objectives Tables of this report, the outcomes are 43% and 40%, respectively.

Table 4. PEP Performance Measure 1.3 Data

| | Window number | The number of students served by the grant who consumed fruit two or more times per day and vegetables three or more times per day | The number of students participating in the program during that window |
|-----------------------------|---------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| | Baseline | 1221 | 2854 |
| | 1 | 1006 | 2854 |
| | 2 | 1111 | 2854 |
| | 3 | 1165 | 2854 |
| | 4 | 1164 | 2854 |
| Totals (excluding Baseline) | | 3440 | 8562 |
| Divide by Number of Windows | | 1146.67 | 2854 |
| Average (rounded) | | 1147 | 2854 |

| Window number | Number of participating students who returned completed surveys during that window | Number of students participating in the PEP program during that window | That window's response rate |
|---------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Baseline | 2572 | 2854 | 90% |
| 1 | 2109 | 2854 | 74% |
| 2 | 2272 | 2854 | 80% |
| 3 | 2303 | 2854 | 81% |
| 4 | 2266 | 2854 | 80% |

Performance Measure 1.4: The percentage of students who have an age-appropriate BMI using the CDC’s BMI-for-age growth charts

Table 5 shows the results for PEP BMI data. Pre-test data showed that 54.5% of students tested had a BMI in the normal range using the CDC’s BMI-for-age growth standards. Post-test data indicate that 56% of the students tested had a BMI in the normal range using the CDC’s BMI-for-age growth standards, resulting in a slight pre-post improvement for BMI (for students who were tested). Table 6 shows the data disaggregated using the CDC’s standards. The percent of overweight students decreased by 2% over the school year; while, the percent of obese children remained the same (i.e., 24%). If the number of PEP participants are included in the calculation as required for the Section B Program Objectives Tables of this report, the outcomes are 51% and 51% for pre and post-tests, respectively.

Table 5. PEP Performance Measure 1.4 Data

| Window number | The number of students served by the grant who have an age-appropriate BMI using the CDC’s BMI-for-age growth charts. | The number of students participating in the program during that window |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Baseline (Pre-test) | 2220 | 4303 |
| 1 (Post-test) | 2173 | 4303 |
| Totals (excluding Baseline) | 2173 | 4303 |
| Divide by Number of Windows | 2173 | 4303 |
| Average (rounded) | 2173 | 4303 |

| Window number | Number of participating students | Number of students participating in the PEP program during that window | That window’s response rate |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Baseline (Pre-test) | 4035 | 4303 | 94% |
| 1 (Post-test) | 3880 | 4303 | 90% |

Table 6. PEP Performance Measure 1.4 Data Disaggregated using CDC Growth Charts

| PEP 2010-2011 Summary of Children's BMI-for-Age | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|
| | Boys | Girls | Total |
| PRE Number of children assessed | 2008 | 2027 | 4035 |
| POST Number of children assessed: | 1920 | 1960 | 3880 |
| PRE Underweight (< 5th %ile) | 1% | 2% | 1% |
| POST Underweight (< 5th %ile) | 1% | 2% | 2% |
| PRE Normal BMI (5th - 85th %ile) | 54% | 55% | 55% |
| POST Normal BMI (5th - 85th %ile) | 56% | 56% | 56% |
| PRE Overweight or obese (≥ 85th %ile)* | 45% | 44% | 44% |
| POST Overweight or obese (≥ 85th %ile)* | 42% | 42% | 42% |
| <i>PRE Obese (≥ 95th %ile)</i> | 24% | 24% | 24% |
| <i>POST Obese (≥ 95th %ile)</i> | 23% | 24% | 24% |

*Terminology based on: Barlow SE and the Expert Committee. Expert committee recommendations regarding the prevention, assessment, and treatment of child and adolescent overweight and obesity: summary report. Pediatrics. 2007;120 (suppl 4):s164-92.

PROGRESS TOWARD GOALS:

UNOBTAINED OBJECTIVES:

GPRA MEASURE 1.1a and GPRA MEASURE 1.1b: The participation rate requirement was not met for any of the weeks, including the baseline week.

GPRA MEASURE 1.2a and GPRA MEASURE 1.2b: N.A. – Goals met.

GPRA MEASURE 1.3a and GPRA MEASURE 1.3b:

PEP Schools did not meet the 80% participation rate requirement for Week 2. Two of the nine schools had particularly low GPRA Measure 1.3b participation rates for the second PEP test week (34% and 39%).

GPRA MEASURE 1.4 and GPRA MEASURE 1.4b: N.A. – Goals met.

EXPLANATION:

GPRA MEASURE 1.1a and GPRA MEASURE 1.1b: The PEP specialists estimate that approximately 40% of the pedometers were either lost or stolen, or left home. It was difficult for schools to reliably administer the 3D PAR five times over the course of two months. Additionally, the State Assessments overlapped with weeks of state assessment testing which likely interfered with access to the technology lab where the 3D PAR and pedometer data were usually collected using the lab's computers.

GPRA MEASURE 1.2a and GPRA MEASURE 1.2b: N.A. – Goals met

GPRA MEASURE 1.3a and GPRA MEASURE 1.3b:

JCPS was required to collect five weeks of PEP data for Measure 1.1 before the end of the school year. Unfortunately, week two of PEP testing occurred during the final week of Kentucky's state assessment. Schools in general were particularly challenged in collecting PEP assessment data during Week 2.

GPRA MEASURE 1.4 and GPRA MEASURE 1.4b: N.A. – Goals met.

CORRECTIVE ACTIONS:

GPRA MEASURE 1.1a and GPRA MEASURE 1.1b: Next year, parents and students will have to agree to a higher standard of accountability in order to receive a pedometer. Schools will receive more support in collecting pedometer and 3D PAR data now that the contract with the University of Louisville has been signed by the JPCS Board of Education to approve two part-time resource teachers to assist with the grant. Additionally, it was not possible to install the pedometer software on all classroom computers, forcing students to upload pedometers in the school technology lab which is less accessible. Next fall, all classroom computers will have the pedometer software installed. Additionally, challenges and small incentives (no cost to the grant) will be in place next year to further encourage participation. Having a much larger time frame for data collection will improve the ability of schools to conduct the assessments without competing priorities. Survey results of school personnel are also being reviewed to find ways to improve the program and intended outcomes for next year.

GPRA MEASURE 1.2a and GPRA MEASURE 1.2b: N.A. – Goals met

GPRA MEASURE 1.3a and GPRA MEASURE 1.3b:

Next year there will be no PEP assessment scheduled during the state assessment window. Survey results of school personnel are also being reviewed to find ways to improve the program and intended outcomes for next year.

GPRA MEASURE 1.4 and GPRA MEASURE 1.4b: N.A. – Goals met.

U.S. Department of Education
Grant Performance Report (ED 524B)
Project Status Chart

OMB No. 1894-0003
Exp. 02/28/2011

PR/Award # (11 characters): Q215F100081

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

All funds for this project period were not drawn down. This is partially due to the once a month draw down from our business office. Also, various other factors played into all funds not being drawn down and the specific expenditures are identified in the attached spreadsheet. Regarding personnel, we started searching in October 2010 for a part time budget/data clerk and didn't hire him until February 10, 2011. However the amount of work to be completed by the clerk between now and the end of the budget period (9/30/2011) will deplete the remaining funds allotted for this expense. Also, the part-time services agreement with the University of Louisville for full-time equivalent of services to assist with the grant was held up in our own legal counsel and theirs which in turn resulted in it not being finalized until the June 13, 2011 board meeting. The expense will be incurred within the next month now that the agreement is finalized. Other personnel costs were for training and the initial training for collecting baseline data did not take a full 6 hours. The trainings took approximately two hours. Therefore, an additional summer professional development training will be conducted to cover the programmatic intervention directions, discussion about initial data collection, best practices related to data collection, along with topics related to chronic diseases as defined in our initial proposal. This upcoming summer training in August will expend the remaining funds by the period ending 9/30/11. The fringe budgetary amounts not being all drawn down as of yet is basically the same explanation as the direct personnel costs described above. These expenditures will be completely expended by the period end 9/30/11.

Regarding the travel expenditures not all items have been drawn down but will be in August once the travel to the PEP Director's meeting occurs.

Supplies expenditures have been drawn down but again not all. After having the initial grant meeting with our Program Officer, Lisa Harrison, budget changes were submitted but they did not affect the scope of the program and did not exceed the acceptable federal guidelines for making changes to our budget. The budgetary changes for supplies were due to the increase in the numbers of pedometers needed for more participating classes in our PEP project schools. The cost decreased per pedometer but the number of classes increased. The Go Healthy Nutrition supplies have all been ordered but the draw down has not occurred as of yet. The Y5210 Kits will be incurred and drawn down once the final product is developed, and before the budget period ending date. All of the supplies budget will be expended and drawn down by the end of the budget period 9/30/2011. All of these items will be used during the upcoming 2011-12 school year, since all baseline data was to be collected before starting the programmatic intervention. This approach allows the program to be conducted over a complete school year, and the evaluation data will include a full year's worth of data, instead of a few months.

Contractual expenses have not all been drawn down but almost all have been encumbered. Parts of the Y5210 kits expansion and enhancement have been developed and finalized but some parts are still being developed. All kits will be developed by the contractor, including the new videos and will be ready for training and implementation at the professional development training in August 2011. Therefore all contract amounts should be drawn down on before the 9/30/2011 budget period ending.

All Indirect Costs will be incurred by the budget period ending 9/30/2011. Regarding the non-federal expenditures, our required match we had 25% of time devoted for our key personnel (Director, Specialist IV, Specialist III, and two Specialist II positions). All personnel have spent numerous hours on the project and will have committed the full match by 9/30/11. Our match for in-kind supplies has not been fulfilled as of yet due to the remaining supplies that will be ordered and used at the professional development training in August. However the full amount will be matched by the grant period ending 09/30/11.

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

N.A.