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ABSTRACT

A PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP
FOR TEACHERS RESPONSIBLE FOR
ADMINISTERING THE FITNESSGRAM

Janice M. Schmidt

This project focused on planning, organizing, and facilitating a professional development workshop for teachers from Northwest California who are responsible for administering the California state-mandated physical fitness tests to students in grades five, seven and nine. California adopted the FITNESSGRAM as the measurement instrument of specific physical fitness categories. Currently, teachers receive an abbreviated instruction manual which describes each test component, but most teachers had not received any training in the past ten years. There was a well recognized regional need to provide additional training in the use of the FITNESSGRAM. The history of physical fitness testing in California was presented as well as multi-year analysis of the most recent physical fitness results of Humboldt County students. Current issues surrounding the administration of components of the test were discussed. Additionally, the workshop presenters provided instruction in pedagogy, lessons, and curriculum to assist teachers in improving fitness scores of their students. Time was provided for participants to collaborate with other teachers who teach in similar grades and/or settings, such as elementary, secondary, and K-8 schools.
I wish to express my sincere gratitude to a number of individuals who have assisted me in the completion of my Master’s Degree. First, I would like to thank Stephanie Jackson, my mentor, colleague and friend. From the moment I met her in 1993 in the Jay Willard Gymnasium at Eureka High School while I was looking for a Master Teacher (luckily, I got Stephanie), she has had a major positive role in my life. Her endless support and positive, can-do attitude inspire me every day to live life to the fullest and be the best that I can be. I value her friendship and I feel so very fortunate to have met her, and I know that fate brought us together. Next, I would like to thank my good friend Tahnia Campbell for her support and friendship, and her help with this project. She inspires me to continue to exercise and push myself to new limits (the Triathlon). I am proud that she is pursuing her Master’s Degree as she is already an excellent teacher and coach. Next I would like to thank my sister-in-law, Claudia Ivanjack, who has been my #1 supporter and cheerleader for the past fourteen years. Her confidence in me, and ongoing support have helped me attain personal and professional goals beyond my dreams. I would also like to acknowledge my former colleague and classmate, Vanessa Pickering, whose company I enjoyed during all those hours of graduate classes. I would also like to thank my husband Allan Schmidt, who provided emotional and physical support (neck rubs) during the completion of this project. He also served as a proof reader for this document. Finally, I would like to thank Dr. Chris Hopper, my Committee Chair.
Without his willingness to take on this project with me none of this would be possible. I am eternally indebted to him for his assistance and patient support.
TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ........................................................................................................................................ iii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT ....................................................................................................................... iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS .................................................................................................................... vi
LIST OF TABLES ............................................................................................................................. viii
BACKGROUND ............................................................................................................................. 1
LITERATURE REVIEW ..................................................................................................................... 5
  Childhood Obesity Rates .................................................................................................................. 5
  Historical Perspective of Fitness Issues and Testing ...................................................................... 10
  The FITNESSGRAM ....................................................................................................................... 19
  Description of test ......................................................................................................................... 21
    The standards ............................................................................................................................ 25
MULTI-YEAR ANALYSIS OF PHYSICAL FITNESS SCORES .............................................................. 26
PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS AND TRAINING ........................................ 32
DISCUSSION GROUPS .................................................................................................................... 35
CALIFORNIA ASSOCIATION OF HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION, RECREATION & DANCE CONFERENCE - MARCH 2007 .......................................................... 39
PROJECT METHODOLOGY ........................................................................................................... 41
ASSESSMENT OF WORKSHOP ....................................................................................................... 52
FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS ...................................................................................................... 60
REFERENCES ................................................................................................................................. 63
APPENDIX A FITNESSGRAM WORKSHOP ............................................................... 65
APPENDIX B FITNESSGRAM PRE-WORKSHOP ASSESSMENT .............................. 67
APPENDIX C FITNESSGRAM POST-WORKSHOP ASSESSMENT ............................. 70
# LIST OF TABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Prevalence of Overweight* Among U.S. Children and Adolescents (Aged 2–19 Years)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2006 Participation in Physical Fitness Test by Gender</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2004-06 Comparison of Percentages of All Students in the Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ) by Fitness Area</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2004-06 Comparison of Percentages of All by Number of Fitness Standards Achieved</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2006 Percentages of Students Achieving the HFZ in All Six Fitness Areas by Grade Level</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Percentage of Humboldt County Students Who are Not in the HFZ</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Top Row = number of incorrect answers by participants on pre-assessment</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Top Row = number of incorrect answers by participants on post-assessment</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
BACKGROUND

In 1969 man landed on the moon, the Vietnam War was the nightly headline on the six o’clock news, and I participated in the President’s Physical Fitness Award Program. I was in the 7th grade and I remember being required to “try” to do a pull-up from a hanging position, throw a softball as far as I could, and run one and a half times around the school track as fast as I could. I believe there were a few additional “tests” that the other students and I were required to do as well. I have never forgotten the burning feeling in my lungs after completing the run on that hot and smoggy San Fernando Valley day. I also recall the humiliation of not being able to pull my chin over the bar even one time, and the small twinge of pain in my upper right arm after throwing the softball as far as possible (we were given two tries) without a proper warm-up. Needless to say, I did not receive any special awards from these tests, but I did gain the knowledge that I did not like taking the tests the way they were administered. Later, the memory of those physical fitness tests played a part in my chosen career and also played a critical part in the development of my Master’s Project. I earned my Bachelor’s Degree in Physical Education (PE) in 1993 and went on to earn a Single Subject Teaching Credential in PE as well as a Multiple Subject Teaching Credential. After teaching for about five years, I obtained my Administrative Credentials, and I am currently an elementary school principal in Eureka, California. During my first year of teaching, I was required to administer the physical fitness tests to my 7th grade students. My two
colleagues and I read through the photocopied sheets of instructions for each test and, without any specific training on the proper administration of each test, we administered the battery of tests. From my previous personal history with fitness testing I was committed to preparing my students for these tests the best I could. In looking through the battery of tests I noticed that the softball throw was not included, and we were not going to be able to do a pull-up test as we did not have a proper facility, so my main focus was making sure that my students’ lungs weren’t burning at the end of the run. I set out to build their aerobic capacity in the weeks preceding the test; this helped greatly. After that year, I changed grade levels and was not involved in physical fitness testing again for a number of years.

After becoming an elementary school principal, I was again made aware of the annual Physical Fitness Testing (PFT). My district office sent PFT information to me sometime in March and instructed me to deliver the information to the 5th grade teachers. The testing window was March through May. I really did not think much about it for the first two years as my energy and attention were elsewhere. But, during my third year I became somewhat alarmed when looking through the material provided by the district. It included limited information about each test with inadequate pictures and descriptions. It also did not include all the test options and even left out The Pacer, the preferred aerobic capacity test component. The Pacer is the “recommended” test by the creators of the FITNESSGRAM, which is the State-adopted test. I knew that my teachers and the other teachers in my district needed to be better trained. Additionally, I questioned the
reliability and validity of the results of a test that is given by teachers who have not been properly trained on the standardization requirements in the administration of the test.

For the past three years I also served on my district’s Nutrition Committee; the committee’s responsibility was to develop an implementation plan for the district’s nutrition policy. The nutrition policy was developed and adopted in 2003. Soon after the district’s nutrition policy was adopted by the Eureka City Schools Board of Education, the State passed legislation requiring that all schools adopt a wellness policy which includes a variety of components such as nutrition, physical education, physical activity, and staff wellness.

The concerns and alarms about the increasing rates of childhood obesity were sounding across the country and now California schools were being required to have policies in place to help combat this growing trend. The State required that each school district have a wellness policy in place at the start of the 2006-2007 school year. I became a member of the Eureka City Schools Wellness Committee and helped to develop the current wellness policy. Required components of this policy include a nutrition policy, as well as policies involving physical education and physical activity (ECS Board Policy).

I also observed first-hand that many elementary teachers lacked the confidence and proper training to provide a quality physical education program. Although I sent all my teachers, kindergarten through grade five, to workshops on physical education curriculum during my first year as principal, most teachers reverted to the same old thing, kickball, “Save the Bacon,” or free play and called it PE. Worst of all, many teachers routinely used PE as a carrot to encourage students to get their work done or to be quiet.
If the class wasted time, the amount of time wasted would come off their PE time. In many instances, the students would get only five to ten minutes if they got PE at all. I discovered through an informal survey of my teaching staff that only one teacher out of a group of twenty-one knew the correct mandated minutes of physical education in the California Education Code.

And finally, after reviewing my 5th graders scores and the scores of Humboldt County students on the Summary of Results from the California Physical Fitness Report, I realized that something needed to be done. All of these experiences led me in the direction of investigating ways of improving students’ fitness scores. I began this endeavor with a review of the current literature, held discussion groups, and attended the California Association of Health, Physical Education, Recreation & Dance (CAHPERD) annual conference in March 2007.
LITERATURE REVIEW

Childhood Obesity Rates

The rate of obesity among school-age children has become a national health concern. The number of overweight children aged 6 to 11 has more than tripled over the past three decades (Lewis & Parsad, 2006). “The prevalence of overweight among children and adolescents…increased significantly during the 6-year period from 1999 to 2004” (Ogden, Carroll, Curtin, McDowell, & Tabak, 2006). According to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) 2007, “The National Health Survey Act, 1956, provided the legislation authorizing for a continuing survey to provide current statistical data on the amount, distribution, and effects of illness and disability in the United States.” The National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) was created to fulfill the purpose of this act. The results of the current survey show that childhood obesity/overweight is a rapidly growing problem in our country. The following graph (Table 1) shows trends in childhood overweight based on the data for various age groups, beginning with NHANES I (1971–1974) and ending with NHANES 2003–2004, which was the most recently available published data (CDC, 2007).
Table 1

*Prevalence of Overweight* Among U.S. Children and Adolescents
(Aged 2–19 Years)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>Survey Periods</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ages 2 through 5</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 6 through 11</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ages 12 through 19</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Sex-and age-specific BMI ≥ 95th percentile based on the CDC growth charts
Sources: CDC, 2007
During the past three decades, overweight has almost tripled among school-aged children aged 6-19 years (CDC). Data from NHANES I (1971–1974) to NHANES 2003–2004 show increases in overweight among all age groups:

- Among preschool-aged children, aged 2–5 years, the prevalence of overweight increased from 5.0% to 13.9%.
- Among school-aged children, aged 6–11 years, the prevalence of overweight increased from 4.0% to 18.8%.
- Among school-aged adolescents, aged 12–19 years, the prevalence of overweight increased from 6.1% to 17.4%.

Overweight children and adolescents may experience immediate and/or long term health consequences and may be at risk for weight-related health problems in adulthood. These health consequences include psychological risks and cardiovascular disease. Psychologocial risks, referred to as psychosocial, are some of the immediate health consequences (CDC, 2007). Overweight children and adolescents are targets of early and systematic social discrimination. The psychological stress of social stigmatization can cause low self-esteem which, in turn, can hinder academic and social functioning, and persist into adulthood. Overweight children and teens have been found to have risk factors for cardiovascular disease (CVD), including high cholesterol levels, high blood pressure, and abnormal glucose tolerance as well. Less common health conditions associated with increased weight include asthma, hepatic steatosis, sleep apnea, and Type 2 diabetes.
The Centers for Disease Control report that childhood overweight/obesity is the result of an imbalance between the calories a child consumes and the calories used to support normal growth and development, metabolism, and physical activity. This imbalance can result from the influences and interactions of a number of factors including, genetic, behavioral, and environmental. Certain genetic characteristics may increase an individual’s susceptibility to overweight. Behavioral factors include energy intake, physical activity, and sedentary behavior. Environmental factors include those within the home, child care facilities, schools, and community design. The CDC states that it is the interaction among these factors that is believed to cause overweight.

Throughout the literature, recommendations for reducing childhood obesity include increasing physical activity. The following physical activity facts and recommendations were provided from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) and have been based on publications from DHHS, CDC, The National Center for Health Statistics, and the following reports: Physical Activity and Health, 1996: Call to Action to Prevent and Decrease Overweight and Obesity, 2001, and Healthy People 2010.

- According to a study by the National Association of Sports and Physical Education (NASPE), infants, toddlers, and pre-schoolers should engage in at least 60 minutes of physical activity daily and should not be sedentary for more than 60 minutes at a time except when sleeping.
• Physical activity among children and adolescents is important because of the related health benefits (cardio-respiratory function, blood pressure control, weight management, cognitive and emotional benefits).

• Significant health benefits can be obtained by including a moderate amount of physical activity (e.g., 30 minutes of brisk walking or raking leaves, 15 minutes of running, 45 minutes of playing volleyball).

• Thirty to sixty minutes of activity broken into smaller segments of 10 or 15 minutes throughout the day have significant health benefits.

• Moderate daily physical activity can substantially reduce the risk of developing or dying from cardiovascular disease, type 2 diabetes, and certain cancers, such as colon cancer. Daily physical activity helps to lower blood pressure and cholesterol, helps prevent or retard osteoporosis, and helps reduce obesity, symptoms of anxiety and depression, and symptoms of arthritis.

• Heart disease is the leading cause of death among men and women in the United States. Physically inactive people are twice as likely to develop coronary heart disease as regularly active people.

• Thirty-seven percent of adults report they are not physically active. Only 3 in 10 adults get the recommended amount of physical activity.

• Poor diet and inactivity can lead to overweight/obesity. Persons who are overweight or obese are at increased risk for high blood pressure, type 2 diabetes, coronary heart disease, stroke, gallbladder disease, osteoarthritis, sleep apnea, respiratory problems and some types of cancer.
The major barriers most people face when trying to increase physical activity are time, access to convenient facilities, and safe environments in which to be active.

School and worksite interventions have been shown to be successful in increasing physical activity levels.

One quarter of U.S. children spend 4 hours or more watching television daily.

Encouraging moderate and vigorous physical activity among youth is important. Because children spend most of their time in school, the type and amount of physical activity encouraged in schools is important.

Only 28 percent of students in grades 9 through 12 participated in daily school physical education in 2003, down from 42 percent in 1991.

**Historical Perspective of Fitness Issues and Testing**

In the early 1950’s the performance by children on fitness tests shocked President Eisenhower and caused him to establish the President’s Council on Youth Fitness in 1956. It is now called The President’s Council on Physical Fitness and Sports. The timeline below is from the *historical* link on its website (www.fitness.gov). It describes many of the chronological events that led up to the establishment of the council and the changes that the council has gone through since its inception.

*1953* – The first national fitness study called the Kraus-Weber Test was conducted by Hans Kraus. It was administered to about 4,400 students between ages 6 and 16 in public school systems across the United States and to about 3,000 European students in the same age range in Switzerland, Italy, and Austria. The test results were startling: 56 percent of
the U.S. students failed at least one of the test components, which included activities such as leg lifts, sit-ups, trunk lifts, and toe touches. However, only about 8 percent of the European children failed even one of the test components. No matter what age, gender, or test, Europeans kids held a decisive edge. Kraus attributed the test results to lifestyle. Europeans relied less on automobiles, school buses, and elevators. European children walked miles to school, rode bicycles, hiked, and chopped and hauled wood for home heating. In contrast, American children were largely driven in cars by their parents, confined to their own neighborhoods, and obligated to perform only easy chores such as making their own beds and setting the table, nothing more strenuous than walking the dog or mowing the lawn. An article, “Muscular Fitness and Health” (December 1953), was published in the Journal of the American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation. In the article, coauthors Hans Kraus and Bonnie Prudden sounded an alarm: The affluent lifestyle of 20th century America was making life so easy that American adults and children were rapidly losing muscle tone. This article appeared in the New York State Journal of Medicine and eventually got the attention of President Eisenhower.

1956 - The President’s Conference on the Fitness of American Youth was held in June. The broad range of recommendations generated during the conference included the following:

- The public must be made aware of the problem of establishing and maintaining fitness;
- Fitness must be popularized and promoted among youth;
• Research on fitness is needed to decide what kind and how much;

• Out of school programs should include agencies already working in the field (e.g. Boy and Girl Scouts, YMCA, etc.);

• Funds for any programs and initiatives should come from private industry, foundations, community chests; a greater share of tax revenues should be allocated to community recreation;

• Schools should have more time, equipment, and personnel for physical education and should focus increased attention on children who are not athletically gifted, rather than on “stars;”

• The standards and prestige of the physical education profession must be raised;

• Community recreational facilities should be increased and better use made of existing facilities;

• All children must have periodic medical examinations;

• Better leadership is needed for physical activity at home, in the school, and in the community, and adults should be role models for physical fitness.

• Girls should have equal opportunities for physical fitness.

1956 – The President’s Council on Youth Fitness was established by President Eisenhower. In his letter to the participants of the President’s Conference on the Fitness of American Youth, President Dwight D. Eisenhower expressed that more attention should be given to what he felt was our country’s most precious asset, our youth.
1961 – A nationwide advertising campaign was launched, and President Kennedy “walks the talk” by taking 50 mile walks. State demonstration centers were designed to showcase model elementary and secondary schools. President Kennedy speaks at the Conference on Physical Fitness of Youth.

1963 – President John F. Kennedy changes the name of the council to the President’s Council of Physical Fitness to address all age groups.

1964 – The second national fitness survey was conducted using children 10 to 17 years old to establish norms for youth.

1966 – The President’s Award for Physical Fitness established and awarded to students who scored in the upper 15th percentile which was originally administered by the American Alliance of Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAHPERD).

1968 - President Johnson renamed the Council, The President’s Council on Physical Fitness and Sports.

1971 – The first issue of Physical Fitness Research Digest, a quarterly edited by research consultant, Harrison Clarke was published.

1972 – The Council created a new award, the Presidential Sports Award, to motivate both youth and adults to commit to long-term participation in sports and fitness activities. The Presidential Physical Fitness Awards school program was expanded to allow use by recreation departments and youth groups such as Scouts and Boys and Girls Clubs as well as school physical education programs. Three conferences on fitness in business and industry were conducted by the Council during President Nixon’s administration (1972, 1973, and 1974).
1981 - George Allen, former NFL coach, was named by President Reagan as head of The Council on Physical Fitness and Sports. Under his leadership a number of new programs were established and/or expanded. Some examples include: the Council established regional sports clinics and private-sector employee programs; established programs to inform the general public of the importance of exercise and the link between regular physical activity, good health, and effective performance; conducted public service advertising campaigns (usually two major media campaigns a year); published a Council newsletter; published numerous public information materials in co-sponsorship with private companies and groups; established Governors’ Councils on Physical Fitness, State Demonstration Centers, and State Games; established the State Champion program recognizing schools with the highest percentage of students earning awards; cosponsored medical symposiums for physicians and physical educators, which focused on the role of exercise in disease prevention; and initiated National Physical Fitness and Sports Month, encouraging local communities to increase participation in sports and fitness activities such as fitness fairs, fun walks and runs, media events, and panel discussions. Other initiatives spearheaded by Allen and the other Reagan administration Council members were the National Fitness Foundation; the U.S. Fitness Academy; the National Fitness Classic; the Adult Fitness Card; the National Fitness Testing Week; and Youth Fitness Forums.

1982 – The Council, in cooperation with AAHPERD, introduced a program known as “Fitnessgram,” based on the AAHPERD National Youth Fitness Test. The program was developed by the Institute for Aerobic Research and funded by the Campbell Soup
Company. A pilot study was conducted in Oklahoma during the 1982-83 school year and expanded the following year.

1985 - The National School Population Fitness Survey was conducted, the last survey of its kind by the Council. This resulted in the establishment of a new award, the National Physical Fitness Award, to recognize children who scored between the 50th and 85th percentiles on the Presidential Physical Fitness Test, as well as children who performed at the 85th percentile and above, who continued to receive the Presidential Physical Fitness Award.

Mid 1980’s - The youth fitness test had five components: sit-ups; pull-ups, push-ups, or flexed-arm hang to measure upper body strength; a one-mile walk/run; a V-sit reach; and the shuttle run. In 1986, the Council adopted the name “President’s Challenge Youth Physical Fitness Awards Program” for its youth physical fitness testing.

1988 - The Amateur Athletic Union (AAU), in collaboration with the University of Indiana School of Health, Physical Education, and Recreation (HPER), became the administrator of the President’s Challenge program.

1989 – President George H.W. Bush appointed Arnold Schwarzenegger as his Council chairman. On his own initiative and at his own expense, Schwarzenegger traveled to all 50 states to advocate personally to governors the need for daily, quality physical education in American schools.

Great American Workouts - During Schwarzenegger’s tenure as chairman, National Physical Fitness and Sports Month became a nationally televised celebration, when
President and Mrs. Bush joined Arnold and other celebrity athletes and Hollywood personalities at “Great American Workouts” held on the White House lawn during President Bush’s administration.

1989 - The Council was named lead agency on the physical activity and fitness priority area of the government report, “Healthy People 2000,” published every 10 years by the HHS Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion; the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) served as science advisor.

1993 - President Bill Clinton appointed Florence Griffith Joyner (“Flo Jo”) and Tom McMillen as Council co-chairs. Olympic track and field medalist Griffith Joyner was both the first woman and the first African American to serve in a Council leadership position.

1996 - During the Clinton administration, the President’s Council on Physical Fitness and Sports served as co-lead with the CDC in developing physical activity and fitness objectives for Healthy People 2010. This included the government’s statement of goals and objectives for the next decade. The President’s Council on Physical Fitness and Sports also served as the co-lead in the Surgeon General’s Report “Physical Activity and Health.” The publication in 1996 of the landmark report signaled a major shift in the way physical fitness was viewed and discussed by the general public as well as health and fitness professionals. Now “physical activity” joined “physical fitness” as a recognized essential for good health. Among the findings reported in “Physical Activity and Health” are:
People of all ages, both male and female, benefit from regular physical activity;
Significant health benefits can be obtained by including a moderate amount of physical
activity (e.g. 30 minutes of brisk walking or raking leaves, 15 minutes of running, or 45
minutes of playing volleyball) on most, if not all, days of the week. Through a modest
increase in daily activity, most Americans can improve their health and quality of life.

1997 – The Council published a report, “Physical Activity and Sport in the Lives of
Girls,” under the direction of the Center for Research on Girls and Women in Sport,
University of Minnesota. The report described the status of physical activity and sports
for women and girls in athletics, discussed the impact of Title IX, and recommended
further ways to promote physical activity and sports opportunities for women and girls,
noting that young females were twice as likely to be inactive as young males.

2000 – In January, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) released
the report Healthy People 2010. This report outlined two broad goals: increase the years
and quality of healthy life and eliminate health disparities. This report succeeds 1) the
1979 report Healthy People: The Surgeon General’s Report on Health Promotion and
Disease Prevention and the 1990 health objectives published in Promoting
Health/Preventing Disease: Objectives for the Nation and 2) Healthy People 2000
(Healthy People 2010). President Clinton issued an Executive Memorandum, directing
the secretaries of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and the U.S.
Department of Education to identify strategies to improve the nation’s youth fitness. The
report, “Promoting Better Health for Young People through Physical Activity and
Sports,” was submitted to the president in November 2000.
2001 - In 2001, the Council introduced a new award, the Presidential Active Lifestyle Award (PALA), developed as a response to the key findings of the 1996 Surgeon General’s Report on Physical Activity and Health. In January the Council launched www.fitness.gov, a gateway Web site to the vast government information resources available on physical activity, fitness, and health.

2002 - President G.W. Bush appointed NFL Hall of Fame winner and four-time Super Bowl champion Lynn C. Swann as chairman, and Olympic Softball gold medalist, Dot Richardson, as vice chair. When he introduced his Council, President Bush also launched his Healthier US initiative, based on the premise that anyone can improve health by adopting four basic behaviors:

- Be physically active every day
- Eat a nutritious diet
- Get preventive screenings
- Make healthy choices/avoid risky behaviors

During the Bush administration, the president, HHS secretaries, the Surgeon General, and the Council members stressed a uniform message: prevention is key to overcoming the nation’s health problems. Swann and Richardson testified before several congressional committees about the health benefits of physical activity.

2003 – Council Chairman Lynn Swann announced at the National Press Club that for the first time, the President’s Challenge awards program would be offered to adults as well as youth. Swann announced that the Presidential Active Lifestyle Award (PALA) was now available to adults, including seniors, as well as children and teens. Americans of all
ages could earn a PALA by being active 30 to 60 minutes a day, five days a week for six weeks.

*The FITNESSGRAM*

Assembly Bill 265 was signed into law in October 1995 requiring all California public schools to administer fitness tests to all students in grades five, seven and nine. It reads in part, “During the month of March, April, or May the governing board of each school district maintaining any of grades five, seven, and nine shall administer to each pupil in those grades the physical performance test designated by the State Board of Education” (CDE 2006). The FITNESSGRAM was designated as the required physical performance test by the State Board of Education in February 1996.

The FITNESSGRAM was developed by The Cooper Institute, and endorsed by the American Association for Health, Physical Education, Recreation & Dance, as the national fitness test battery for youth. The Cooper Institute, in Dallas, Texas, was founded on June 22, 1970 by Dr. Kenneth Cooper. According to the Cooper Institute webpage, Dr. Cooper is a physician with the United States Air Force who is credited with coining the term “aerobics” in 1968. Formerly a track star, he believed that it was as important to try to prevent disease as it was to treat and cure disease, so he focused his research in preventative medicine. As a result of his research, public appearances and inspiring books, he started a worldwide fitness movement which saw millions of people exercising. Today Dr. Cooper is recognized as a prominent leader of the international physical fitness movement and credited with motivating more people to exercise in
pursuit of good health. He serves as president and chief executive officer of the Cooper Aerobics Center. He holds a B.S. degree and an M.D. degree from the University of Oklahoma as well as an M.P.H. degree from the Harvard University School of Public Health, and he is certified by the American Board of Preventive Medicine.

The FITNESSGRAM was developed in response to the needs of physical education programs for a comprehensive assessment protocol. It includes a variety of health-related physical fitness tests designed to assess cardiovascular fitness, muscle strength, muscular endurance, flexibility and body composition (Cooper & Pangrazi, 2007). These tests are scored using criterion-referenced standards that are age and gender specific that have been established on how fit children need to be for good health. The ACTIVITYGRAM is an activity assessment tool that provides detailed information on a student’s level of physical activity. Feedback is provided on the amount and type of activity that a child performs. The primary goal of the FITNESSGRAM/ACTIVITYGRAM program is the promotion of lifelong habits of physical activity, and it endorses providing children with the knowledge, attitudes and skills to be active for a lifetime. The program includes a computerized reporting program that allows teachers to produce an individualized report for each student in a class. The program philosophy is the acronym HELP specifying that “health is available to everyone for a lifetime-and it’s personal,” (FITNESSGRAM, 2007).
Description of test

The FITNESSGRAM provides a number of options for most of the fitness areas so that all students, including those with special needs, have the maximum opportunity to participate in the tests. The creators of the FITNESSGRAM have identified their recommended option as well as alternative tests where appropriate. Physical fitness testing consists of three components: 1) aerobic capacity, 2) body composition, and 3) muscular strength, endurance, and flexibility. To ensure thorough measurements of all three components, the FITNESSGRAM is comprised of the following six major fitness areas with multiple performance task options for most areas. The following is a brief description of the six fitness areas of the FITNESSGRAM and the performance task options (CDE PFT Overview Packet and FITNESSGRAM Manual Chapters 5, 6, & 7):

1. Aerobic Capacity - this is perhaps the most important indicator of physical fitness. This test option assesses the capacity of the cardiorespiratory system by measuring endurance.

   PACER (Progressive Aerobic Cardiovascular Endurance Run) Recommended

This is a multi-stage fitness test set to a pace, which provides a valid and fun alternative to the customary distance run. The objective is to run as long as possible back and forth across a 15-meter or 20-meter distance at a specified pace that gets faster each minute. The creators of the FITNESSGRAM recommend it for all ages but strongly recommend it for participants in grades K-3. The PACER is recommended for the following reasons:
• All students are more likely to have a positive experience in performing the PACER.

• The PACER helps students learn the skill of pacing.

• Students who have a poorer performance will finish first and not be subjected to the embarrassment of being the last person to complete the test.

One-Mile Run  *Alternative* - the objective of this test is to walk and/or run a distance of one mile at the fastest pace possible.

Walk Test  *Alternative* - the objective of this test is to walk a distance of one mile as quickly as possible while maintaining a constant walking pace for the entire distance. This test is for students who are 13 years and older. The score is calculated using a formula that combines the walk time (in minutes and seconds) and the heart rate taken at the end of the walk.

2. Trunk Extensor Strength and Flexibility - this test is related to lower back health and vertebral alignment.

Trunk Lift  *Recommended* - the objective of this test is to lift the upper body a maximum of 12 inches off the floor using the muscles of the back and to hold the position long enough to allow for the measurement of the lift distance.

3. Upper Body Strength and Endurance - this test measures the strength and endurance of the upper body. This is important to maintain functional health and to promote good posture. Three options are available to test for upper body strength and endurance. It should be noted that regular pull-ups are not the recommended test for the vast majority of students because many are unable to perform even one pull-up.
Push-Up *Recommended* - the objective of this test is to complete as many push-ups as possible at a specified pace.

Modified Pull-Up *Alternative* - the objective of this test is to successfully complete as many modified pull-ups as possible. A student performs the test by lying on his or her back directly under a bar and grasping the bar to pull up until the chin reaches a specified level.

Flexed-Arm Hang *Alternative* - the objective of this test is to hang by the arms with the chin above a bar as long as possible.

4. **Body Composition** - body composition results provide an estimate of the percent of a student’s weight that is fat in contrast to the “fat-free” body mass that comes from muscles, bones, and organs.

Skinfold Measurements *Recommended* - measurements of the thickness of the skinfold on the back of the upper right arm and the inside of the right calf are taken using a device called a skinfold caliper. A formula is used to calculate the percentage of body fat using these measurements.

Body Mass Index *Alternative* - this test provides an indication of a student’s weight relative to his or her height. Height and weight measures are inserted into a formula to calculate the body mass index.

5. **Abdominal Strength and Endurance** - abdominal strength and endurance are important in promoting good posture and correct pelvic alignment. Strength and endurance of the abdominal muscles are important in maintaining lower back health.
Curl-Up *Recommended* - the objective of this test is to complete as many curl-ups as possible up to a maximum of 75 at a specified pace.

6. Flexibility - this test measures joint flexibility, which is important to functional health.

Back-Saver Sit and Reach *Recommended* - the objective of this task is to assess the flexibility of the lower back and posterior thigh. Using a special box with measurements indicated on top of the box and beginning in a sitting position with one leg extended and the other leg bent, the student extends forward to reach as far as possible on top of the box, to a maximum of 12 inches. After measuring one side, the student switches the position of the legs and reaches again. The distance reached is measured for both sides of the body.

Shoulder Stretch *Alternative* - this is a simple test of upper body flexibility. The student is instructed to touch the fingertips together behind the back by reaching over both the right and left shoulder and under the elbow.

To complete the FITNESSGRAM, students are required to participate in the following:

- One of the options from aerobic capacity
- The trunk lift test
- One of the options from upper body strength and endurance
- One of the options from body composition
- The curl-up test
- One of the options from flexibility
The standards

“The FITNESSGRAM uses criterion-referenced standards to evaluate fitness performance. These standards were established by The Cooper Institute to represent a level of fitness that offers some degree of protection against diseases resulting from sedentary living. Findings from current research, expert opinions, and theoretical perspectives have been used as the basis for establishing the FITNESSGRAM standards. In addition, the FITNESSGRAM standards have been established according to gender and age. Performance levels for each of the FITNESSGRAM tests are classified as (1) ‘in the Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ)’ or (2) ‘needs improvement’” (CDE, Report to the Governor, December 2006).
MULTI-YEAR ANALYSIS OF PHYSICAL FITNESS SCORES

Table 2

2006 Participation in Physical Fitness Test by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th></th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
<th></th>
<th>Grade 9</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>231,666</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>227,679</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>220,391</td>
<td>48.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>241,948</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>237,453</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>230,078</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Gender Information</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cited from: CDE,PFT, Report to the Governor and Legislature, Table 1 pg9, December 2006
Table 3

2004-06 Comparison of Percentages of All Students in the Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ) by Fitness Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Fitness Area</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
<th>Grade 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aerobic Capacity</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Composition</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>67.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdominal Strength</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>80.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trunk Extensor Strength</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Body Strength</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cited from: CDE, PFT, Report to the Governor and Legislature, Table 17 pg 18, December 2006
Table 4

2004-06 Comparison of Percentages of All by Number of Fitness Standards Achieved

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Fitness Standards Achieved</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
<th>Grade 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 of 6</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 of 6</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 of 6</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 of 6</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 of 6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 of 6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 of 6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTES: • Columns may not add up to 100 percent due to rounding.  
Cited from: CDE, PFT, Report to the Governor and Legislature, Table 18 pg 18, December 2006
Table 5

2006 Percentages of Students Achieving the HFZ in All Six Fitness Areas by Grade Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Subgroup</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Grade 9</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number Tested</td>
<td>Number Achieving HFZ for All Six Areas</td>
<td>Percent Achieving HFZ for All Six Areas</td>
<td>Number Tested</td>
<td>Number Achieving HFZ for All Six Areas</td>
<td>Percent Achieving HFZ for All Six Areas</td>
<td>Number Tested</td>
<td>Number Achieving HFZ for All Six Areas</td>
<td>Percent Achieving HFZ for All Six Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Students</td>
<td>473,633</td>
<td>121,314</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>465,159</td>
<td>137,591</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>450,488</td>
<td>123,213</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cited from: CDE, PFT, Report to the Governor and Legislature, Table 9 pg 13, December 2006
Table 6

*Percentage of Humboldt County Students Who are Not in the HFZ*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Physical Fitness Area</th>
<th>Grade 5</th>
<th>Grade 7</th>
<th>Grade 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerobic Capacity</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>36.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Composition</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>28.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abdominal Strength</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trunk Extensor Strength</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Body Strength</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>33.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>40.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>27.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table created by J. Schmidt
Below are listed the average percentages of Humboldt County students who are **NOT** in the Healthy Fitness Zone (HFZ) in Grades 5, 7, & 9 over the three year period, 2004-2006.

- ~32% for Aerobic Capacity.
- ~32% for Body Composition
- ~15% for Abdominal Strength
- ~9% for Trunk Extension
- ~32% for Upper body Strength
- ~31% for Flexibility

Approximately 71% of Humboldt County students did not pass 6 of 6 fitness tests over the past 3 years.

In the Report to the Governor and the Legislature in December 2006, the CDE reports slow progress in students achieving the HFZ in all six areas since the first results were posted in 1999. The historical PFT data shows that the majority of California students tested are not meeting the standards for the fitness areas of the FITNESSGRAM. The report goes on to say that “Both males and females and students from all ethnic or racial backgrounds could benefit from a greater emphasis on all areas of physical fitness, especially aerobic capacity, body composition, upper body strength, and flexibility.”
PHYSICAL EDUCATION TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS AND TRAINING

In 2001 The National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE) conducted a study titled, “Shape of the Nation Report, Status of Physical Education in the USA.” The purpose of the report was to determine the:

1) mandate and availability for physical education programs at each level (elementary, middle and high school) and in each state
2) qualifications of those teaching physical education
3) existence of curricular standards for physical education
4) class size
5) accountability for student achievement

The results show that little progress has been made in providing high quality physical education across the nation. Most states are not living up to the recommendation in reports such as; Goals 2000, the Surgeon General’s Report, Physical Activity and Health and The Centers for Disease Control Prevention Guidelines for School, and Community Programs to Promote Lifelong Physical activity Among Young People to require physical education for all students in kindergarten through 12th grade. This recommendation is also endorsed by American Academy of Pediatrics and the National Education Association. In spite of the growing crisis in childhood obesity, increase of Type II diabetes and sedentary lifestyles, most states have taken little or no action to make changes. All but two states have some kind of mandate for physical education, but most states do not specify the frequency or duration. Across the country the state mandated
requirements for PE in elementary schools varies. While some states meet the NASPE recommendation of 150 minutes per week, many states only have 30 minutes per week mandated. In middle and high schools the range is from 80 minutes per week to 275 minutes per week. NASPE recommends 225 minutes per week. The majority of high school students take PE for only one or two years. Some states require only one year/unit, while some states require two years/units. Illinois and New Jersey are the only states that require 4 years/units of PE for their high school students. Substitutions and/or exemptions such as medical, religious, participation in varsity athletics, ROTC and marching band are allowed in 58% of the states. Only four states require a certified PE teacher provide PE instruction at the elementary levels. In 38 states certified PE specialists are required to teach PE at the middle school level. Certified PE teachers are required to teach PE at the high school level in 47 states.

One change in a positive direction is in the area of curricular standards as 44 states indicate that there are state PE Content Standards, or that these standards are in development. Over 80% of the states with standards based them on NASPE’s National Standards for Physical Education. The teacher student ratio of 1:30 is found in PE classes in nearly 80% of the states which is larger than other subject area classes, but lower than many California classes. California reports the following physical education class sizes: elementary level is 31-40 students, middle school is 20–30 students, with high schools reporting class sizes of 40 or more. More than 20% of the states report no regulations for class size. State approved assessments are used in five states and physical fitness testing is being conducted in seven states, including California.
California appears to be ahead of many states in some areas on the report above including having mandated minutes for PE, requiring fitness testing for students in certain grades, and having Model Content Standards for Physical Education. Unfortunately, it appears that many teachers do not know what the mandated minutes are, have not received training in the appropriate techniques for administering the state-adopted fitness test to receive reliable results, and are not aware that California recently adopted PE content standards. Also, California is one of the states where students can receive a two year exemption from PE.

In my experience, the Physical Fitness Test (PFT) results traditionally have not had an impact on the curriculum offered to students; often times the results are barely looked at. Recently, a law was passed in California, SB 78, which ties a student’s ability to “pass” the FITNESSGRAM in 9th grade with their ability to receive a two year exemption from physical education, but, conversely, a student who does not “pass” would not be eligible for the exemption. Additionally, due to a lack of training, it is probable that the results of the test are unreliable due to inconsistencies in test administration across California. One purpose of the workshop is to provide the necessary training and support to make our results more reflective of actual student ability as the test designers originally planned.
DISCUSSION GROUPS

In addition to a review of the literature, I wanted to gain first-hand knowledge from teachers in Humboldt County. I decided to hold two discussion groups and invited teachers to participate. I was pleased to find that the teachers were willing and eager to participate in the discussion. During each session I explained my goals for the session were to gather information about:

- Teachers’ knowledge about physical fitness testing
- Teacher’s knowledge about ways to improve students’ physical fitness and fitness scores
- Current practices in the delivery of physical education in relation to the Physical Education Model Content Standards

To gather the information above, I asked each group the following questions:

1. Have you previously administered any part of the FITNESSGRAM?
2. Have you ever received *training* in the proper administration of the FITNESSGRAM?
3. Do you have a copy of the FITNESSGRAM Test Administration Manual?
4. When was the last time that you reviewed the Physical Education Content Standards?
5. Do you believe that you are delivering a standards-based program? If not, what areas need to be strengthened?
6. Education Code Section 51210 requires a certain number of minutes of physical education. Do you know the mandated minutes required for the students you teach?

I held the first group in early March, 2007. I invited six elementary teachers to participate in my first discussion group. The group included four 5th and two 4th grade teachers who currently teach in Eureka City Schools.

Have you previously administered any part of the FITNESSGRAM?

1. Of the six participants five had previously administered the FITNESSGRAM and one had not, but was aware of it.

2. Have you ever received *training* in the proper administration of the FITNESSGRAM?

None of the five teachers who had previously administered the FITNESSGRAM could remember ever receiving any formal training related to the testing instrument.

3. Do you have a copy of the FITNESSGRAM Test Administration Manual?

None of the group members have ever seen the FITNESSGRAM Test Administration Manual and were not aware that it existed.

4. When was the last time that you reviewed the Physical Education Content Standards?

None of these teachers were aware that the Model Content Standards for Physical Education were adopted in January 2006 and were available online.

5. Do you believe that you are delivering a standards-based program? If not, what areas need to be strengthened?
Since they were not aware of the Content Standards, they were not sure what specific areas need to be strengthened, but they were all familiar with the Physical Education Framework.

6. Education Code Section 51210 requires a certain number of minutes of physical education. Do you know the mandated minutes required for the students you teach?

One member of this group knew the correct mandated minutes for physical education as listed in the Education Code, but five did not know the correct minutes.

I invited six secondary physical education teachers to participate in my second discussion group. The group included five high school and one middle school teacher.

1. Have you previously administered any part of the FITNESSGRAM?
   All six participants had previously administered the FITNESSGRAM.

2. Have you ever received training in the proper administration of the FITNESSGRAM?
   One of the teachers remembered receiving an abbreviated training on the testing instrument about ten years ago.

3. Do you have a copy of the FITNESSGRAM Test Administration Manual?
   Two group members have a copy of the FITNESSGRAM Test Administration Manual and have used it for the past two years.

4. When was the last time that you reviewed the Physical Education Content Standards?
Four of these teachers were aware that the Model Content Standards for Physical Education were adopted in January 2006 and were available online, but had not received any training in how to implement the standards.

5. Do you believe that you are delivering a standards-based program? If not, what areas need to be strengthened?

The two members who were not aware of the Content Standards were not sure what specific areas need to be strengthened, but the other four members identified a variety of areas that would benefit from needed attention and focus.

6. Education Code Section 51210 requires a certain number of minutes of physical education. Do you know the mandated minutes required for the students you teach?

All but one member of this group knew the correct mandated minutes for physical education for their grade level as listed in the education code, and one member was off by just five minutes per day.

The discussion groups supported my hypothesis that Humboldt County teachers are not properly trained in the proper administration of the FITNESSGRAM. They would benefit from professional development in this area as well as a refresher course in physical education in general, including mandates, content standards, curriculum development and ways to increase students’ fitness scores.
After a review of the literature and gaining valuable information from two different discussion groups, I determined that there was a well recognized regional need to provide additional training in the use of the FITNESSGRAM. An additional need was identified to provide training to elementary teachers as well as secondary teachers in pedagogy and curriculum to improve students’ physical fitness scores and to provide reliable and valid results. To obtain more information, I attended the California Association of Health, Physical Education Recreation and Dance (CAHPERD) Conference in Sacramento in March, 2007. During this conference I attended a session titled “Using the FITNESSGRAM/ACTIVITYGRAM Fitness and Physical Activity Assessment.” This session was presented by Kathy Reid, Applications Development Project Manager at Human Kinetics. At this presentation I learned that Human Kinetics is the publisher of the FITNESSGRAM/ACTIVITYGRAM Test Administration Manual, 4th edition. The manual comes with a DVD that explains and demonstrates all test components. The manual also comes with a CD that includes the cadence for the Pacer, the Curl-up, and the Push-up test components. Finding this manual was a gold mine! In addition to wonderful visuals on the DVD, the manual also included the mission, goals and philosophy of the FITNESSGRAM. This information lays the foundation for the effective use of this instrument with the following features: “personal testing to help students evaluate their level of health-related fitness, institutional testing to allow
teachers to view group data (for curriculum development), ‘personal best’ testing to allow individual students to privately determine performance levels, teaching students about criterion-referenced health standards and what types of activity are needed to reach them, helping students track fitness results over time, documenting that FITNESSGRAM is being administered in schools and that student self-assessments are being tracked over time is appropriate” (Meredith & Welk, 2007).

During the conference I also attended a presentation by Dianne Wilson-Graham, Consultant for the California Department of Education. From her I learned that the Model Content Standards for Physical Education were adopted by the State Board of Education in January 2006, but hadn’t been “rolled out” yet, as had been the past practice when other curricular areas content standards were previously adopted. She indicated that there was a political battle going on within the California Department of Education and even though there was a warehouse full of newly printed copies of these standards, the information about their availability was not being sent out to schools. She did share that these content standards are available for purchase and they can also be downloaded from the CDE website.
After collaborating with my Committee Chair for my Master’s Project, it was decided that I would plan, organize and facilitate a workshop for teachers that would provide the needed training that I identified. The most difficult part of the job turned out to be narrowing the focus of the workshop. The more I learned about health issues such as the drastic rise in childhood obesity, the high failure rates on the fitness tests, the possible unreliability of the fitness test results, and the lack of resources available to provide a quality physical education program, I realized that a one-day workshop could not possibly do justice to all of these topics. Additionally, I identified the need for teachers to receive professional development in the recently adopted Physical Education Model Content Standards and in the area of curriculum to improve students’ fitness scores. I also realized that it would be difficult to provide a relevant and meaningful workshop that included teachers in grades kindergarten through twelve because of their differing needs.

With guidance from Dr. Hopper, the decision was made to gear this workshop to teachers in Northwest California who teach physical education in grades four through twelve with a primary goal of providing training in the proper administration of the FITNESSGRAM components. He recommended two local physical education teachers who he had worked with before, Enrique Esparza and Debbie Prevost, as well as Rock Braithwaite, Associate Professor at Humboldt State University, to serve as workshop presenters. I added to the list the following local high physical education teachers:
Stephanie Jackson, Tahnia Campbell, and Kristie Christiansen. I contacted all these individuals, and they all eagerly agreed to participate as presenters at this workshop.

With the target audience and primary goal identified, the next step was to secure a date and facility for the workshop. I contacted the School Support Division of the Humboldt County Office of Education (HCOE) and discussed my interest in putting on a workshop at their facility. I was referred to Linda Hill, Curriculum Specialist at HCOE. I set up a meeting with Linda to discuss the initial plan for the workshop. During this meeting we discussed the following:

- Potential dates
- Advertising the Workshop, including creation and distribution of a flyer, email announcements, and advertisement on the HCOE website
- Registration procedures
- Facilities
- Technology needs
- Duplication of workshop handouts
- Food
- Costs including fees to participants and the fee charged by HCOE for facility and support
- Reimbursement procedures for the cost of substitutes for the presenters

Upon meeting with Linda I discovered that facility availability was going to determine the extent and size of the workshop as there was not a day left in April, 2007, where both large conference rooms at the HCOE were available as I had hoped. I secured
the largest conference room and a smaller room for break out sessions. With the date secure, I requested that Linda Hill send out an email to all Humboldt and Del Norte County school administrators to alert them to be on the look out for the upcoming physical education FITNESSGRAM workshop. She also agreed to advertise it on the HCOE website. We established the procedures for duplication of workshop handouts which included a deadline for submission to the HCOE duplicating center. We also discussed room set up including number of tables and chairs as well as technology needs. She completed a work order for the room set up and referred me to the duplicating center to set up the technology. I met with the HCOE computer technician one week prior to the event and secured his services for the morning of the event.

I then met with Paulette Gilliam, Department Secretary, HCOE School Support Division, who assisted me in planning the food for the workshop which included a continental breakfast and buffet lunch. She also instructed me in the area of budgeting and reimbursement procedures as well as procedures to pay for the substitute teachers who were hired to cover for the workshop presenters. We established the procedures for participant registration, sign-in, sign-out, name tags, handout packets, and workshop evaluation forms. I met one last time with Linda Hill to go over room set-up.

I set up a series of meetings with the workshop presenters. During these meetings, the conversations were alive and engaging as the presenters displayed their passion about providing a better physical education program for all students. One purpose of these meetings was for the presenters to meet with each other to determine who would be responsible for becoming “experts” on teaching the individual components of the
FITNESSGRAM. As an “expert” the presenters would be responsible for the total
delivery of the instruction, demonstration, and question and answer period about their test
component.

From these meetings the workshop agenda developed. I narrowed the focus of the
workshop to include the following:

• History of physical fitness testing in California
• Multi-year analysis of the fitness results of Humboldt County students
• Review the CDE study comparing fitness scores and STAR scores
• Review of childhood obesity rates
• District wellness policy requirements
• PE Waivers effective 7-1-07
• FITNESSGRAM administration procedures for reliable results
• Panel discussion – question and answer period
• Instruction in pedagogy, lessons, curriculum and motivation techniques to assist
teachers in improving fitness scores of their students
• Collaboration time for grade level articulation
• Favorite fitness games

Prior to the workshop I created a pre- and post-workshop assessment (see
appendices B and C). This assessment included 14 true or false questions about the
proper administration of the FITNESSGRAM. It also included “fill-in” questions and
some demographic information. Additionally, I produced a PowerPoint presentation and
determined which documents would be included in the packet of hand-outs for the
participants. I also made a seating schema with labels designating tables for elementary, middle school and high school level teachers. This would become important throughout the workshop as the opportunities for collaboration and dialogue were built in to the schedule. In addition, I contacted John Klein from Human Kinetics and explained my plan to provide this training. He was very helpful and provided me with free samples of Health and Physical Education textbooks as well as brochures to distribute including FITNESSGRAM/ACTIVITYGRAM handouts. He also directed me to the FITNESSGRAM Reference Guide on the Human Kinetics website and said that I was welcome to use and duplicate any information from the guide for this workshop. I also created the workshop flyer and submitted it to Linda Hill for duplicating and distribution to all appropriate schools in Humboldt, Del Norte and Mendocino Counties. The morning of the workshop I placed chart paper around the room with the following labels: Ideas, Concerns, and Questions and provided Post-Its on all tables. I also procured all materials and supplies needed for the day.

The workshop was opened by Dr. Hopper who introduced me and explained that this workshop was my Project for my Master’s Degree. I welcomed the participants and gave them an overview of the day. I then asked each participant to complete the pre-workshop assessment and instructed them to keep it in their packet. I told them not to write their names on them and explained that these would remain anonymous. I then introduced Dr. Rock Braithwaite.

The history of physical fitness testing in California was presented by Dr. Rock Braithwaite, Assistant Professor at Humboldt State University. He shared that:
• Assembly Bill 265 was passed in October 1995 requiring all California schools to administer the physical performance test designated by the State Board of Education to all students in grades five, seven and nine.

• In February 1996, the state adopted the FITNESSGRAM as the required PFT.

• In 1998, Senate Bill 896 passed requiring report results to go to the Governor and the Legislature.

• In January 2003, the test administration window was widened to include February.

He also provided an overview of the fitness test results for Humboldt County students over the past three years. In addition to an alarming number of students not passing all portions of the test, he also shared concerns about the inaccurate test results due to the fact that the recommended standards for testing administration are not being followed in many cases. He then provided workshop participants with an overview of the CDE studies showing a positive correlation between student PFT scores and their academic STAR (Standardized Testing and Reporting) scores. The studies were completed by the CDE in 2001 and in 2004 and looked at the connection between Academic Achievement in English/language arts and math on the STAR Test and Fitness on the PFT. The results of both of these studies showed that students with higher academic achievement have higher fitness levels. This was a correlational study and did not show cause/effect.

Following Dr. Braithwaite’s presentation, Kiyo Tracy, a school nurse employed with Eureka City Schools, provided the workshop participants with the latest data on childhood obesity rates. She had attended an HCOE sponsored Obesity Workshop the previous week where she was provided with the latest figures and recommendations. She
shared the following chart from the Child Health and Disability Prevention (CHDP) program:

### 2005 CA Overweight Prevalence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Category</th>
<th>At-Risk of Overweight</th>
<th>Overweight</th>
<th>Combined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children 2 &lt; 5 Years</td>
<td>16.3 %</td>
<td>17.4 %</td>
<td>33.7 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children/Adolescents 5 &lt; 20 Years</td>
<td>18.3 %</td>
<td>22.7 %</td>
<td>41 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The data were gathered from over 1.5 million California children who receive CHDP health exams. This information is submitted to the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) annually. She also shared that the recommendation is now to change the term “overweight” to “obese” for children who fit in that category. Up to now, doctors were reluctant to use the term obese due to the potential psychological ramifications. Due to the nationwide epidemic of childhood obesity, the policy is changing to use direct language in the hopes of making parents aware of the serious potential health consequences that their children face.

Stephanie Jackson, Chair of Eureka City Schools Wellness Policy Committee, and I then gave a brief overview of recently passed legislation requiring that all districts in California have adopted Wellness Policies beginning with the 2006-2007 school year. The requirements of the wellness policy were also introduced and discussed with the participants.

We also shared the information about Senate Bill (SB) 78 which becomes law effective July 1, 2007. I received a letter from Jack O’Connell, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, in February 2007 that was sent out to public school administrators.
The letter discusses student exemptions from high school physical education courses and highlights the newly passed Senate Bill. The letter clarifies that all students are required to take two courses in physical education in order to be eligible to graduate from high school, unless the school district grants an exemption. There are three types of exemptions, temporary, two-year, and permanent. Senate Bill 78 states, “The two-year exemption is available to a student if the student “passes” the physical performance test.” The letter goes on to say, “There is no designated “passing” score on the FITNESSGRAM. The statutory change enacted by SB 78 does not define ‘passing.’ The Cooper Institute advises that the FITNESSGRAM should not be used for evaluating individual students in physical education (e.g., grading or state standards testing). The letter continues to say that, “CDE staff are in communication with the Legislature to try to develop policy guidance for districts to ensure that students are involved in physical education courses and develop personal fitness programs and that the physical fitness test is administered and used in its intended manner” (Jack O’Connell, February 2007). Most workshop participants had not heard anything about this or were unsure of the exact wording of the legislation. A copy of the Jack O’Connell letter was included in the workshop handouts. This topic created much discussion and debate among the participants.

Next, instruction in the proper administration of the FITNESSGRAM began. Two presenters were designated to become “experts” for each component of the FITNESSGRAM and agreed to instruct the workshop participants in the recommended administration techniques to obtain reliable results. Each presentation included showing
the DVD for the particular test component, leading a discussion of ways to obtain reliable results even in large classes, and also a live demonstration of the test. Student teachers and workshop participants volunteered to act as the “student” while the expert presenters simulated the proper administration for their test component. Most presenters became “experts” for two or more test components. Each workshop participant was supplied with a workshop packet that included test administration directions with pictures and tips for proper administration that they used to follow along and take notes during each presentation. The FITNESSGRAM administration instruction continued until the lunch break.

After lunch the presenters assembled together in the front of the room for a panel discussion with questions and answers. I reminded the participants that the assembled panel only agreed to become “experts” on their test components on the FITNESSGRAM and that the collective knowledge of teachers in the room would add greatly to this discussion time. Throughout the morning participants had placed Post-Its on the chart papers around the room. These were read out loud and used to begin the discussion which included discourse among the participants as well as the presenters. Some of the posted questions included:

- “What happens when the category changes from overweight to obese?”
- “Can you turn in multiple tests for one area, for example, the PACER and the One-Mile Run, and The Walk Test for 13 year olds?”
- “At a PE conference ten years ago they said no forward arm circles in adolescence because of injury to developing Acromion Process – is that still true?”
• “How do you record the scores if you use a variety of tests, e.g., pull-ups, push-ups, bent arm hang?”
• “Can you recommend resources for our school cook to improve school lunches?”

Some concerns posted included:

• “The lack of fitness focused elements in PE which has been strongly sport education.”
• “Overweight tables; parents need to do a better job.”

The panel discussion was robust and well received by the presenters and participants. After about thirty minutes, the participants were invited to participate in the activity portion of the workshop.

It began with aerobic fitness activities including cardio-salsa and cardio cha-cha, Team Aerobic Bowling, and Noodle Tag. This was followed by a variety of upper body strengthening activities such as demonstrations on Upper Body Activity Mat, and Ball Tap Push-ups. All participants were invited to engage in the activities – most tried at least two different activities. After about thirty minutes, the participants were invited to return to their tables to collaborate with other teachers who teach similar grades. The elementary level teachers focused on a discussion about curriculum and equipment. I shared information that I learned at the CAHPERD Conference about Exemplary Physical Education Curriculum (EPEC). This curriculum was developed in Michigan and is standards based using the National Association of Sports and Physical Education (NASPE) standards. The curriculum includes a box of activity cards that are organized in folders based on skill type. It includes a DVD where a cartoon character demonstrates
each skill on the activity card and is a K–12 program. The middle and high school group was facilitated by the presenters. Their discussion included ways to motivate students to try their best on the fitness tests. At the conclusion of the collaboration time the participants were asked to complete a training evaluation form administered by the HCOE and reminded to sign out.
ASSESSMENT OF WORKSHOP

Forty people attended the workshop either as a participant or presenter. Most participants (34) completed a pre-workshop assessment. This assessment included 15 true or false questions about the proper administration of the FITNESSGRAM. It also included a few “fill-in” questions and some demographic information. The following responses were tallied from the individual pre-workshop assessment:

**Fill-In**

A. Have you previously administered any part of the FITNESSGRAM?
   - No 10  Yes 23

B. Have you ever received *training* in the proper administration of the FITNESSGRAM?
   - Approximate year

C. When was the last time that you reviewed the Physical Education Content Standards?
   - This Year 19  Last Year 7  Don’t Remember 7

D. Are you aware that in 2005 a new set of Physical Education Content Standards were adopted by the California State Board of Education?
   - No 12  Yes 21

E. Education Code Section 51210 requires a certain number of minutes of physical education. Do you know the mandated minutes required for the students you teach?
   - No 16  Yes 15
Demographics

F. What is your current assignment?

Teacher (indicate grade level(s) you teach)

- K-5: 12
- 6-8: 12
- 9-12: 5
- Student Teacher: 7
- Other: 1

G. School setting you work in

- Elementary: 16
- Middle School/Junior High: 9
- High School: 8
- Charter School: 1
- Other

At the conclusion of the workshop, each participant was asked to complete a post-workshop assessment. This assessment was the same assessment given at the beginning of the day, but was in a different color paper. The participants were instructed to paperclip their pre- and post-workshop assessment together. I scored all assessments and determined that the participants improved their knowledge about the FITNESSGRAM significantly by the end of the workshop. Table 7 below shows the number of answers missed by the participants. There were a total of 33 pre-assessments scored.
The top row reflects the number of incorrect answers. The bottom row reflects the number of people who had that number of incorrect answers. In calculating the number of correct answers, it was determined that the mean is 9.24, the median is 9.5, and the mode is 10. The highest score was minus 1 with the lowest score minus 11.

Table 8 below shows the number of answers missed by the participants on the post-assessment. There were a total of 34 pre-assessments scored (one participant came late and did not complete a pre-assessment).

Table 7

*Top Row = number of incorrect answers by participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-0</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-4</th>
<th>-5</th>
<th>-6</th>
<th>-7</th>
<th>-8</th>
<th>-9</th>
<th>-10</th>
<th>-11</th>
<th>-12</th>
<th>-13</th>
<th>-14</th>
<th>-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bottom Row = number of participants with that number of incorrect answers*

Table 8

*Top Row = number of incorrect answers by participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-0</th>
<th>-1</th>
<th>-2</th>
<th>-3</th>
<th>-4</th>
<th>-5</th>
<th>-6</th>
<th>-7</th>
<th>-8</th>
<th>-9</th>
<th>-10</th>
<th>-11</th>
<th>-12</th>
<th>-13</th>
<th>-14</th>
<th>-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bottom Row = number of participants with that number of incorrect answers*
In calculating the number of correct answers, it was determined that the mean is 13.76, the median is 14 and the mode is 13.

The results indicate that the mean increased by 4.52 points, the median increased 4.5 points, and the mode showed a positive change from 10 to 13. It is important to note that 11 participants achieved a perfect score on their post-assessment. Also noteworthy is that question #7 received the greatest number of incorrect responses. Twelve participants answered true when it is actually false (see Appendix C). Question #13 received the second greatest number of incorrect responses with 10 participants answering true when it is false.

The workshop evaluation form provided by HCOE included four Likert Scale questions with a scale of 1-10 where 10=highest and 1=lowest. It also included five open ended questions. Below is a compilation of the 27 evaluation forms that were completed. A tally sheet showing all scores as well as all comments on the open ended questions is included.

1. Average Score 8.3
   Quality of information presented today.
   (10=relevant and new, 1=I already knew all this, and/or it was not relevant)

2. Average Score 9.4
   Presenters’ knowledge, experience and presentation techniques.
   (10=very effective, 1=not effective)

3. Average Score 9.2
   Application of ideas and practices to my classroom.
   (10=very applicable, 1=not applicable)

4. Average Score 9.6
   I would recommend this training to a colleague.
   (10=enthusiastically recommend, 1=would not recommend)
Humboldt County Office of Education – School Support Department

Training Evaluation - Tally Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Question 1</th>
<th>Question 2</th>
<th>Question 3</th>
<th>Question 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 and below</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- What aspect(s) of the training could have been dealt with at greater length?
  - Would like more ideas on several equipment items that could be used for many activities
  - Just about everything. Not enough time for so much info.
  - More info about integrating these ideas into self-contained (non – PE teacher) classes.
  - The time went so fast
  - I would have liked to see a few more activities
  - Obese vs. Overweight, B.M.I.
  - For people with no prior training in basic skills, more training
  - More activities to use to improve different components tested on Fitnessgram (e.g. upperbody strength).
  - Ed Code testing requirements
  - Nutrition
  - Would like more hands-on “doing” activities
  - I only attended the second half of this workshop so my comments will be limited. I enjoyed the cha cha/salsa warm-up demonstration. I also will use the bowling activity and the foam wand activities. I would benefit from a training further info on activities that teach specific skills.
  - Examples of activities
  - Curriculum development (2)
  - I thought the training had great balance
  - Specific games, techniques for working out and stretching
• What changes to the training, if any, would you recommend?

  ❖ Would like more ideas on several equipment items that could be used for many activities.
  ❖ Have FITNESSGRAM “score sheets” available.
  ❖ Possibly 2 days – Day 1. Background Info, same stuff as today
    Day 2. Activities
  ❖ Hit on nutrition aspect harder
  ❖ More activity examples
  ❖ More hands on training. Have everyone get tested and do the tests.
  ❖ Maybe a review course
  ❖ Give some topic ideas for groups to discuss during closing discussion.
  ❖ In order to do the test with students, we should all perform these for practice
  ❖ Show and explore advanced levels
  ❖ 2 days, or 1 longer to allow more opportunity to try out activities (make brain connection for me!)
  ❖ FITNESSGRAM Score Sheet for viewing
  ❖ We should have done more kinesthetic activities – so they would stay in our long term memory
  ❖ More ideas and examples of activities to use in classroom
  ❖ Less talk about boring details of how to report FITNESSGRAM
  ❖ Maybe a little more into modifications for special needs

• Would you like further training from these presenters; if so, what specific topics would you like covered?

  ❖ Yes! What are the most critical skills to teach
  ❖ I think it would be great to meet and get curriculum ideas from all the different presenters.
  ❖ Specific activities to increase fitness levels
  ❖ New progressive PE ideas – pedagogies. Presenters were very knowledgeable.
  ❖ Flexibility activities
  ❖ Yes, these presenters are very good and I would love to have them present on assessment methods.
  ❖ The presenters were good
  ❖ More from Enrique – like 6 hours of PE class
  ❖ Yes – maybe more info on curriculum discussed
  ❖ Sequential skill development through games
  ❖ Student motivation
• Would you like further training on this same general topic; if so, what additional support would you like?

  ❖ Yes! More activity ideas.
  ❖ Phys Ed in general.
  ❖ More specific activity ideas for large groups
  ❖ More ideas or time for ways to get students motivated
  ❖ Interested in EPEC (a PE curriculum)
  ❖ Training on how to run physical fitness testing
  ❖ I would have liked some handouts on some of the activities we did today (e.g. noodle presentation)
  ❖ Only if it covered higher caliber concepts
  ❖ Sure, any support is great
  ❖ Yes, Prep for F-Gram

• Commendations to presenters or other comments/concerns

  ❖ Enrique Esparza very good.
  ❖ I felt it was good that many topics were covered quickly and efficiently. Knowledgeable panel – good activities. Great to get us PE folk together and share info.
  ❖ Great Day – Thank You!
  ❖ Thanks for all the work and information – lots of good ideas
  ❖ Presenters were energetic!
  ❖ I plan to implement the ideas covered today. This workshop was excellent – I really like the way it was organized – the many presenter approach – the activities and the opportunity for questions and sharing
  ❖ We got a lot of good info!
  ❖ Great Job! I will make some changes in my testing right away!
  ❖ For a long day it moved quickly. Love the activity after lunch! Great! 😊
  ❖ I thought it was very informing, very well done, educational and fun. Great Job!
  ❖ Very good presentation, relevant information
  ❖ This was well done and seems like it was much needed
  ❖ Be aware of your own image and fitness levels so kids have a positive role model.
  ❖ Wonderfully done! Thanks. 😊
  ❖ *The websites are a useful reference source, * a good blend of activity, technology, handouts and discussion
  ❖ Thanks! Questions on the board great.
  ❖ Very fun and helpful – Thanks
  ❖ Well done! Enjoyed learning the simple, yet fun and challenging games.
  ❖ Well organized, great use of resources
  ❖ Great Job!
  ❖ Good presentations, helpful tips for P.F. Testing
  ❖ Nice job by all presenters
After reviewing and analyzing the pre and post-workshop assessments and the HCOE training evaluation form I concluded that the workshop was worthwhile. The participants showed marked increases in their knowledge on the FITNESSGRAM test components. Additionally, the participants reported very positive responses to the workshop overall. Considering that the workshop included general classroom teachers without specialty PE credentials and certified middle and high school teachers, the responses were very favorable. The lowest score on the evaluation form was found on Question #1, Quality of Information, where the average score was 8.3. Questions #2, 3 and 4 received average scores above 9 on the 10 point scale.
FUTURE RECOMMENDATIONS

Many participants expressed gratitude that a professional development workshop on physical education was provided. In addition to the written comments, lots of verbal comments were made during the workshop and in subsequent conversations with participants that workshops that focus on PE should occur on a regular basis, at least annually. I would utilize the comments from the participants to improve future workshops. For example, some participants felt there was too much information for a one-day workshop, so I would recommend limiting the content or expanding the workshop to a two-day event. A number of people requested more hands-on activities so I would have each participant take each test component, rather than just watch a volunteer go through the battery of tests. Also, I would include more activities that target specific components of fitness, such as upper body strength or flexibility. Finally, I would have hand-outs available for all games and/or activities taught.

The presenters all reported to me that they enjoyed their role in this workshop and would be interested in being involved in subsequent workshops. Future workshops might include the California State Standards Workshop, Sports Play and Active Recreation for Kids (SPARK), Skillastics, and the Coordinated Approach to Child Health (CATCH) program. Continuing to generate interest and enthusiasm in the need for workshops such as these is important to help Humboldt County students improve their fitness scores.

In addition to supporting future professional development opportunities for teachers responsible for teaching physical education and administering the state-
mandated PFT, I believe it is critical to share information found in this document with school administrators, school board members, parents, students, and community members. Making sure that these groups are aware of:

- the increasing rates of childhood obesity and subsequent health risks
- the results of the State-mandated PFT that show that the overwhelming majority of students are not in the healthy fitness zone in all six areas
- that many teachers administering The FITNESSGRAM, a standardized test, have not received training in the proper administration of this testing instrument
- the results of the Shape of the Nation Report that show little progress has been made in providing high quality physical education across the nation
- that California adopted Model Content Standards in Physical Education, but many teachers are still not aware of that fact
- the studies that show that most elementary school students are not receiving the number of minutes in physical education that are mandated in the Education Code
- the legislative change that now requires a “passing” score on the FITNESSGRAM for a high school student to be eligible for an exemption from the two-year requirement of PE that they need in order to be eligible for graduation, and that there is no designated “passing” score on the FITNESSGRAM

is a critical step in attaining NASPE’s goal of obtaining quality physical education for all students in kindergarten through grade twelve. Teachers can share this information with their colleagues and with parents during parent/teacher conferences. Administrators can share this information with school board members as an information item on school
board agendas. They can share it with parents by including it in newsletters, bulletins, and handbooks. Additionally, parents and the media can be educated during school sponsored family fitness activities.

The status quo is unacceptable - it is time for a change! Our children deserve a high quality research-based physical education program so they will have the skills and knowledge they need to make healthy life choices. To achieve this important goal, teachers, administrators, parents, and legislators need to commit the attention, energy, and resources necessary!
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DO YOU CARE ABOUT CHILDHOOD OBESITY? DO YOU WANT TO LEARN HOW TO INCREASE YOUR STUDENTS’ ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT THROUGH PHYSICAL ACTIVITY?

Then…

This Workshop is For YOU!

FITNESSGRAM Workshop

When: Monday, April 23, 2007
Time: 8:15 a.m. – 2:30 p.m.
Where: Humboldt County Office of Education, Sequoia A & B
Cost: $35.00 (includes continental breakfast and lunch)

To Register: HCOE online at www.humboldt.k12.ca.us/pdo or By 24-hour phone registration at 445-7083

Who: All teachers responsible for physical education in grades four through twelve

What: This workshop will support teachers administering the State mandate FITNESSGRAM to students in grades five, seven and nine. Additionally, teachers will learn about ways they can help to improve their students’ physical fitness and why it’s important to do so.

➢ Multi-year analysis of the fitness results of Humboldt County students.
➢ Current issues surrounding components of the test will be presented and discussed (such as BMI) as well as training to obtain reliable results.
➢ Instruction in pedagogy, lessons, curriculum and motivation techniques to assist teachers in improving fitness scores of their students.
➢ Collaborate with other teachers who teach in similar grades and/or settings, such as elementary school, secondary schools, and K-8 schools.
➢ Review the CDE study comparing Fitness Scores and CST Scores.

Facilitator: Jan Schmidt, Principal, Alice Birney Elementary School
Presenters: Stephanie Jackson, Physical Education Teacher, Eureka High School
Kristie Christiansen, Physical Education Teacher, Eureka High School
Tahnia Campbell, Physical Education Teacher, Arcata High School
Enrique Esparza, Physical Education Teacher, McKinleyville Middle School
Rock Braithwaite, Associate Professor in Kinesiology, HSU
Chris Hopper, Interim Dean of Research & Graduate Studies, HSU

Dress: Relaxed clothing that allows you to move freely

Be prepared to have fun!
APPENDIX B

FITNESSGRAM
PRE-WORKSHOP ASSESSMENT
TRUE OR FALSE (Please circle your answer)

T    F  1. The One-Mile Run is the recommended test for aerobic capacity.
T    F  2. During the Back-Saver Sit and Reach, students fully extend both legs with the feet flat against the box.
T    F  3. The Walk Test is an alternative aerobic capacity test, but it is limited to students ages 13 and older.
T    F  4. The Curl-Up requires a 3 inch wide measuring strip for all students.
T    F  5. The Pull-Up is the recommended test for Upper Body Strength and Endurance.
T    F  6. The Back-Saver Sit and Reach measures predominantly the flexibility of the hamstring muscles.
T    F  7. During the Trunk Lift, students should be encouraged to lift their torso off the floor as high as possible in a very slow and controlled manner.
T    F  8. The Pacer is only available to students in grades 5 and 7.
T    F  9. During the Modified Pull-Up, students are to stop when the first form correction is made.
T    F 10. The flexibility component tests, Shoulder Stretch and Back-Saver Sit and Reach, are *optional* tests within the FITNESSGRAM.
T    F 11. During the Pacer, the student is eliminated the first time he or she fails to reach the line by the beep.
T    F 12. Grading students on their FITNESSGRAM scores is an Inappropriate Use of the FITNESSGRAM.
T    F 13. The Body Mass Index is the recommended test for Body Composition.
T    F 14. During the Mile-Run, walking is not permitted.
A. Have you previously administered any part of the FITNESSGRAM?

☐ No  ☐ Yes

B. Have you ever received *training* in the proper administration of the FITNESSGRAM?

No  ☐ Yes  ☐ If Yes, when? _____________________

Approximate year

C. When was the last time that you reviewed the Physical Education Content Standards?

☐ This Year  ☐ Last Year  ☐ Don’t Remember

D. Are you aware that in 2005 a new set of Physical Education Content Standards were adopted by the California State Board of Education?

No  ☐ Yes  ☐ If Yes, do you have a copy? ____________

E. Education Code Section 51210 requires a certain number of minutes of physical education. Do you know the mandated minutes required for the students you teach?

☐ No  ☐ Yes  ☐ If Yes, complete the following:

Ed Code requires ___________ minutes of PE every ________________ day(s).

F. What is your current assignment?

☐ Teacher  ☐ K-5  ☐ 6-8  ☐ 9-12

☐ Student Teacher

☐ Other _______________________

G. School setting you work in

☐ Elementary (list grades in school) ______ through ______

☐ Middle School/Junior High

☐ High School

☐ Charter School (list grades in school)

☐ Other___________________________
TRUE OR FALSE (Please circle your answer)

T  F  1. The One-Mile Run is the recommended test for aerobic capacity.

T  F  2. During the Back-Saver Sit and Reach, students fully extend both legs with the feet flat against the box.

T  F  3. The Walk Test is an alternative aerobic capacity test, but it is limited to students ages 13 and older.

T  F  4. The Curl-Up requires a 3 inch wide measuring strip for all students.

T  F  5. The Pull-Up is the recommended test for Upper Body Strength and Endurance.

T  F  6. The Back-Saver Sit and Reach measures predominantly the flexibility of the hamstring muscles.

T  F  7. During the Trunk Lift, students should be encouraged to lift their torso off the floor as high as possible in a very slow and controlled manner.

T  F  8. The Pacer is only available to students in grades 5 and 7.

T  F  9. During the Modified Pull-Up, students are to stop when the first form correction is made.

T  F  10. The flexibility component tests, Shoulder Stretch and Back-Saver Sit and Reach, are optional tests within the FITNESSGRAM.

T  F  11. During the Pacer, the student is eliminated the first time he or she fails to reach the line by the beep.

T  F  12. Grading students on their FITNESSGRAM scores is an Inappropriate Use of the FITNESSGRAM.

T  F  13. The Body Mass Index is the recommended test for Body Composition.
14. During the Mile-Run, walking is not permitted.

A. Education Code Section 51210 requires a certain number of minutes of physical education. Do you know the mandated minutes required for the students you teach?

☐ No ☐ Yes If Yes, complete the following:

Ed Code requires __________ minutes of PE every ______________ day(s).