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LAUSD is a large, diverse district
- 885 schools serving over 670,000 students
- 91% of students are children of color
- 68% receive FRPM
Obesity rates above the national average
- 75% of students failed to pass all 6 Fitnessgram tests in 2008/2009
Map of LAUSD

District covers 710 sq. miles
Campaign & Adoption of PE Policy

- PE policy to enforce PE requirements & civil rights laws
- Board of Ed adopted PE resolution
- Teachers, attorneys & school officials devised PE implementation plan
- Campaign relied on evidence based research on PE & health disparities
- UTLA organized public support campaign
- Attorneys filed complaints under civil rights and education laws
Requires District to:

- Enforce PE minutes requirements under state law
- Require PE curriculum to cover certain content areas & provide gender neutral PE electives
- Limit PE class sizes
- Require all students 1st-12th grade to take PE with certain exemptions
- Remedy PE teacher vacancies & lack of competency
- Provide quality facilities for PE
- Ensure student & school participation in Physical Performance Test (FitnessGRAM)
Case Study of Campaign & Adoption of PE Policy

• 18 Stakeholder Interviews
  – Principals, teachers & parents
  – LAUSD school board members
  – Former superintendent of LAUSD
  – PA Advisor to LAUSD
  – Representatives from community organizations involved in advocacy campaign

• Semi-structured interviews
  – Investigated advocacy campaign process, challenges, successes & outcomes
Observational assessments of PE classes & interviews with teachers/administrators

Sample of 35 LAUSD schools from highest and lowest quintiles of FRPM eligibility
(mean of 91.6% vs. 45.5%)

Comparison to 12 matched schools in nearby districts
  - El Monte, Mountain View, ABC, Compton, Pasadena & Pomona
“System for Observing Fitness Instruction Time” (SOFIT) originally developed by Dr. Thomas McKenzie at SDSU

Our adaptation adheres to basic protocol, noting PA levels at 10 second intervals, rotating between 4 representative students.

Physical activity levels (1-4 vs. 1-5 in original version)
- **PA level 1** = lying down/sitting
- **PA level 2** = standing
- **PA level 3** = walking
- **PA level 4** = running

PA levels 3 and 4 = moderate to vigorous physical activity (MVPA)
**EVALUATION METHODS:**

**School Staff Interviews**

- Conducted on-site with PE teacher or administrator familiar with PE
- Examined:
  - PE curriculum used
  - Frequency of classes
  - Exemptions from PE class
  - Teacher credentials
  - Awareness of the PE policy (in LAUSD only)
Results
Campaign Successes

- Community organizing
- Development of awareness & leadership
- Usage of evidence-based social science research
- Usage of administrative complaints
- Strong support from district superintendent & PA advisor to the district
PE Campaign/Policy Outcomes

“The actual act of passing the PE policy indicated to principals that PE was truly a priority in the district. We weren’t really aware of it before.”

• Enforcing the implementation plan has been difficult due to budget cuts resulting from the economic downturn
## Instructional Time in PE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Socioeconomic Status</th>
<th>Baseline Mean (std. dev)</th>
<th>Follow-Up Mean (std. dev)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elem</strong></td>
<td>Low SES (5th quintile FRPL)</td>
<td>31.6 (15.0)</td>
<td>35.7 (14.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High SES (1st quintile FRPL)</td>
<td>25.8 (4.5)</td>
<td>37.4 (13.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle</strong></td>
<td>Low SES (5th quintile FRPL)</td>
<td>40.2 (9.3)</td>
<td>47.3 (18.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High SES (1st quintile FRPL)</td>
<td>37.3 (6.4)</td>
<td>38.8 (20.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td>Low SES (5th quintile FRPL)</td>
<td>43.5 (14.1)</td>
<td>46.4 (18.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High SES (1st quintile FRPL)</td>
<td>39.4 (9.3)</td>
<td>45.6 (15.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# PE Class Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Classes &gt; 55 students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elem</td>
<td>Low SES (5th quintile FRPL)</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>16% 8/51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High SES (1st quintile FRPL)</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>9% 2/22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>Low SES (5th quintile FRPL)</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>5% 2/40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High SES (1st quintile FRPL)</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>26% 12/46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low SES (5th quintile FRPL)</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>5% 1/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High SES (1st quintile FRPL)</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>20% 4/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### % of PE Time Spent in MVPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Baseline</th>
<th>Follow-Up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(std. dev)</td>
<td>(std. dev)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elem</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5\textsuperscript{th} quintile FRPL)</td>
<td>(20.7)</td>
<td>(18.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SES</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1\textsuperscript{st} quintile FRPL)</td>
<td>(12.5)</td>
<td>(3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Middle</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5\textsuperscript{th} quintile FRPL)</td>
<td>(8.2)</td>
<td>(11.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SES</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>45.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1\textsuperscript{st} quintile FRPL)</td>
<td>(13.5)</td>
<td>(14.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low SES</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>59.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5\textsuperscript{th} quintile FRPL)</td>
<td>(13.9)</td>
<td>(91.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High SES</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1\textsuperscript{st} quintile FRPL)</td>
<td>(14.8)</td>
<td>(11.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

- Bureaucratic inertia and/or countervailing forces (e.g. budget cuts) seem to have limited the translation of policy into classroom level changes.
- At the secondary level a robust minority of classes continue to be very large.
- At the primary level classes are smaller but less time is spent in MVPA.
FURTHER ANALYSIS

- Triangulations with FitnessGRAM results
- Multivariate analysis to examine determinants of high levels of MVPA
- Comparison with controls (may be problematic due to difficulty recruiting control sites, esp. at low income schools)
- Need creative methods to verify frequency of PE
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