



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

OMB No. 1894-0003  
Exp. 06/30/2017

PR/Award # S215F130147

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

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

GPR Measure #1

| 1 Performance Measure  | Measure Type    | Quantitative Data |              |       |   |                         |       |   |
|--|-----------------|-------------------|--------------|-------|---|-------------------------|-------|---|
|  |                 | GPR               | Target       |       |   | Actual Performance Data |       |   |
|  |                 |                   | Raw Number   | Ratio | % | Raw Number              | Ratio | % |
| <b>The percentage of students served by the grant who engage in 60 minutes of daily physical activity measured by using pedometers for students in grades K-12 and an additional 3-Day Physical Activity Recall (3DPAR) instrument to collect data on students in grades 5-12.</b> | <b>BASELINE</b> |                   | 4,832 /6,041 | 80%   |   | 1,081/5,438             | 20%   |   |
|  | <b>YEAR 1</b>   |                   | 4,832 /6,041 | 80%   |   | 1,427/4,163             | 34%   |   |
|  | <b>YEAR 2</b>   |                   | 4,832 /6,041 | 80%   |   | 2,244/4,668             | 48%   |   |
|  | <b>YEAR 3</b>   |                   | 4,832 /6,041 | 80%   |   | 2,661/5,004             | 53%   |   |
|  |                 |                   |              |       |   |                         |       |   |

- The districts were given the option of collecting the data for the GPR measures during any full school week of September 2016 for the first collection period. For the second collection period, they each designated a full week in April.
- The data in this table represent the full three years of the grant. For the last year (2016-2017) data was collected as before, during one week in the fall of '16 and 1 week in the spring of '17. The numbers of student participating has not risen to those of the first year, but the overall enrollment in the consortium is down by 440 students. The number participating represents 83% of the total number of students and those measured represents a 40% increase from the first year of the grant. Although the goal of an 80% achievement rate was not reached, significant growth was seen. On average, fully one third more of the students were meeting this goal by the end of the grant that when the Baseline data was taken.
- The method of data collection varied depending on the grade level of the students, but has remained consistent year to year.
  - √ Pedometers were issued to all students for the data collection periods.
  - √ Students in grades K – 4 used exit tickets (Tickets out of class) at the end of the day to record pedometer steps. These were turned into their teachers who used the teacher data collection spreadsheet to record the data. For younger students who were not able to reliably record their data, the teacher completed the exit ticket for them. This data was then sent to the grant director at the close of each data collection window via an electronic spreadsheet where possible. When not possible, the data was submitted via mail.
  - √ Students in grades 5 – 8 used the student record sheets to record information throughout the week. At the close of the data collection window the students used an on-line survey to submit their data directly to the grant director. Again, when electronic collection was not possible, the student data sheets were mailed to the grant director for collation.

**Raw Data GPRA #1**

| FALL '16         |                |              |                |              | SPRING '17       |                |              |                |              |
|------------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|------------------|----------------|--------------|----------------|--------------|
|                  | K-5            |              | 6-8            |              |                  | K-5            |              | 6-8            |              |
|                  | Achieved       | Participated | Achieved       | Participated |                  | Achieved       | Participated | Achieved       | Participated |
| Andes Central    | 24             | 134          | 45             | 64           | Andes Central    | 18             | 132          | 40             | 60           |
| Armour           | 25             | 71           | 30             | 37           | Armour           | 44             | 71           | 38             | 45           |
| Chamberlain      | 107            | 340          | 148            | 182          | Chamberlain      | 72             | 217          | 135            | 141          |
| Colome           | 60             | 85           | 43             | 51           | Colome           | 26             | 83           | 43             | 56           |
| Corsica/Stickney | 35             | 115          | 51             | 65           | Corsica/Stickney | 63             | 114          | 54             | 56           |
| Ethan            | 60             | 112          | 49             | 61           | Ethan            | 70             | 108          | 52             | 60           |
| Gregory          | 38             | 130          | 39             | 44           | Gregory          | 37             | 76           | 44             | 60           |
| Kimball          | 35             | 115          | 43             | 51           | Kimball          | 32             | 113          | 40             | 53           |
| Mitchell         | 487            | 1,240        | 387            | 546          | Mitchell         | 516            | 1,277        | 392            | 522          |
| Parkston         | 103            | 193          | 69             | 89           | Parkston         | 91             | 159          | 75             | 101          |
| Plankinton       | 39             | 112          | 35             | 43           | Plankinton       | 7              | 103          | 31             | 41           |
| Platte Geddes    | 46             | 198          | 77             | 89           | Platte Geddes    | 85             | 207          | 71             | 85           |
| Sanborn Central  | 33             | 71           | 31             | 40           | Sanborn Central  | 53             | 89           | 29             | 38           |
| Wagner           | 73             | 357          | 138            | 178          | Wagner           | 136            | 405          | 123            | 163          |
| Wessington Sprs. | 40             | 139          | 14             | 20           | Wessington Sprs. | 73             | 133          | 17             | 18           |
| White Lake       | 9              | 50           | 19             | 23           | White Lake       | 11             | 40           | 21             | 22           |
| Woonsocket       | 47             | 90           | 41             | 43           | Woonsocket       | 86             | 110          | 36             | 46           |
| <b>TOTAL</b>     | 1,261<br>(36%) | 3,552        | 1,259<br>(77%) | 1,626        | <b>TOTAL</b>     | 1,420<br>(41%) | 3,437        | 1,241<br>(79%) | 1,567        |



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

OMB No. 1894-0003  
Exp. 06/30/2017

PR/Award # S215F130147

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

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

GPR Measure #2

| 2. Performance Measure  | Measure Type    | Quantitative Data |       |   |                         |                      |            |
|---|-----------------|-------------------|-------|---|-------------------------|----------------------|------------|
|   |                 | Target            |       |   | Actual Performance Data |                      |            |
| The percentage of students served by the grant who meet the standard of a healthy fitness zone as established by the assessment for the Presidential Youth Fitness Program (PYFP) in at least five of the six fitness areas of that assessment. | <b>GPR</b>      | Raw Number        | Ratio | % | Raw Number              | Ratio                | %          |
|   | <b>BASELINE</b> |                   | /     |   |                         | <b>612 / 5,591</b>   | <b>11%</b> |
|   | <b>YEAR 1</b>   |                   | /     |   |                         | <b>1,409 / 5,102</b> | <b>28%</b> |
|   | <b>YEAR 2</b>   |                   | /     |   |                         | <b>1,857 / 4,025</b> | <b>45%</b> |
|   | <b>YEAR 3</b>   |                   | /     |   |                         | <b>2,151 / 4,661</b> | <b>46%</b> |

- This GPRA measure shows a growth percentage that is similar to GPRA measure #1. Almost one in five of the students within the consortium are now within the healthy zone when assessed by the President Youth Fitness Program. When the baseline data was collected, barely 1 in 10 students was able to meet that mark. The consortium feels that the increased rigor of the physical education programs, the heightened focused on personalized programming an the increased amount of time engaging in vigorous exercise all help contribute to this growth. Into the future each district anticipates a greater number of student reaching this benchmark, as the new programming becomes part of the educational culture.
- Data for this measure was collected during one week during September of 2106 and one week during April of 2017. Students were evaluated using the measures prescribed by the Presidential Youth Fitness Program (PYFP). All data was then submitted by the

**Raw Data GPRA #2**

| FALL '16         |                |             | SPRING '17       |                |             |
|------------------|----------------|-------------|------------------|----------------|-------------|
|                  | K-8            |             |                  | K-8            |             |
|                  | Achieved       | Participate |                  | Achieved       | Participate |
| Andes Central    | 116            | 193         | Andes Central    | 122            | 190         |
| Armour           | 33             | 104         | Armour           | 46             | 106         |
| Chamberlain      | 45             | 324         | Chamberlain      | 147            | 447         |
| Colome           | 41             | 113         | Colome           | 51             | 107         |
| Corsica/Stickney | 33             | 129         | Corsica/Stickney | 28             | 130         |
| Ethan            | 80             | 170         | Ethan            | 137            | 168         |
| Gregory          | 143            | 215         | Gregory          | 153            | 231         |
| Kimball          | 55             | 146         | Kimball          | 58             | 162         |
| Mitchell         | 509            | 1,571       | Mitchell         | 672            | 1,519       |
| Parkston         | 21             | 41          | Parkston         | 62             | 235         |
| Plankinton       | 134            | 188         | Plankinton       | 149            | 186         |
| Platte Geddes    | 63             | 296         | Platte Geddes    | 49             | 237         |
| Sanborn Central  | 28             | 109         | Sanborn Central  | 31             | 108         |
| Wagner           | 117            | 463         | Wagner           | 291            | 475         |
| Wessington Sprs. | 38             | 152         | Wessington Sprs. | 58             | 151         |
| White Lake       | 12             | 60          | White Lake       | 16             | 61          |
| Woonsocket       | 63             | 151         | Woonsocket       | 81             | 148         |
| Total            | 1,531<br>(35%) | 4,425       | Total            | 2,151<br>(46%) | 4,661       |



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

OMB No. 1894-0003  
Exp. 06/30/2017

PR/Award # S215F130147

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

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

GPRM Measure #3

| 3. Performance Measure  | Measure Type | Quantitative Data |               |     |                         |             |      |
|---|--------------|-------------------|---------------|-----|-------------------------|-------------|------|
|   |              | Target            |               |     | Actual Performance Data |             |      |
| The percentage of students served by the grant who consume fruit two or more times per day and vegetables three or more times per day as measured in programs serving high school students using the nutrition-related questions from the Youth Risk Behavior Survey and in programs serving elementary and middle school students using an appropriate assessment tool for their populations | GPRM         | Raw Number        | Ratio         | %   | Raw Number              | Ratio       | %    |
|   | BASELINE     |                   | 4,530 / 6,041 | 75% |                         | 309 / 5,438 | 5.6% |
|   | YEAR 1       |                   | 4,530 / 6,041 | 75% |                         | 274 / 4,163 | 7%   |
|   | YEAR 2       |                   | 4,530 / 6,041 | 75% |                         | 564 / 4,668 | 12%  |
|   | YEAR 3       |                   | 4,530 / 6,041 | 75% |                         | 583 / 5,004 | 12%  |

- The information, beginning the baseline data that was taken for GPRM performance measure 3, through the three years of the grant do not paint the picture that was one of the goals of this program. This illustrates the biggest frustration of the districts in trying to demonstrate success. Twelve percent does not do justice to the number of students who showed growth in making healthier nutritional choices. Districts have provided feedback that the ‘all or nothing’ aspect of this particular measure did not reflect what they were seeing in changing student behavior.
- The Executive Summary details what was accomplished and what the districts plan to do as they sustain growth in this area.
- Data was collected in the same manner as in Years One and Two. Districts were asked to select one full school week in September and in April for the collection window:
  - √ Students in grades K – 4 filled in the same exit tickets that were used for their pedometer data to record daily fruit and vegetable consumption. Teachers used the same spreadsheet to record and submit this data at the end of the collection window. Younger students gave their information daily to their teachers who filled out the data for them.
  - √ Similarly, students in grades 5 – 8 used the same record sheet on which they recorded pedometer data to record diet and nutrition information. This information was also submitted using the on-line survey process.

**Raw Data GRPA #3**

|                  | FALL '16     |              |              |              | SPRING '17       |              |              |              |              |
|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|                  | K-5          |              | 6-8          |              |                  | K-5          |              | 6-8          |              |
|                  | Achieved     | Participated | Achieved     | Participated |                  | Achieved     | Participated | Achieved     | Participated |
| Andes Central    | 15           | 134          | 5            | 64           | Andes Central    | 15           | 132          | 7            | 40           |
| Armour           | 6            | 71           | 4            | 37           | Armour           | 6            | 71           | 4            | 45           |
| Chamberlain      | 8            | 340          | 2            | 182          | Chamberlain      | 22           | 217          | 10           | 141          |
| Colome           | 27           | 85           | 11           | 51           | Colome           | 29           | 83           | 21           | 56           |
| Corsica/Stickney | 25           | 115          | 13           | 65           | Corsica/Stickney | 28           | 114          | 18           | 60           |
| Ethan            | 19           | 112          | 6            | 61           | Ethan            | 5            | 108          | 4            | 60           |
| Gregory          | 26           | 130          | 7            | 44           | Gregory          | 23           | 76           | 7            | 60           |
| Kimball          | 1            | 115          | 2            | 51           | Kimball          | 1            | 113          | 2            | 53           |
| Mitchell         | 58           | 1,240        | 57           | 546          | Mitchell         | 115          | 1,277        | 47           | 522          |
| Parkston         | 21           | 193          | 14           | 89           | Parkston         | 20           | 159          | 14           | 101          |
| Plankinton       | 7            | 112          | 4            | 43           | Plankinton       | 0            | 103          | 4            | 41           |
| Platte Geddes    | 14           | 198          | 6            | 89           | Platte Geddes    | 20           | 207          | 4            | 85           |
| Sanborn Central  | 15           | 71           | 11           | 40           | Sanborn Central  | 17           | 89           | 6            | 38           |
| Wagner           | 74           | 357          | 11           | 178          | Wagner           | 23           | 405          | 13           | 163          |
| Wessington Sprs. | 34           | 139          | 0            | 20           | Wessington Sprs. | 19           | 133          | 1            | 18           |
| White Lake       | 0            | 50           | 1            | 23           | White Lake       | 0            | 40           | 0            | 22           |
| Woonsocket       | 63           | 90           | 10           | 43           | Woonsocket       | 67           | 110          | 11           | 46           |
| Total            | 413<br>(12%) | 3,552        | 164<br>(10%) | 1,626        | Total            | 410<br>(12%) | 3,437        | 173<br>(11%) | 1,567        |



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

OMB No. 1894-0003  
Exp. 06/30/2017

PR/Award # S215F130147

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

Year three of the South Dakota MCEC PEP grant began with our annual meeting. This brought a cohort of two to three representatives from each of our twenty-two schools from nineteen regional school districts to review and analyze the data, share and edit wellness policies, review the HECAT standards, and make a plan to write district health and nutrition curriculum that would work in the framework of each individualized school district's organization. Stipends were provided for each participant for their work throughout the day.

At this time, each school was provided a calendar for each family in their district. These calendars were created with artwork from students from the cohort's students illustrating healthy choices and nutritious snacks. Throughout the days/months, healthy activities and recipes were provided for families to take part in.

In January, we partnered with the SD Extension office to provide nutrition professional development to each district. Each district sent representatives for a day-long training with tools, resources, recipes, and lessons to utilize with their students. Again, each participant was provided a stipend for participating.

As with past summers, we were able to provide S.M.A.R.T. -Stimulating Maturity through Accelerated Readiness Training - Boost-Up training to beginning kindergarten through eighth grade classroom teachers. These teachers were engaged for three days with training, curriculum, resources, and make-and-take activities to use in their classrooms. They were also provided stipends for attending.

Travel expenses were minimum this year as district representatives traveled to a central location for various professional development opportunities and the annual meeting. There was \$1,690.66 left in this line item because the director and coordinator only made one site visit to each of the twenty participating schools throughout the year because of these other gatherings.

Supplies were purchased by each district to support their S.M.A.R.T. Boost-Up programs and support the SPARK physical education curriculum many were trained in during years one and two. Last spring we held an art contest with the theme *Healthy Eating – Healthy Living*. WE then used these student works of art to create a calendar. The calendars purchased for each family of each district were incredibly beneficial. Students were excited to see their artwork or artwork of one of their peers show up on various months. In addition, the activities, recipes, and reminders added fun ways for families to get involved with the project's goals. This line item went over budget due to a mix up described below.

During this three-year PEP grant experience, we have had three different federal monitors. Being new to this position as a project director, I was in need of questions answered and assistance at various times. Unfortunately, our first federal monitor was difficult to get a hold of. By the end of our second year, we were on to our second federal monitor. I now had a better handle on how much was spent in each line item and wished to make some changes. For example, because there were no workshops or conferences for the coordinator or director, we always had extra dollars in the travel area. In past years, I was able to

send an email explaining what we wanted to do, and the federal monitor would simply approve without much assistance or involvement. With this new federal monitor, it was not so easy. At the beginning of the summer of 2016 after completing our second session of S.M.A.R.T. Boost-Up training, I sent the request for changes for our year three budget and was told it needed to be in a different format. With assistance, I completed the new format but was told it had to match what was in the G5 account. After about six to eight emails, edits, and changes, we finally got our budget approved. At the beginning of this process, I believe my numbers were correct. By the time it got approved, however, the dollars that had already been earmarked to pay for the just-finished Boost-Up training, were added back in to the available budget even though they had already been spent. We are \$24,324 over in the supplies line item due to this mix-up. This was a very confusing process and by the time I realized the error, we were at the end of year three and on to our third federal monitor. Not having a consistent relationship with the federal monitor has made this more difficult than it needed to be. Not having the face-to-face workshops to help us network, collaborate and get assistance has also been a disadvantage.

In addition to the director and coordinator's salaries/benefits, contractual dollars were spent to provide professional development in the following areas: S.M.A.R.T. Boost-Up training for classroom teachers, SPARK for physical education teachers, health and nutrition for district representatives. Stipends were provided all participants for these activities.

The \$217,493.54 matching dollars came from each district's contributions. \$74,361.37 was contributed for each district's PEP grant liaison. This person was the main contact for the district. He or she was responsible for ensuring all activities were completed on time, all data was collected, and this was sent to the project director. They also ensured the purchase requests complimented and supported the curriculum and grant objectives. Another \$18,601.98 was provided for the fringe benefits of said contact person. Other personnel contributions (\$4652.98) came in the form of districts providing substitute teachers during our professional development days and volunteer time for district specific activities. Districts also paid their teachers' mileage for attending the professional development with totaled \$677.86. The final \$119,199.35 came from districts supporting their own programs through updating playground equipment to promote out-of-school active play, purchasing additional physical education supplies, and purchasing other supplies to compliment or enhance their health and nutrition curriculum, their health and wellness activity nights, or their Boost-Up programs in classrooms.



**SECTION C - Additional Information**

| District Enrollment Data (K-8) |              |              |              |              |              |
|--------------------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
|                                | 2013         | 2015         | 2016         | 2017         | (+/-)        |
| Andes Central                  | 263          | 296          | 259          | 225          | -38          |
| Armour                         | 113          | 115          | 118          | 119          | +6           |
| Chamberlain                    | 603          | 634          | 638          | 762          | +159         |
| Colome                         | 176          | 165          | 163          | 118          | -58          |
| Corsica-Stickney               | 110          | 182          | 170          | 175          | +65          |
| Ethan                          | 188          | 180          | 170          | 178          | -10          |
| Gregory                        | 258          | 264          | 259          | 252          | -6           |
| Kimball                        | 205          | 233          | 201          | 181          | -24          |
| Mitchell                       | 2,194        | 1,951        | 1,955        | 1,989        | -205         |
| Parkston                       | 409          | 385          | 359          | 365          | -44          |
| Plankinton                     | 224          | 243          | 217          | 214          | -10          |
| Platte-Geddes                  | 322          | 342          | 342          | 380          | +58          |
| Sanborn Central                | 146          | 150          | 135          | 103          | -43          |
| Wagner                         | 700          | 727          | 597          | 624          | -76          |
| Wessington Springs             | 256          | 253          | 235          | 181          | -75          |
| White Lake                     | 167          | 80           | 86           | 72           | -95          |
| Woonsocket                     | 151          | 162          | 162          | 107          | -44          |
| <b>Total Enrollment</b>        | <b>6,485</b> | <b>6,362</b> | <b>6,066</b> | <b>6,045</b> | <b>(440)</b> |

**(1) Summary of results from grant-end needs assessment:**

This needs assessment completed at the end of the grant period was a combination of two instruments. The SHI was used when developing the program to inform the direction of the grant programming. The HECAT was also used during the grant in developing a more comprehensive approach to physical health and wellness education through better policy.

Results of the SHI pre-assessment:

The grant and budget narratives indicated the greatest needs and the expressed highest desire to improve was in the areas of: (Some of the elements may be different depending on if one looks at the Elementary or the Middle School instrument, but the content is the same)

Physical Activity

- Students active at least 50% of class time – This was addressed through extensive professional development for Personal Health and Wellness instructors through the SMART organization and the purchase of supplies that assist in the realignment of activities during the PE classes. To a person, these professionals have indicated their students are now much more active and engaged for at least 75% of the class time. The 75% is a result of a different educational design that allows for instruction during one class period for, perhaps, 50% of the time. Subsequent classes will then see 80% to 90% of the time spent in activity.
- Individualized physical activity and fitness plans – Again, the SMART organization played a crucial role in the success experienced by the districts in being able to address individual needs through such plans. The grant made it possible to purchase the supplies and equipment that allow for personalization such as computer monitoring programs, heart rate monitors, and individualized fitness tools.
- Professional development for teachers – This occurred for both the personal health and wellness instructors and the classroom teachers through a combination of offerings from the SMART organization (as discussed) and BOOST UP. The latter provides training to promote active students outside the PE environment, during passing time, in classrooms, etc. in such a way to increase engagement in the classroom and raise student performance. Both of these programs were extremely well received and their elements have been integrated into the district classrooms.
- Participation in intramural programs or physical activity clubs – This element did not play out as originally envisioned. For a variety of reasons, schools with small student bodies (almost ¾ of the districts have an enrollment of less than 100-250) find developing intramural programs to be problematic. However, many of the schools did report

developing before, during and after school walking and running clubs with participation that grew throughout the course of the grant. Several also spent a significant amount of the grant dollars and thousands of dollars in-kind funds improving their playground areas to encourage the use of these facilities during out of school time. All report that this was, indeed, successful.

#### Nutrition

- Essential topics of healthy eating – This was addressed in several ways, the most important of which was the introduction of the Wisconsin health curriculum to all of the consortium schools. The structure of this curriculum allowed each district to customize for their populations' needs. Over the course of the three summers of the grant, representatives from each district attended professional development meetings in which they were assisted in tailoring their health curriculum to incorporate this information. It was during these meeting that the HECAT was employed to identify which areas needed the most work. The result was an appropriately crafted document for each district.

Results of the SHI post-assessment:

A number of the steps taken during the grant have been outline above and, as noted, the results were mixed, but largely positive. The revisiting of the SHI after the three years of grant programming illustrated gains that had not been the focus of the grant but are clearly the result of its primary focuses as outlined above. The following elements are firmly in place (3) or almost firmly in place (2+):

#### Physical Activity

- Sequential physical education programming consistent with standards
- Information and materials for physical education teachers
- Students active at least 50% of class time
- Individualized physical activity and fitness plans
- Health related fitness
- [Promotion] of community physical activity
- Promotion or support of walking to school
- Availability of before- and after-school physical activity opportunities
- Availability of physical activity breaks in the classrooms

#### Nutrition

- Essential topics in healthy eating (covered by a comprehensive curriculum overhaul)
- Breakfast and lunch programs
- Variety of offerings in school meals
- [Promotion] of healthy food and beverage choices using Smarter Lunchroom techniques
- Adequate time to eat school meals
- Clean, safe, and pleasant school cafeterias

#### **(2) The HECAT and updating policy:**

- The grant focused on HECAT Module 5: *Students will demonstrate the ability to use decision-making skills to enhance health* and Module 6: *Students will demonstrate the ability to use goal-setting skills to enhance health* to revise curriculum and develop policies to support these goals.
- Importantly, the information contained within the Wisconsin Health Curriculum played a key role in crafting the new curriculum, therefore in crafting the district policies.
- The districts also reviewed the recommendations of the CDC on student access to healthy food and beverages at schools. This resulted in the incorporation of policy which limits/outlines the types of snacks that are acceptable in the school environment for celebrations and rewards. It also has promoted the idea that staff should be setting the tone for healthy eating. (This has been underscored by the results of GPRA #3. It was almost unanimous among the schools that all avenues to raise more awareness of and support healthy choices should be capitalized upon.)
- Physical activity and health policy was written to have an impact on grades K-12 although this grant was only applicable to grades K-8.

What emerged were the following common focuses in district policy. Although these are not unique, the wording with these iterations is more directive where possible, rather than stated merely as recommendations.

Students will have:

- Healthy food choices when the food is provided at school
- A safe and pleasant eating environment
- A minimum of 20 minutes for lunch break
- A comprehensive curriculum to acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to make healthy food choices for a lifetime
- An environment at school and school events prohibiting food and beverage sales and unapproved food and beverage distribution that are in direct conflict with the lunch/breakfast programs
- Multiple opportunities to develop the knowledge and skills for specific activities, maintain physical fitness, regularly participate in physical activities, and understand the short and long-term benefits of a physically active and healthy lifestyle
- Sequential and interdisciplinary nutrition education
- Nutritional food and beverage choices made available on campus during the school day will be consistent with the current Dietary Guidelines for Americans
- Food safety and security guidelines
- Neither food nor physical activity taken away or used as a punitive physical activity or consequence
- A comprehensive physical activity program, individualized as possible and/or necessary

### **(3) Partnerships:**

The partnerships remained much the same throughout the course of this grant.

- DIAL/Mid Central Educational Cooperative and the district partners worked with the following:
- Sanford FIT – This is a subsidiary of Sanford Health that offers a free on-line fitness program for schools and families. Sanford Research also has an existing partnership with several of the schools through the Innovation Lab Schools partnership.
- The City of Platte – This is the community in which DIAL and MCEC are headquartered, as well as the location of the Platte-Geddes School District. Additionally it is centrally located to a number of the smaller districts. The mayor of the city has signed an agreement that provides the use of community facilities in support of the grant activities for free or at reduced rates.
- South Dakota Office of Public Health – Charles Mix County – The public health nurse in Charles Mix County as well as other such offices in south central South Dakota have offered their services in support of the grant programming. Specifically, they have been available to offer advice on materials that compliment the efforts of the grant and to work with the schools to offer informational training for students and staff.
- Additionally, many of the local businesses in the district towns continued to provide support for the program as their time, expertise or monetary support has been requested.
- The inclusion of *SHAPE America* during the grant's second year was a benefit to all districts as it was an additional method through which to strengthen existing programs. Sherri Becker, the grant director was a trained facilitator for this purpose.

### **(4) Unanticipated results or successes:**

The breadth to which reform took place throughout the consortium could be considered an unintended consequence. As noted in (1) of Section C, so much more was accomplished than was planned. The grant intended to increase the amount and level of student activity while better training the education professionals in their educational environment. So many other areas of the wellness programs were also impacted as a result that it has been most gratifying to all involved.

One true success was for the Chamberlain School District as they were named a national winner of the Let's Move award that recognized "the district's commitment to increasing physical education and physical activity opportunities for their students along with promoting a healthy school environment in the areas of nutrition, well-being, and overall-curriculum. "

An additional unanticipated result was the difficulty experienced in raising the student achievement level for GPRA #3. As explained in the Executive summary, this is an area that the districts all indicate, through our survey, an unshakable level of commitment to improving as each moves to sustain the, albeit limited, improvement seen.

**(5) Alternative contact information**

The information on file should remain correct in the event contact with the director is required.