

UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA LAS VEGAS

### Abstract

Staff development (aka, in-service training) is a common feature of public education, and an important aspect of t continued development of physical education teachers a their initial certification. This presentation describes the Pittsburgh Obesity Prevention Initiative (POPI), with emp on describing lessons learned in conducting staff development at the high school level. Results indicated teacher satisfaction with the program as well as high leve physical activity during PE classes (i.e., over 50% MVPA) Numerous barriers to conducting and assessing staff development on a limited budget were identified. Results shed light on important contextual and behavioral influer on high school student participation in physical activity for the continued development of teachers. Procedures in POPI may serve as models for others interested in conducting staff development programs.

### Introduction

 Physical education is strongly recommended as a publi health tool for increasing participation in physical activit

 In the absence of intervention, physical education lesso often fall short of public health goals for providing mode vigorous physical activity (MVPA).

 Professional development in elementary and middle sch physical education is known to improve the quality and contribution of physical education to public health goals

•Little is known about staff development efforts in high a physical education.

### Methods

 POPI was a 4-year collaboration involving Pittsburgh Pub School District, an external funding agent, three universit and a private sector staff development team (SPARK). •7 High schools participated

- •4 control
- •3 intervention

•Graduate students were trained to collect data using the System for Observing Fitness Instruction Time (SOFIT). •Baseline data were collected in all 7 high schools in the of 2005 prior to the implementation of the staff developme program.

 Follow-up data were collected in all 7 schools in the sprin 2007.

 Data were generated (a) using teacher-reported feedback the program and the staff development process (b) direct observation of lessons in the 7 schools over two years us SOFIT, and (c) interviews with key informants.

# **Pittsburgh Obesity Prevention Initiative: Lessons Learned** Nicole Smith,<sup>1,2</sup> Thomas McKenzie,<sup>1</sup> Julie Frank, <sup>3</sup> & Paul Rosengard<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>San Diego State University, School of Exercise and Nutritional Sciences <sup>2</sup>University of Nevada, Las Vegas <sup>3</sup>The SPARK Programs

			•		
	Res	ults			
			entage of lesson length s		
ne fter			sed by 9.8% and 9.0% in i		
	and control schools respectively from baseline to follow-up. Figure 1. % MVPA by condition and time				
hasis	70	Figure 1. % IVI	VPA by condition and	a time	
high	70		58.2		
els of	60 -	48.4			
-	50 - <b>2</b>		52.1		
	<b>b</b> 40 -	43.1		Intor	
ces	<b>b</b> 30 -			Inter Cont	
nd	20 -			Com	
sed	10 –				
	0				
		Baseline	Follow-Up		
			ion schools increased M		
		•	$1., 20.8\%$ ) and controls in $7 \pm 0.16$ (min) $17 = 5\%$ ( ) from $7 \pm 0.16$		
<b>y</b> .		ollow-up.	.7 to 16.1 min; 17.5%) fro	m paseiine	
ns		•			
rate-	20	Figure 2. W	VPA minutes per less 18.6		
	18 - 16 -	15.4	16.1	-Con -Inte	
ool	14	137		птс	
	<b>S</b> 12 -				
	<b>1</b> 0 –				
chool	<b>Š</b> 8				
	6 – 4 –				
	2 -				
	0				
lic		Baseline	Follow-Up		
es,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
	90%	of teachers (n = 9) wo	ould recommend SPARK	to others.	
	Table	e 1 shows teachers re	ported the training prog	ram was	
			omponents of the training		
	exce	ellent.			
pring	Table	e 1. Overall Impressio	n of SPARK Workshop		
nt	Cha	racteristic	Μ	lean Score <sup>a</sup>	
aof	Pres	enter's Knowledge		5.0	
g of	Pres	senter's skills		5.0	
on	Orga	anization of schedule	d time	4.5	
	Qua	lity and value of audio	ovisual materials	4.7	
ing	Prov	vided new information		4.8	
	Suff	icient time to ask que	stions	4.5	
		rall usefulness		4.8	
	Ove			4.8 4.9	



rvention trol

ntrol ervention

# **Results Continued**

between 4.7-5.0 on a 5.0 point scale.

Characteristic

Pathways to change

**Teaching methods a** 

Assessment

Content

**Direction of PE** 

**Resources to facilita** 

Activity demonstration

<sup>a</sup> Items scored on a 5

# Discussion

•Although MVPA% approached the Healthy People 2010 goal at baseline (48.4% intervention; 43.1% control) and increased over time in both groups ( $\Delta$ +9.8% intervention;  $\Delta$ +9.0% control), MVPA minutes accrued during PE lesson were far short of daily activity recommendations (i.e., 60 minutes).

•MVPA was relatively high at baseline, thus an intervention to increase it even more would need to be robust.

•Staff professional development in high schools was well-received.

•Collecting quality data in high schools is challenging unless observers are properly trained, supervised, and compensated. Building in research capacity at the beginning and providing adequate funding for data collection (training, supervision) is important.

•POPI was the first of the SPARK high school professional development programs to be studied. Additional assessment is needed in order to fully understand adoption and adherence to health-related physical education programs.

## Conclusions

Similar to studies of SPARK staff development in elementary and middle schools, the program was well received by teachers in these high schools. Additional assessment procedures are needed to evaluate specific changes in the conduct of PE, including its dosage, content, and activity intensity.

# Acknowledgments

Highmark Blue Cross Blue Shield and the Grable Foundation provided funds to conduct the POPI study, and SPARK for donated staff time and materials.



# Table 2 shows the range of mean scores for items measuring the "Usefulness of SPARK Professional Development"

 Table 2. Usefulness of SPARK Professional Development

	-	
	Mean Score <sup>a</sup>	
e	5.0	
and strategies	4.8	
	4.6	
	4.7	
	4.9	
ate change	4.8	
tions	4.9	
5 point scale. 1 = not us	eful at all; 5 = very	

### Lessons Learned