

Food on the Run 1998-1999
Environment Evaluation Report II

Prepared by
Erika Takada, M.P.H.
Evaluation Specialist

January 2000

California Project LEAN, P.O. Box 942732, MS-675, Sacramento, CA 94234-7320

This document is funded by a grant from The *California* Endowment, and is administered through the Public Health Institute.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PROGRAM BACKGROUND

Food on the Run (FOR) is a high school student advocacy project to promote healthy eating and physical activity organized by California Project LEAN (Leaders Encouraging Activity and Nutrition), a program of the California Department of Health Services and the Public Health Institute. Its mission is to increase healthy eating and physical activity among teens as a way to improve health and reduce the risk of chronic disease. The goals of FOR are to conduct a high-school based program that:

- Prompts high school students to advocate for additional healthy food and physical activity options in their community.
- Advances policy and environmental changes that promote healthy eating and physical activity options in the school and surrounding community.
- Motivates students to eat healthier and engage in more physical activity.

Food on the Run operates in 30 low-income high schools across the state of California. In carrying out its work, FOR's primary target audience is multiethnic underserved high school students. Secondary target audiences include families, school staff, community leaders and policymakers.

INTRODUCTION

Each year Environment Surveys are conducted as a part of California Project LEAN's (CPL) on-going *Food on the Run* (FOR) evaluation process. This is the second annual report of the Environment Survey Evaluation. The environment survey is only

one part of the entire CPL evaluation plan, but is a vital component. There are two main purposes of the environment evaluation:

- 1) To assess the eating and physical activity environment of the *Food on the Run* high schools with particular attention to the access and promotion of healthy options.
- 2) To determine the level at which *Food on the Run* is addressing adolescent nutrition and physical activity issues at high school campuses.

The environment survey does serve as a valuable, basic needs assessment tool, but more importantly it is a tool that allows each FOR site to collect the information necessary to create the platform for policy and environmental changes, as well as to monitor changes in that area.

The objective of environmental and policy change efforts is to strategically target factors in the high school environment that contributes to the poor health status of teens. Individual attempts to change lifestyle behaviors are more successful when the environment supports the behavior. By making changes in school environments and to school-based practices related to nutrition and physical activity, support for healthy behavior can be strengthened. Environmental and policy change efforts are essential components to a population-based approach to the primary prevention of chronic disease.

The following results demonstrate the success FOR has achieved in making healthier school environments, however, it also demonstrates areas that need improvements. The results are based on responses to the environment survey completed by all FOR high schools for the 1998-1999 project year.

METHODS and FINDINGS

FOR high schools were recruited into the program in waves. The first wave of ten high school sites were recruited by local CPL representatives who were knowledgeable about the local school community. The second wave of ten high school were selected by a competitive RFA (request for application) process.

Each FOR site is required to complete the Environment Survey (see Appendix B) as a part of the evaluation process. The Environment Survey is completed, annually, in May or June – the end of the high school year.

As described above, FOR sites have been recruited in waves, therefore in addition to the overall mean score, two sets of t-test results will be presented for each set of scores. The first set of results are based on data from the original regional FOR sites (Wave 1), and they reflect a comparison from '97-'98 to the '98-'99 school year (N=11). The second set of results are based on data from the first round of FOR sites recruited by the RFA process (Wave 2), and they reflect a comparison from the beginning of the '98-'99 school year to the end of the same school year (N=8)** . Please see Appendix A for complete frequency tables on each of the survey items.

Healthy Foods Score

The Healthy Foods Score is a measurement of the healthy eating options available to students on campus.

The overall mean score for 1998-1999 including all FOR sites was 5.7 out of a possible eleven points.

** Due to non-compliance and/or missing data some sites could not be included in the analysis.

Both sets of scores show significant improvements in healthy eating options offered to students at school.

Healthy Eating Promotion Score

The Healthy Eating Promotion Score is a measure of the healthy eating promotional efforts on campus.

The overall mean score including all of the FOR sites (N=19) was 2.3 out of a possible five points.

For the 1997-1998 to 1998-1999 comparison of the Wave 1 school sites there was no change in the healthy eating promotional efforts. For the comparison of Wave 2 school sites from the beginning of the school year to the end of the school year, there was significant improvement in the healthy eating promotional efforts that occurred on campus.

School Physical Activity Score

The School Physical Activity Score is a measure of the physical activity options available to students on campus during school.

The overall mean score including all of the sites (N=19) was 3.3 out of a possible six points.

For the Wave 1 comparison there was no significant change detected in the physical activity options on campus. For the Wave 2 comparison there was significant improvement in the physical activity made available to students on campus during school.

After-School Physical Activity Score

The After-School Physical Activity score is a measure of the physical activity options available to students after school.

The overall mean score including all of the sites (N=19) was 4.1 out of a possible nine points.

For the Wave 1 school sites comparison there was significantly fewer options available for students after school. For the Wave 2 school sites comparison there was no significant change detected in the after school physical activity options for students.

Physical Activity Promotion Score

The Physical Activity Promotion Score is a measure of the physical activity promotional efforts on campus.

The overall mean score including all of the sites (N=19) was 2.1 out of a possible five points.

For the Wave 1 school sites comparison there was significantly fewer physical activity promotional efforts detected on campus. For the Wave 2 school sites there was no significant change detected in the physical activity promotional efforts on campus.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Data collected from the Environment Survey indicate that FOR is succeeding in creating high school environments that support healthy eating and physical activity.

Several areas, however, most notably physical activity, need greater emphasis. The following are recommendations based on the results:

- Focus efforts on increasing physical activity options for use before, during, and after school by improving and adding to existing resources.
- Partner and collaborate with physical education staff and recruit students who are specifically interested in the area of physical activity to help accomplish physical activity environmental/policy change goals.
- Promote and increase lifelong physical activity options. (Lifelong physical activity is physical activity among youth that can continue on into adulthood so that they may obtain the benefits throughout life.)
- Continue to maintain the healthy eating/nutrition changes and systematically change the focus to sustainability. The environmental changes accomplished should remain after the student advocates graduate and funding for FOR ends.
- Fully engage teens throughout the advocacy and policy change process (Utilize *Playing the Policy Game* workbook.) Environmental change efforts are more compelling when they are student driven (i.e., with student interest, enthusiasm and energy).
- Strategically use this environment survey data to shape the direction of the program at the state and local levels and to support policy and environmental change efforts.

ENVIRONMENT EVALUATION REPORT II

PROGRAM BACKGROUND

Food on the Run (FOR) is a high school student advocacy project to promote healthy eating and physical activity organized by California Project LEAN (Leaders Encouraging Activity and Nutrition), a program of the California Department of Health Services and the Public Health Institute. Its mission is to increase healthy eating and physical activity among teens as a way to improve health and reduce the risk of chronic disease. The goals of FOR are to conduct a high-school based program that:

- Prompts high school students to advocate for additional healthy food and physical activity options in their community.
- Advances policy and environmental changes that promote healthy eating and physical activity options in the school and surrounding community.
- Motivates students to eat healthier and engage in more physical activity.

In carrying out its work, *Food on the Run*'s primary target audience is multiethnic underserved high school students. Secondary target audiences include families, school staff, community leaders and policymakers.

Food on the Run operates in 30 low-income high schools across the state of California. This school based project:

- Trains high school students (Student Advocates) about healthy eating, physical activity, consumerism, advocacy, and the media.

- Conducts classroom, campus- and community-related activities to advocate for healthy eating and physical activity options.
- Integrates lessons into existing curriculum that encourage students to eat healthy, keep moving and become smart shoppers and involved citizens.

FOR is grounded in a student-driven philosophy. Each high school site designs and implements projects with input from Student Advocates with whom they work; therefore, each site's FOR project is unique and responsive to the needs and circumstances of the students in that particular high school.

INTRODUCTION TO REPORT

Each year Environment Surveys are conducted as a part of California Project LEAN's (CPL) on-going *Food on the Run* (FOR) evaluation process. This is the second annual report of the Environment Survey Evaluation. The environment survey is only one part of the entire CPL evaluation plan, but is a vital component. There are two main purposes of the environment evaluation:

- 3) To assess the eating and physical activity environment of the *Food on the Run* high schools with particular attention to the access and promotion of healthy options.
- 4) To determine the level at which *Food on the Run* is addressing adolescent nutrition and physical activity issues at high school campuses.

The environment survey does serve as a valuable, basic needs assessment tool, but more importantly it is a tool that allows each FOR site to collect the information necessary to

create the platform for policy and environmental changes, as well as to monitor changes in that area.

The objective of environmental and policy change efforts is to strategically target factors in the high school environment that contributes to the poor health status of teens. Individual attempts to change lifestyle behaviors are more successful when the environment supports the behavior. By making changes in school environments and to school-based practices related to nutrition and physical activity, support for healthy behavior can be strengthened. Environmental and policy change efforts are essential components to a population-based approach to the primary prevention of chronic disease.

A recent editorial in the New England Journal of Medicine (October 1999) on the prevention of obesity stated that large community based trials of methods for the prevention of heart disease demonstrated that targeting individual behavior was ineffective in reducing the prevalence of cardiovascular disease and obesity. This has motivated a search for new public health interventions *emphasizing environmental change*. What this finding presents is the opportunity for public health professionals and their partners (youth, schools, and other professionals in the community) to play a key role in shaping and supporting social and environmental policies that can help adolescents improve their diets and become physically active. This has been the premise of CPL's FOR program from the start.

The following results demonstrate the success FOR has achieved in making healthier school environments, however, it also demonstrates areas that need improvements. The results are based on responses to the environment survey completed by all FOR high schools for the 1998-1999 project year.

METHODS

FOR high schools were recruited into the program in waves. The first wave of ten high school sites were recruited by local CPL representatives who were knowledgeable about the local school community. The second wave of ten high school were selected by a competitive RFA (request for application) process. Most recently a third wave of eight high schools were recruited by an RFA process. This report includes data from the first two waves of high schools. Data from the third wave of schools will be included in the next annual environment evaluation report.

Each FOR site is required to complete the Environment Survey (see Appendix B) as a part of the evaluation process. The Environment Survey is completed, annually, in May or June – the end of the high school year. When new school sites are recruited to the FOR project, they are required to conduct one baseline assessment before implementing the program.

The Environment Survey consists of ten items: four healthy eating/nutrition items, four physical activity items, and two open-ended questions. The items on the survey are based on environmental changes that CPL expects and aims to see as a result of the implementation of FOR at the participating high school sites.

The survey is completed by the FOR site coordinator and a high school student. Each site coordinator receives training on conducting the evaluation process and receives an accompanying manual with original copies of the surveys and protocols. Responses to the items correspond to a physical assessment of the high school campus environment.

The survey responses were entered into an SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) 8.0 version database in accordance with the data protocol. SPSS was

also used to analyze the data. Frequency statistics are provided for the following variables: healthy food options; presence of nutrition information; types of eating venues; healthy eating promotion; physical activity promotion; physical education requirement; and physical activity options both during and after school. A Healthy Foods Score was computed by assigning one point for each positive response to the options for item #1 on the survey (see survey in Appendix B), and adding them together for a total sum for each site. The same procedure was used to compute a Healthy Eating Promotion Score (item #4); School Physical Activity Score (item #6); After School Physical Activity Score (item #7); and a Physical Activity Promotion Score (item #7). Paired t-tests were performed on the overall mean scores in order to determine any significant changes over time.

FINDINGS

The following are the final results of the 1998-1999 project year. Since we are midway through FOR, two more years of environment assessment will occur. Therefore, this report provides essential mid-point data that can be used to help shape the direction of the program for the remainder of the funding period.

As described above, FOR sites have been recruited in waves, therefore in addition to the overall mean score, two sets of t-test results will be presented for each set of scores. The first set of results are based on data from the original regional FOR sites (Wave 1), and they reflect a comparison from '97-'98 to the '98-'99 school year (N=11). The second set of results are based on data from the first round of FOR sites recruited by the RFA process (Wave 2), and they reflect a comparison from the beginning of the '98-

'99 school year to the end of the same school year (N=8) **. Please see Appendix A for complete frequency tables on each of the survey items.

Healthy Foods Score

The Healthy Foods Score is a measurement of the healthy eating options available to students on campus. One point is given for each option marked in question number one of the Environment Survey. There are 11 total possible points.

The overall mean score for 1998-1999 including all FOR sites was 5.7 out of a possible eleven points (Table 1).

Table 1 - Overall Healthy Foods Score

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median
Healthy Eating Score	19	5.7	2.2	5.5

Both sets of scores show significant improvements in healthy eating options offered to students at school (Tables 2 and 3).

Table 2 - Healthy Foods Score Comparison, Wave 1 (N=11)

	Mean Difference	t	Significance
'97-98 to '98-'99 school site comparisons	1.9	-3.3	.008*

*p<.01

Table 3 - Healthy Foods Score Comparison, Wave 2 (N=8)

	Mean Difference	t	Significance
'98-'99 baseline to end of school year comparison	1.5	-5.0	.000*

*p<.001

** Due to non-compliance and/or missing data some sites could not be included in the analysis.

Healthy Eating Promotion Score

The Healthy Eating Promotion Score is a measure of the healthy eating promotional efforts on campus. One point was assigned to each promotional response item marked in question number four of the survey. There are five total points possible.

The overall mean score including all of the FOR sites (N=19) was 2.3 out of a possible five points (Table 4).

Table 4 – Overall Healthy Eating Promotion Score

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median
Healthy Eating Promotion Score	19	2.3	1.1	2.0

For the 1997-1998 to 1998-1999 comparison of the Wave 1 school sites there was no change in the healthy eating promotional efforts (Table 5). For the comparison of Wave 2 school sites from the beginning of the school year to the end of the school year, there was significant improvement in the healthy eating promotional efforts that occurred on campus (Table 6).

Table 5 - Healthy Eating Promotion Score Comparison – Wave 1 (N=11)

	Mean Difference	t	Significance
‘97-98 to ‘98-’99 school site comparison	.00	.00	1.00

Table 6 - Healthy Eating Promotion Score Comparison – Wave 2 (N=8)

	Mean Difference	t	Significance
‘98-’99 baseline to end of school year comparison	1.4	-5.8	.000*

*p<.001

School Physical Activity Score

The School Physical Activity Score is a measure of the physical activity options available to students on campus during school. One point is assigned for each item marked in question number seven on the survey. There are six total points possible.

The overall mean score including all of the sites (N=19) was 3.3 out of a possible six points (Table 7).

Table 7 - Overall School Physical Activity Score

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median
School Physical Activity Score	19	3.3	1.4	3.0

For the Wave 1 comparison there was no significant change detected in the physical activity options on campus (Table 8). For the Wave 2 comparison there was significant improvement in the physical activity made available to students on campus during school (Table 9).

Table 8 - School Physical Activity Score Comparison – Wave 1 (N=11)

	Mean Difference	t	Significance
'97-98 to '98-'99 school site comparison	.27	-.39	.706

Table 9 - School Physical Activity Score Comparison – Wave 2 (N=8)

	Mean Difference	t	Significance
'98-'99 baseline to end of school year comparison	.86	-2.2	.041*

*p<.05

After-School Physical Activity Score

The After-School Physical Activity score is a measure of the physical activity options available to students after school. One point is given to each response item chosen for question number eight on the survey. There are nine total points possible.

The overall mean score including all of the sites (N=19) was 4.1 out of a possible nine points (Table 10).

Table 10 - Overall After-School Physical Activity Score

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median
After-school Physical Activity Score	19	4.1	2.1	4.0

For the Wave 1 school sites comparison there was significantly fewer options available for students after school (Table 11) (see discussion section). For the Wave 2 school sites comparison there was no significant change detected in the after school physical activity options for students (Table 12).

Table 11 - After-school Physical Activity Score Comparison - Wave 1 (N=11)

	Mean Difference	t	Significance
'97-98 to '98-'99 school site comparison	.91	2.3	.043*

*p<.05

Table 12 - After-school Physical Activity Score Comparison – Wave 2 (N=8)

	Mean Difference	t	Significance
'98-'99 baseline end of school year comparison	.05	-.12	.905

Physical Activity Promotion Score

The Physical Activity Promotion Score is a measure of the physical activity promotional efforts on campus. One point is given for each response item marked for question number five on the survey. There are five total points possible.

The overall mean score including all of the sites (N=19) was 2.1 out of a possible five points (Table 13).

Table 13 - Overall Physical Activity Promotion Score

	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Median
Physical Activity Promotion Score	19	2.1	1.5	2.0

For the Wave 1 school sites comparison there was significantly fewer physical activity promotional efforts detected on campus (Table 14). For the Wave 2 school sites there was no significant change detected in the physical activity promotional efforts on campus (Table 15).

Table 14 - Physical Activity Promotion Score Comparison – Wave 1 (N=11)

	Mean Difference	t	Significance
'97-98 to '98-'99 school site comparison	1.18	2.4	.034*

*p<.05

Table 15 - Physical Activity Promotion Score Comparison – Wave 2 (N=8)

	Mean Difference	t	Significance
'98-'99 baseline to end of school year comparison	.41	-1.4	.175

DISCUSSION

Overall the results are an accurate reflection of what is happening at the Project LEAN *Food on the Run* high schools in regards to environmental changes being made. It is important to keep in mind that the environment survey is a physical assessment of the eating and physical activity campus environment and is not a measurement of behavior. Therefore it is possible that a measurement of behavior shows something contrary to what the environment survey results suggest.

Healthy eating options offered on campus yielded the most significant positive changes in the 1998-1999 project year. Changes in both the number and variety of healthy options offered on campus contributed to the marked significant improvements in the Healthy Foods Scores.

The changes in the Healthy Foods Scores appear to be positively associated with the Healthy Eating Promotion scores. Healthy eating promotional efforts on campus includes posters, signs, newsletters distributed on campus and/or sent home to parents, and events that encourage healthy eating. There was no change detected in the Healthy Eating Promotion score for the Wave 1 FOR sites. The Wave 1 sites, however, showed a significant improvement ($p < .05$) the previous project year and were therefore able to maintain the same level of healthy eating promotion through the 1998-1999 project year.

The Wave 2 sites were able to show a significant improvement in the physical activity options offered to students on campus during school. Most of the changes were attributed to adding to and improving what already exists on the high school campuses, such as acquiring more equipment to use, opening up the gym/weight room to all

students, and tailoring campus physical activities towards girls (in combination with their promotions).

The overall decline in the area of physical activity for the Wave 1 sites may be attributed to a few factors. Many of these sites chose to focus their efforts during the 1998-1999 project year on nutrition and healthy eating, which is evident in the significant improvements in the healthy eating score. Since this is a multiple year project, some sites have chosen to work on a minimal number of issues at a time which can dilute or slow progress in other areas, i.e., physical activity. On a related note, several of the site coordinators are registered dietitians by training and feel more comfortable beginning their work with students on nutrition issues on campus. They may find making changes in the area of physical activity more challenging.

In addition, the wording for survey item number eight, which asks about physical activity options available to students after school, changed slightly on the 1998-1999 survey. For this most recent survey the statement, “*This **does not** include competitive and/or varsity sports*” was added (see survey, Appendix B). In previous years some respondents included competitive sports in their responses to the survey item. Therefore, the 1998-1999 After-school Physical Activity score could actually be the true score reflecting the intention of the survey item (assess the physical activity options available to **all students** after school).

Overall, data collected from the Environment Survey indicate that FOR is succeeding in creating high school environments that support healthy eating and physical activity. Several areas, however, most notably physical activity, need greater emphasis. The following are recommendations based on the results.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- Focus efforts on increasing physical activity options for use before, during, and after school by improving and adding to existing resources.
- Partner and collaborate with physical education staff and recruit students who are specifically interested in the area of physical activity to help accomplish physical activity environmental/policy change goals.
- Promote and increase lifelong physical activity options. (Lifelong physical activity is physical activity among youth that can continue on into adulthood so that they may obtain the benefits throughout life.)
- Continue to maintain the healthy eating/nutrition changes and systematically change the focus to sustainability. The environmental changes accomplished should remain after the student advocates graduate and funding for FOR ends.
- Fully engage teens throughout the advocacy and policy change process (Utilize *Playing the Policy Game* workbook.) Environmental change efforts are more compelling when they are student driven (i.e., with student interest, enthusiasm and energy).
- Strategically use this environment survey data to shape the direction of the program at the state and local levels and to support policy and environmental change efforts.

Appendix A

Tables

Table A 1 – Low-fat, fat free, healthy food options offered at school. (N=19)

	YES	NO
	N (%)	N (%)
Salad/fresh vegetables	18 (94.7)	1 (5.3)
Low-fat dressing	6 (31.6)	13 (68.4)
Fresh fruit	19 (100.0)	0
Dried/canned fruit	9 (47.4)	10 (52.6)
Non-fat milk	5 (26.3)	14 (73.7)
1% milk	15 (78.9)	4 (21.1)
100% juice	11 (57.9)	8 (42.1)
Low-fat entrée	8 (42.1)	11 (57.9)
Vegetarian entrée	8 (42.1)	11 (57.9)
Whole grain item	8 (42.1)	11 (57.9)
Other	4 (21.1)	15 (78.9)

Table A 2 – Low-fat, fat free, healthy food options offered at school.

CPL Region	FOR Site	Salad/fr. veg.	Lf-drsng.	Fr. fruit	Other fruit	Nf-milk	1% milk	100% juice	Lf-entree	Veg. entree	Whole grain	Other
Bay Area	Andrew Hill	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Balboa	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Central Valley	Mendota	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
	Firebaugh	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Gold Coast	Ernest Righetti	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
Gold Country	Encina	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No
	San Juan	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Great South	Fontana	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
	Colton	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Cajon	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Los Angeles	Gabrielino	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
North Central	King City	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
North Coast	Del Norte	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
	Zoe Barnum	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Sierra Cascade	Anderson	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
	Portola	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Southern Coast	Herbert Hoover	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
	SELF	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
	Southwest	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No

Table A 3 – Type of information posted for foods. (N=19)

Nutrition Information	YES	NO
	N (%)	N (%)
Low-fat	8 (42.1)	11 (57.9)
Fat-free	2 (10.5)	17 (89.5)
Nutrition label	6 (31.6)	13 (68.4)
Other	4 (21.1)	15 (78.9)
None	5 (26.3)	14 (73.7)

Table A 4 – Type of information posted for foods by region and site.

CPL Region	FOR Site	Low-fat	Fat-free	Nutr. label	Other	None
Bay Area	Andrew Hill	Yes	No	No	No	No
	Balboa	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Central Valley	Mendota	No	No	No	Yes	No
	Firebaugh	Yes	No	No	No	No
Gold Coast	Ernest Righetti	No	No	No	No	Yes
Gold Country	Encina	No	No	No	No	Yes
	San Juan	No	No	Yes	No	No
Great South	Fontana	Yes	No	No	No	No
	Colton	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
	Cajon	No	No	No	No	Yes
Los Angeles	Gabrielino	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
North Central	King City	Yes	No	No	No	No
North Coast	Del Norte	No	No	No	No	Yes
	Zoe Barnum	No	No	Yes	No	No
Sierra Cascade	Anderson	No	No	No	Yes	No
	Portola	No	No	Yes	No	No
Southern Coast	Herbert Hoover	No	No	Yes	No	No
	SELF	Yes	No	No	No	No
	Southwest	No	No	No	No	Yes

Table A 5 – Where nutrition information is posted. (N=14; 5 sites have no posted information)

Where Posted	YES	NO	Missing
	N	N	N
On menu	3	10	1
By food	7	6	1
Campus walls	9	4	1
Other	4	9	1

Table A 6 – Food options on campus besides tray meals. (N=19)

Type of Venue	YES	NO
	N (%)	N (%)
Fast-food restaurant	10 (52.6)	9 (47.4)
Snack bar	12 (63.2)	7 (36.8)
Food cart	12 (63.2)	7 (36.8)
Vending machine	13 (68.4)	6 (31.6)
Other	7 (36.8)	12 (63.2)

Table A 7 – Food options on campus besides tray meals by region and site.

CPL Region	FOR Site	Fast-food	How Many	Snack Bar	How Many	Food Cart	How Many	Vend. Mach.	How Many	Other	How Many
Bay Area	Andrew Hill	No	0	Yes	1	No	0	Yes	1	Yes	9
	Balboa	Yes	1	Yes	1	Yes	1	Yes	1	No	0
Central Valley	Mendota	Yes	1	Yes	1	No	0	No	0	No	0
	Firebaugh	Yes	1	Yes	1	Yes	1	No	0	No	0
Gold Coast	Ernest Righetti	Yes	3	No	0	Yes	2	Yes	7	No	0
Gold Country	Encina	No	0	Yes	1	No	0	No	0	Yes	2
	San Juan	Yes	2	Yes	1	Yes	1	Yes	4	Yes	1
Great South	Fontana	Yes	3	Yes	3	Yes	7	Yes	25	Yes	1
	Colton	Yes	1	Yes	2	Yes	6	Yes	12	Yes	1
	Cajon	No	0	Yes	1	Yes	6	Yes	6	No	0
Los Angeles	Gabrielino	Yes	2	No	0	No	0	No	0	No	0
North Central	King City	No	0	Yes	1	Yes	1	Yes	1	No	0
North Coast	Del Norte	No	0	Yes	1	No	0	Yes	2	Yes	1
	Zoe Barnum	No	0	No	0	Yes	1	Yes	3	No	0
Sierra Cascade	Anderson	Yes	2	Yes	1	Yes	1	Yes	11	No	0
	Portola	No	0	No	0	No	0	Yes	1	No	0
Southern Coast	Herbert Hoover	Yes	2	No	0	Yes	6	No	0	No	0
	SELF	No	0	No	0	No	0	Yes	1	No	0
	Southwest	No	0	No	0	Yes	3	No	0	Yes	1

Table A 8 – Healthy eating promotions seen or heard on campus. (N=19)

Type of Healthy Eating Promotion	YES	NO
	N (%)	N (%)
Posters/signs	17 (89.5)	2 (10.5)
Student newspaper	4 (21.1)	15 (78.9)
Over P.A.	7 (36.8)	12 (63.2)
Parent newsletter	6 (31.6)	13 (68.4)
Other	13 (68.4)	6 (31.6)

Table A 9 – Healthy eating promotions seen or heard on campus by region and site.

CPL Region	FOR Site	Posters/ signs	Student Newspaper	Over P.A.	Parent Newsletter	other
Bay Area	Andrew Hill	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Balboa	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Central Valley	Mendota	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
	Firebaugh	Yes	No	No	No	No
Gold Coast	Ernest Righetti	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Gold Country	Encina	Yes	No	No	No	No
	San Juan	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Great South	Fontana	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
	Colton	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
	Cajon	No	No	No	No	Yes
Los Angeles	Gabrielino	No	No	No	No	Yes
North Central	King City	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
North Coast	Del Norte	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
	Zoe Barnum	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes
Sierra Cascade	Anderson	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
	Portola	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Southern Coast	Herbert Hoover	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
	SELF	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
	Southwest	Yes	No	Yes	No	No

Table A 10 – Physical activity options & facilities during school. (N=19)

	YES	NO
	N (%)	N (%)
Organized sports	9 (47.4)	10 (52.6)
Playing fields	13 (68.4)	6 (31.6)
Weight room	16 (84.2)	3 (15.8)
Basketball courts	15 (78.9)	4 (21.1)
Check-out equipment	3 (15.8)	16 (84.2)
Other	2 (10.5)	17 (89.5)

Table A 11 – Physical activity options & facilities during school by region and site.

CPL Region	FOR Site	Sports Club	Playing fields	Weight Room	B-ball courts	Check-out equip	Other
Bay Area	Andrew Hill	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
	Balboa	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	Yes
Central Valley	Mendota	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
	Firebaugh	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Gold Coast	Ernest Righetti	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Gold Country	Encina	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
	San Juan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Great South	Fontana	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
	Colton	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Cajon	No	No	No	No	No	No
Los Angeles	Gabrielino	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
North Central	King City	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
North Coast	Del Norte	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
	Zoe Barnum	No	No	No	No	No	No
Sierra Cascade	Anderson	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
	Portola	No	Yes	Yes	No	No	No
Southern Coast	Herbert Hoover	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
	SELF	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
	Southwest	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No

Table A 12 – Physical activity options & facilities after school. (N=19)

	YES	NO
	N (%)	N (%)
School teams	12 (63.2)	7 (36.8)
Playing fields	13 (68.4)	6 (31.6)
Weight rooms	13 (68.4)	6 (31.6)
Basketball Courts	13 (68.4)	6 (31.6)
YMCA/YWCA	5 (26.3)	14 (73.7)
Boys/Girls Clubs	5 (26.3)	14 (73.7)
Community sport leagues	9 (47.4)	10 (52.6)
Health club/gym	9 (47.4)	10 (52.6)
Other	3 (15.8)	16 (84.2)

Table A 13 – Physical activity options & facilities after school by region and site.

CPL Region	FOR Site	School teams	Playing fields	Weight room	B-ball courts	YMCA/YWCA	Boys/Girls club	Comm league	Gym	other
Bay Area	Andrew Hill	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes
	Balboa	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Central Valley	Mendota	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
	Firebaugh	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
Gold Coast	Ernest Righetti	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
Gold Country	Encina	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
	San Juan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
Great South	Fontana	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Colton	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Cajon	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Los Angeles	Gabrielino	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
North Central	King City	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
North Coast	Del Norte	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	Yes	No
	Zoe Barnum	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Sierra Cascade	Anderson	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
	Portola	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Southern Coast	Herbert Hoover	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
	SELF	No	No	Yes	No	No	No	No	Yes	No
	Southwest	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No

Table A 14 – Physical activity promotions seen or heard on campus. (N=19)

Type of Physical Activity Promotion	YES	NO
	N (%)	N (%)
Posters/signs	12 (63.2)	7 (36.8)
Student paper	7 (36.8)	12 (63.2)
Over P.A.	7 (36.8)	12 (63.2)
Parent newsletter	5 (26.3)	14 (73.7)
other	10 (52.6)	9 (47.4)

Table A 15 – Physical activity promotions seen or heard on campus by region and site.

CPL Region	FOR Site	Posters/signs	Student newspapers	Over P.A.	Parent newsletter	Other
Bay Area	Andrew Hill	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Balboa	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
Central Valley	Mendota	No	No	No	No	Yes
	Firebaugh	Yes	No	No	No	No
Gold Coast	Ernest Righetti	No	No	No	No	Yes
Gold Country	Encina	Yes	No	No	No	No
	San Juan	No	No	No	No	No
Great South	Fontana	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
	Colton	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
	Cajon	No	No	No	No	No
Los Angeles	Gabrielino	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
North Central	King City	Yes	No	Yes	No	No
North Coast	Del Norte	No	No	No	No	No
	Zoe Barnum	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Sierra Cascade	Anderson	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
	Portola	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
Southern Coast	Herbert Hoover	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes
	SELF	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
	Southwest	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No

Table A 16 – Environmental assessment scores.

CPL Region	FOR Site	Healthy foods score	Healthy Eating Promo Score	School Physical Activity Score	After-school Physical Activity Score	Physical Activity Promo Score
	Total Possible:	11.0	5.0	6.0	9.0	5.0
Bay Area	Andrew Hill	10.0	5.0	2.0	5.0	4.0
	Balboa	8.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Central Valley	Mendota	2.0	3.0	3.0	4.0	1.0
	Firebaugh	2.0	1.0	3.0	3.0	1.0
Gold Coast	Ernest Righetti	5.0	2.0	5.0	7.0	1.0
Gold Country	Encina	6.0	3.0	4.0	2.0	1.0
	San Juan	3.0	3.0	4.0	4.0	0.0
Great South	Fontana	8.0	4.0	4.0	6.0	4.0
	Colton	10.0	2.0	6.0	8.0	5.0
	Cajon	4.0	2.0	3.0	6.0	2.0
Los Angeles	Gabrielino	4.0	1.0	3.0	4.0	2.0
North Central	King City	5.0	3.0	3.0	0.0	2.0
North Coast	Del Norte	7.0	3.0	3.0	6.0	0.0
	Zoe Barnum	8.0	3.0	0.0	2.0	2.0
Sierra Cascade	Anderson	6.0	4.0	4.0	7.0	4.0
	Portola	3.0	2.0	2.0	5.0	2.0
Southern Coast	Herbert Hoover	9.0	2.0	3.0	4.0	3.0
	SELF	8.0	2.0	4.0	2.0	3.0
	Southwest	4.0	2.0	2.0	3.0	3.0
	Mean (sd)	5.7 (2.2)	2.3 (1.1)	3.3 (1.4)	4.1 (2.1)	2.1 (1.5)
	Median	5.5	2.0	3.0	4.0	2.0

Table A 17 – Paired t-tests: Comparisons of environmental assessment scores for original regional sites. (N=11)

	Mean '97-'98 (sd)	Mean '98-'99 (sd)	t	Significance
Healthy Foods Score	5.18 (2.04)	7.09 (2.34)	-3.3	.008*
Healthy Eating Promotion Score	2.82 (1.47)	2.82 (1.25)	.00	1.00
School Physical Activity Score	2.82 (1.83)	3.09 (1.51)	.39	.706
After-School Physical Activity Score	5.36 (2.65)	4.45 (2.38)	2.3	.043*
Physical Activity Promotion Score	3.55 (1.63)	2.36 (1.75)	2.4	.034*

*p<.05

Table A 18 – Paired t-tests: Comparisons of environmental assessment scores for Round I sites. (N=8)

	Mean '98-'99 Baseline (sd)	Mean '98-'99 School year-end (sd)	t	Significance
Healthy Foods Score	3.59 (1.65)	5.09 (1.85)	-5.0	.000**
Healthy Eating Promotion Score	.86 (.89)	2.27 (.94)	-5.7	.000**
School Physical Activity Score	2.45 (1.34)	3.32 (1.13)	-2.2	.041*
After-School Physical Activity Score	3.90 (2.23)	3.95 (1.80)	-.12	.905
Physical Activity Promotion Score	1.41 (.85)	1.82 (1.30)	-1.4	.175

*p<.05; **p<.001