

**An Evaluation of King County School District's
Wellness Policies**

By:
Shaila Davis

A capstone project presented in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in Policy Studies,
Interdisciplinary Arts and Sciences

University of Washington, Bothell 2013

Table of Contents

Abstract	3
Chapter 1-Purpose Of The Study	4
<i>State the Problem</i>	4
<i>Justification of importance of study</i>	4
Chapter 2-Literature Review.....	7
Chapter 3-Methodology.....	14
<i>Policy Evaluation Procedures</i>	15
<i>Survey Procedures</i>	16
Chapter 4-Results	19
Chapter 5-Discussion.....	27
<i>Policy Implications</i>	30
References	32
Appendix A.....	36
Appendix B	37

Abstract

The aim of this study is to evaluate the wellness policies in King County's nineteen school districts. The evaluation of current wellness policies (2013) was compared to an evaluation done in 2009 by University of Washington public health students. To supplement, a small number of King County principals were asked to complete a short survey. Results of the evaluations showed many changes regarding district's policies from 2009 to present. For example, regarding the items "*nutrition education teaches skills that are behavior-focused*" and "*nutrition education quality addressed,*" both were reported to be strong in 2009, however their emphases in current policies have gone down. In contrast, the item "*nutrition education integrated into other subjects beyond health*" increased from 2009 to present. The introduction to the Healthy Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 impacted the overall strength of King County wellness policies. The strength of written policies is not a determinant of how successful these policies are being implemented; further research is needed to assess impact of wellness policies.

Chapter 1-Purpose Of The Study

State the Problem

Due to the increase in childhood and adolescent obesity, Congress enacted a law requiring all State school districts to craft wellness policies to combat the growing rates of obesity and to get school-aged children active and engage in their own nutrition. While one evaluation of King County's policies has been conducted, further evaluation is needed to a) assess if districts are maintaining these policies, and b) evaluate perceived impact of the wellness programs.

Justification of importance of study

The United States is experiencing an epidemic of rising rates of overweight and obese school-aged children. An estimated 1/3 of American children and youth are either obese or at-risk of becoming obese (Brescoll, et al 2008). In a landscape where food intake and portion size is increasing, this is becoming a growing concern. The rates of childhood obesity have tripled since the 1960s, with more than 33.3% of youth are now at-risk of obesity (DeMattia, et al 2008). The increase in childhood obesity rates have also increased obesity related diseases such as type 2 diabetes, hyperinsulinemia, hypertension, dyslipidemia, joint abnormalities, polycystic ovarian syndrome, nonalcoholic fatty liver disease, and sleep disturbances (DeMattia, et al 2008). The cost of treating these diseases may have contributed to an increase in total spending in health care.

Information from the Center for Disease Control's (CDC's) Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) provided general data on Washington State as a whole. Examining rates of obesity and overweight rates in Washington in 2009 and 2010, CDC data suggest that overweight rates were around 35% and obese rates were around 26% (Washington State Fact

Sheet, 2010). Using the same database, the national and Washington State data in 2010, were very similar; overweight rates were around 36% and obese rates were 28%. Information from the BRFSS doesn't provide information for school-aged children specifically; however, the numbers do give a good overview of Washington State's obesity rates. Figures from the 2010 Washington State Healthy Youth Survey (HYS) provided data regarding the obesity and overweight rates for school-aged children in 6th, 8th, 10th and 12th grades. The survey, "measures health risk behaviors that contribute to morbidity, mortality, and social problems among youth in Washington State" (HYS, 2011). According to the 2010 Factsheet, the overweight and obesity rates among 8th, 10th and 12th graders has been increasing at a relatively small rate, but has been rising since 2004 (Washington State Fact Sheet, 2010). In 2004, 8th, 10th and 12th grade obesity rates were relatively low at 6, 9, and 11 percent, respectively. In 2010, the rates of 8th and 10th graders increased slightly to 8 and 10 percent, however 12th grade decreased marginally to 8%. The 2010 Factsheet looked at both male and female students, but didn't take into account other factors, besides grade level. Compared to Washington State, obesity and overweight rates in King County are lower for grades 8, 10, and 12 (HYS, 2011).

A study looking more specifically at King County, completed by the National Institute of Health, looked at socio-economic status in King County zip codes. The study, "aimed to determine whether obesity rates at the zip code level in King County, WA, were linked to area-based measure of race/ethnicity, income, poverty, and property" (Drewnowski, et al, 2007). There are over 1.7 million residents in King County, the largest county in Washington State. The study used information from the BRFSS and looked at the seventy-four zip codes in King County. One key result from the study indicated that, "median house value was a significant predictor of obesity prevalence at the zip code level" (Drewnowski et al, 2007). In the study,

their findings found higher rates of obesity in the South West region of King County, covering zip codes in Renton, Auburn and Federal Way.

Targeting the increase in obesity rates among school-aged children, Congress has worked to introduce a law that would help combat these rising rates. The introduction of a mandated wellness policies was created in 2004, under the Child Nutrition and Women, Infants and Children (WIC) Reauthorization Act. All school districts participating in the National School Lunch program or School Breakfast Program, which offers school lunches and breakfasts at a reduced or free price to low-income kids, would have to create a wellness policy by the 2006-2007 school year. The wellness policies were created to help fight the rising rates of obesity and the absence of nutritional foods available to school-aged children. The main focus of these policies were physical activity and nutritional information/education. School districts were tasked with creating and implementing new curriculum and standards for their lunch and breakfast programs, as well as physical education and nutrition programs. School's have an opportunity to impact school-age children, they "can play [a] role by altering various policies and practices to provide a healthful school environment, ensuring coordination of a comprehensive nutrition education program, providing well-run child nutrition programs, and engaging the support of community partners" (Longley et al, 2009).

A previous evaluation from the University of Washington (UW) assessed the wellness policies of the nineteen school districts in King County. Students in the UW Public Health School evaluated policies in 2009, using an assessment tool developed by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. The group in addition, conducted in-person interviews with school district staff or board members, asking specifically about whether the policies would make an impact. However the evaluation did not look deep into whether implementation of these policies was

occurring. The evaluation also occurred before a new law was established that effected what was to be included in school wellness policies.

Chapter 2-Literature Review

In 2005, an estimated 9 million school-aged children were considered obese; obesity is found in all 50 States affecting all levels of social and economic levels (United States Congress, 2008). Lower income communities have higher rates of obesity which may be due to the lack of affordable, healthful foods and opportunities for physical activity. Our nation is often fed by unhealthy fast food, and our jobs are often sedentary in nature, lacking time or opportunities for physical activity. Once adulthood is reached, changes are hard to make, therefore it is important to instill healthy behaviors in our youth (United States Congress, 2008).

Schools have a unique opportunity to influence school-aged children through federal regulations. Eating habits are developed at a young age and can have a lasting impact on children; therefore it is important that children learn about good nutrition early in life. By instilling healthy eating habits during the school years, this “assures that individuals have the information and skills they need to protect and enhance their own health and the health of their families” (Celebuski et al, 1996). In 2002, 31 states did not have competitive food policies in place. By August of 2006, 39 states considered or enacted some type of legislation regarding nutritional quality of school food or beverages (Longley et al, 2009). In-school efforts to encourage students to live healthier lives requires more than changing what foods are offered during lunch, “[Schools] must also provide the knowledge and the skills that enable children to make choices that lead to nutritious diet and improved health” (Celebuski et al, 1996). In a study looking at nutrition education curriculum, the authors found that elementary schools tended to offer nutrition education within total school curriculum (Celebuski et al, 1996).

There have been studies done to measure the impact wellness policies have had on school environments. Policies stemming from these studies have been responsible for increased accessibility to fresh fruits and vegetables and lower access to unhealthful foods (Schwartz et al, 2012). In a study by Chriqui and colleagues (2013), they looked at a national sample of school districts and found that there was a diverse mix of wellness policies. However the current wellness policies were underdeveloped, fragmented or lacked sufficient plans for monitoring and implementing (2013). Wellness policies are only effective if successfully implemented, therefore, if school districts have written all-encompassing policies but do not follow-through in making changes, the language has no purpose. However, if policies are written with clear and concise language, they may have a better chance of being implemented than policies with weak or vague language (Schwartz et al, 2012).

Schools districts that participated in the federal nutrition program were mandated in 2004 to create wellness policies. To design these policies, stakeholders were brought together including school board members, district staff, school health councils, and teachers. The stakeholders' goals were to create new wellness policies, and ensure that the policy met requirements or exceeded standards. According to the mandate, school districts that take part in the National School Lunch Program or the School Breakfast Program were required to promote healthy eating through nutritional standards. The mandate created through the WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004, allowed school districts to set minimal standards to reach compliance. However, a problem arose because the minimal standards that school districts were required to meet may not have increased the opportunity for physical activity and health eating (Belansky, et al, 2010). Therefore each school district's wellness policies were, and still are developed differently and incorporate varying standards.

In 2010, Congress signed into law the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act (HHFKA). The focus of the new legislation was to improve nutritional quality of foods and to strengthen school wellness policies (Prokop, et al, 2011). The new law created more specificity with regards to nutritional standards in federal meal programs, including the National School Lunch Program, the School Breakfast Program, after school meal programs, and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program. Subsequently these programs were run through schools and have had to be incorporated into wellness programs. Therefore, school districts needed to re-assess their previous wellness policies to ensure they were meeting guidelines from the HHFKA 2010. Under the new law, schools must meet new nutrition standards incorporating, “limits on fat, saturated fat and content requirements for protein, vitamins, and minerals” (Healthy, Hunger Free Kids Act of 2010). Additionally the law stipulates that food served outside of the federal meal programs, will need to establish nutrition standards by the Secretary of Agriculture. Since school children can still access food from vending machines, or a la carte style meals, school districts will have to incorporate rules and regulations regarding outside food on their campuses within their wellness policies, also known as competitive foods.

In 2010, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) announced changes to policies regarding foods served on school campuses outside of the federally funded school meal programs. In requirements of the HHFKA, the USDA established nutrition standards for all foods sold in schools. The first step in this process was to develop the *Smart Snacks in Schools* rule. Highlights from the USDA’s proposal include, more nutritious foods such as whole grains, low fat dairy, and, fruits and vegetables as healthy snacks. Increasing snack food items that are lower in fat, sugar, and sodium, and also providing variation to differing age groups with regards to portion size and caffeine content, were also included in the USDA’s proposal. There was also

a goal to assure that parents were still provided with opportunities to pack student lunches and provide treats for class birthday parties or celebrations. While the proposal stated that these rules would apply to food served during the school day, foods served afterschool were not subject to these requirements. The USDA provides local and state communities autonomy by establishing minimum requirements, but encouraging states and schools that have stronger standards to keep their own standards. Lastly, the standards put forth in the USDA proposal would not require implementation for a full school year, during which time comments from the general public, schools, and vendors were encouraged (USDA, 2013).

As a result of the rising rates of obesity among school-aged children throughout King County school districts, policymakers have created a number of wellness policies stemming from the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004. Through these wellness policies, school districts have created guidelines to encourage school kids to become more physically active, have access to healthful food, and become more educated about their own nutrition. Congress recognized that schools could play a vital role in promoting health and preventing childhood obesity. The 2004 mandate stated that school district needed to address these issues within their wellness policies:

1. Nutrition guidelines for all foods available on campus during the day
2. Goals for nutrition education, physical activity, and other school-based activities
3. Assurance that the district's guidelines for reimbursable school meals were not to be less restrictive than federal regulations
4. A plan for measuring the implementation of wellness policies, including the designation of staff responsible for policy implementation

(Agron et al, 2009).

There are a variety of policies throughout King County school districts, most of which include detailed outlines of what to include in meals and foods offered at schools, and that also include some type of physical activity option. Even the more basic policies have opportunities for schools to provide more nutritional food and provide school children with more opportunities to be physically active. However, almost all of the policies do not have a detailed plan of how the policy will be evaluated or monitored, the best written suggestions include an “report-on” the policy implementation from an advisory committee once a year or “periodically” (Buhl et al, 2009).

A previous evaluation of King County wellness policies conducted by graduate students from Public Health and Community Medicine at the University of Washington, was completed in 2009. The evaluation was written after, “Washington State Senate Bill 5093 introduced wellness-related goals to be met by 2010” (Buhl et al, 2009). The purpose was to provide the King County Board of Health, School Obesity Prevention Committee, with recommendations to give to the Board of Health regarding school wellness policies. The study provided the committee with a policy brief for potential action items and also provided information from their quantitative data. The students used a Robert Wood Johnson Foundation evaluation tool, which assessed policies based on 96 different policy items that should be included in wellness policies. The evaluation consisted of seven different sections: “Nutrition Education, Standards for USDA Child Nutrition Programs and Schools Meals, Nutritional Standards for Competitive and Other Foods and Beverages, Physical Education, Physical Activity, Communication and Promotion, and Evaluation” (Buhl et al, 2009). The evaluation assessed the policies and found that the wellness policies were strong on nutrition education, however they were less descriptive on USDA standards and competitive foods. The evaluators used a coding method to score the items, 0, 1, or

2. Where “0” meant the item was not mentioned, “1” meant the item was reference by a weak statement and a score of “2” meant that the item was strongly referred to. The graduate students used Stata statistical software to compare the districts among one another. The study also collected more information about the school districts, including number of students, percentage of students who qualify for Free and Reduced-Price School Meals, student demographics, and WASL scores. The evaluation also conducted qualitative, in-person interviews with a selection of stakeholders, including nutrition services administrator, health and fitness coordinator, school board members and superintendents. The open-ended questions asked about the policies themselves, what was included and whether or not each stakeholder felt that these were the right requirements to have the most impact. The interviews were focused on learning about the interviewees experience with the wellness policies, their opinions about successes in developing policies and suggestions for the Board of Health. The interviewers did ask one or two questions regarding implementation, however this was not the main focus of the interviews and the results did not shed much light on barriers or successes that school districts had experience with integrating their wellness policies. The interviews asked respondents about the Senate Bill 5093 with 31 who expressed knowledge about the bill while 24 did not. Only one respondent stated successful implementation of contents of the bill in their wellness policy. The interviewers also asked questions regarding evaluation and monitoring of the school district wellness policy. Ten school districts did not have a formal program to monitor policies. Eight districts had no monitoring system at all, while three of the districts had a complete evaluation and reports available. The largest portion of the interview questions was regarding suggestions for the Board of Health. The result of the 2009 UW evaluation included ninety-seven recommendations, spilt into nine different categories: fiscal, materials and resources; best practices and evaluation;

general guidance; accountability; marketing of knowledge; advocacy; coordination and facilitation; and miscellaneous.

The 2009 evaluation ended with a comparison to previous policies, keeping in mind that any previous policies were not mandated prior to 2004. After the new law in 2004, the study found a large increase in number of districts having policies surrounding different nutritional and physical activity policies. The study recommended that the Board of Health make aware their availability to help with implementation of school wellness policies by forming partnership within schools and districts (Buhl et al, 2009). The study also recommended seven different items further assessed, including: coordinate funding; facilitate access to curriculum and resources; marketing and disseminate knowledge to the community; promote enthusiasm and participation within districts; advance district accountability; provide self-evaluation tools to districts; and facilitate exchange of best practice information (Buhl et al, 2009). The recommendations pointed out areas where school districts needed more assistance and guidance to fully implement wellness policies, including more support to advocate for funding from state and federal opportunities. The study also pointed out areas where school districts need support with proven curriculum and with integration among the individual schools. Lastly, school districts should aim for accountability and evaluation through self-evaluation tools and accountability between schools and individual staff members (Buhl, et al., 2009).

This study plans to re-assess the wellness policies in King County's nineteen different school districts. The introduction of the new Healthy Hunger-Free Kids law in 2010 may have produced changes to policies that warrant another look at the wellness policies in King County school districts to determine whether the school districts have updated their policies. Using the evaluation tool created by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, the study intends to assess

current policies, and compare previous policies to determine whether there were any changes made. In addition, this survey aims to collect data on principal's knowledge of wellness policies.

Chapter 3-Methodology

This comparative case study plans to look at the nineteen different school districts' wellness policies in King County, Washington (WA), which include Auburn, Bellevue, Enumclaw, Federal Way, Highline, Issaquah, Kent, Lake Washington, Mercer Island, Northshore, Renton, Riverview, Seattle, Shoreline, Skykomish, Snoqualmie, Tahoma, Tukwila, and Vashon Island. To find the wellness policies each individual school districts' website was explored because this is how the general public would gain access to policies. Over half of the school districts had wellness policies posted on their school websites. For the other half the website, http://healthyschools.ospi.k12.wa.us/waschool/wellness_policies/wa_policies.html was used. This site had the policies for all the King County school districts listed. Part of this research aims to look at previous wellness policies, that were used in a 2009 evaluation conducted by a group of Public Health graduate students from the University of Washington. The 2009 evaluation was conducted before the 2010 Healthy, Hunger-Free Act went into effect, therefore differences between the 2009 analyses and the present study may be expected. In order to find wellness policies from 2009 or older, search engines, such as Google will be used. Therefore, comparisons and differences between the current and previous wellness policies will be analyzed.

Policy Evaluation Procedures

An aim of this study was to conduct an evaluation of the wellness policies of the nineteen different school districts in King County, WA. The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation produced the evaluation tool used in this study.¹ The evaluation sheet had seven sections:

1. Nutrition Education
2. Standards for USDA Child Nutrition Programs and School Meals
3. Nutrition Standards for Competitive and Other Foods and Beverages
4. Physical Education
5. Physical Activity
6. Communication and Promotion
7. Evaluation

Following methods developed for the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation evaluation tool, the wellness policies for each school district were scored with a 0, 1, or 2 on each of the 96 evaluation items. A zero meant that the item was not included in the text of the policy. A one was considered to be a weak statement, when the item is mentioned however the policy is vague, unclear or confusing. A one can also be assigned if the item is mentioned but is listed as a suggestion or recommendation. Lastly, a two is given if the policy statement meets or exceeds expectations, when the item is clearly stated using strong language and can be understood that policy makers are committed to making the item happen.

After the scores of the current 2013 wellness policies were evaluated, those scores were inputted into an Excel document, along with the scores from the University of Washington 2009 evaluation. The seven sections were broken apart in order to assess them individually. Once all ninety-six evaluation items were assessed, a summary was created to assess change with regards

¹ Robert Wood Johnson Foundation evaluation tool
<http://yaleruddcenter.org/resources/upload/docs/what/communities/SchoolWellnessPolicyEvaluationTool.pdf>

to each policy item between the 2009 assessment and the 2013 evaluation, shown in Appendix B. There were nine different possible change combinations, 0-0, 0-1, 0-2, 1-0, 1-1, 1-2, 2-0, 2-1 or 2-2. The combinations were color coded in order to provide an easily viewable way to see relationships and spot where items were clearly missing, increased or decreased in occurrence. A summary was used to count the frequency of each possible combination, including all school districts, for each of the seven evaluation sections. Then for each policy statement there was a summary count to add up the number of times that the item was mentioned at Time 1 (i.e., by how many school districts in the 2009 evaluation), and the number of times an item was mentioned at Time 2 (i.e., 2013 evaluation). Lastly, a section summary was produced that added up two scenarios. One, a count of the number of times an item was missing in both evaluations or decreased in prominence (change scores; 0-0, 1-0, 2-1, 2-0). Two, a count of items that had change scores suggesting the same prominence in both evaluations, or that increased from time 1 to time 2 (change scores: 1-1, 2-2, 0-1, 0-2, 1-2).

Survey Procedures

A supplemental survey was conducted to complement the evaluation; the survey was used to better understand the application of wellness policies at the local level. This final step in the research aimed to reach out to local King County school principals. King County principals were asked to participate in the survey because of the authority they hold within their schools. Principals may have the power to move both teachers and school culture to be more involved in a policy. To better assess how familiar, involved or committed principals are in wellness policies, the survey consisted of questions regarding implementation and knowledge of wellness policy. A similar analysis in Colorado surveyed elementary school principals to better understand whether wellness policies were written and being enforced (Belansky et al, 2010). Working off the same

method, principals were randomly selected to assess whether the type of school or the area, affected principal's knowledge of wellness policies. Another study in Connecticut surveyed principals before and after the writing and implementation of wellness policies to better understand how successful implementation was (Schwartz et al, 2012). Their survey was created to better understand whether principals were invested in implementing wellness policies.

In order to ensure that every principal within the King County school districts has an equal opportunity of participating, ten principals will be randomly selected from each of the following groups: elementary, middle schools, and high schools. The random selection was comprised of an equal amount of elementary, middle and high school principals. The survey was conducted online, using Survey Monkey. Once the survey was created, it was distributed to the selected principals. Understanding that participation in research surveys can be low, it was hoped that around fifteen principals would complete the online questionnaire.

To begin data collection, an Excel spreadsheet was created to list all King County public school names, school district, city, and principal's contact information. Also included was a notes column to write any useful information, such as schools who serve K-8, or schools with multiple principals. Schools were separated into the type of school (elementary, middle school, or high school), and then were organized into three different spreadsheet tabs. The information was organized alphabetically by school district, then alphabetically by school name. In order to obtain this information for all nineteen different school districts in King County, information from school website's was used. The district's websites listed all the elementary, middle and high schools within a certain district's lines. After completing the initial list in the Excel spreadsheet, school websites were used to obtain the principal's contact information.

After all school data was collected, the next step was to randomly select school principals whom would be invited to participate in the survey. Each school was assigned an individual integer. In order to select the ten schools from each type, a website called Random Integer Set Generator² was used. The website allowed for the entry of the desired number of schools for each sub-type as well as the number of random integers to be generated. This function was used three times, among the 285 elementary schools, 83 middle schools, and 82 high schools. After ten random numbers for each school type were chosen, the selected schools were marked on the spreadsheet with yellow highlight.

Survey Monkey was used to create an online survey that included ten questions total. The survey questions are presented in Appendix A. A study participation email was crafted that could be customized for each individual principal and each school type. The initial study invitation emails were sent out in early February, and after a few weeks, a reminder email was sent out to the principals asking for their participation with the survey. A final email was sent out in late March, to principals who had yet to respond to the survey.

The survey questions were devised to reflect questions used in similar studies, primarily working off questions used by the 2009 evaluation (Buhl et al, 2009). Also, a similar study conducted by Belansky and colleagues (2012), asked related questions in Colorado regarding principals' knowledge of wellness policies. In a similar study in Connecticut, principals were asked a number of questions related to barriers and implementation of wellness policies, and questions about the written policies themselves. Through the review of these comparable studies, questions were developed to complement previous studies questions, using related barriers, scales and questions.

² Random Integer Set Generator <http://www.random.org/integer-sets/>

This study involved direct interaction with human subjects via email; the University of Washington Institutional Review Board (IRB) was contacted to ask if an IRB application and review were necessary prior to sending out the survey. Based on the IRB response, it was deemed not to be necessary, as the results of the survey were not intended to result in “generalizable knowledge,” therefore did not meet the definition of research required for IRB approval.

Chapter 4-Results

Wellness Policy Evaluation: Current Policies

There are nineteen different King County wellness policies ranging in thoroughness and length. All of the policies describe nutrition standards in meals, physical education and nutrition education. Almost all of the districts have written comprehensive policies including measures to reduce unhealthful food throughout their schools. This includes provisions such as limiting the amount of fat a food can have if it is to be served to school-aged children. Some school districts, like Issaquah, clearly crafted specific provisions for food sold outside of federal meal programs, such as those sold in vending machines or snack bars. They have written requirements, such as “beverage vending machines and beverages sold in student stores at secondary schools must include at least 50% water, low or non-fat milk and/or juice products” (Issaquah School District Wellness Policy). Strategies or policies around health education are more vague, with over half of the school districts outlining requirements for making physical activity available, but not outlining how that will be completed or what that should look like. Issaquah has gone a step further in their policy and has outlined measures to get family and community involved in the transition to a more healthful school environment. The school district also was more descriptive

on what evaluation would look like, describing when there would be an evaluation and what it would measure.

Other districts, such as the Snoqualmie School District, outlined more specifically what type of sweets and unhealthful food can be provided, including candies and marshmallows. The Snoqualmie district also outlines physical activity standards in more detail, incorporating how it will be implemented during recess, before and after school, and through a change in school environment. A school district that has a less detailed wellness policy is the Shoreline School District. The policy isn't poorly written and it does include requirements for the main issues, however their outline is vague, only describing what beverages will be allowed in schools, and not nutritional factors that need to be met. In addition, it does not communicate how outside food will be addressed. The Shoreline policy is more heavily weighted on providing physical activity and education, providing options for schools to implement a physical education program. The Riverview School District was heavy on nutrition requirements, breaking down each school level, detailing specific guidelines for elementary, middle school and high schools that are more relatable to the student population. Their requirements include, "at least 3 grams of protein" for all school students or "contain 275 or fewer calories; no more than 10% of combined calories will be derived from saturated fat, and eliminate trans fat" (Riverview School District Wellness Policy).

Comparative Evaluation of 2009 and 2013 Wellness Policies

Comparative results from the 2013 evaluation showed differences and similarities to the 2009 UW study. Complete tables for these comparisons can be found in Appendix B. The summaries provided an opportunity to make notes about the items that were missing, increasing in strength or decreasing in strength from time one (2009) to time two (2013). The first section of

the evaluation tool, nutrition education, included an item assessing if a policy “includes goals for nutrition education that are designed to promote student wellness in a manner that the local education agency determines is appropriate.” This item was the most consistent and strong statement in that section. Two items in the nutrition education section, “specifies number of nutrition education courses or contact hours” and “district provides nutrition education training for teachers,” were consistently missing at both times. The item, “nutrition education is integrated into other subjects beyond health education” had the largest increase in statement presence, while item seven, “ nutrition education teaches skills that are behavior-focused, interactive, and/or participatory” had a consistent score across districts but decreased in strength.

The second section assessed statements regarding standards for USDA child nutrition programs and school meals. This section included sixteen policy statements to be evaluated. The first statement, “assures that guidelines for reimbursable school meals shall not be less restrictive than USDA school meal regulations” was the most consistent and strong statement. “Addresses access to an/or promotion of the Summer Food Service Program” was a consistently missing statement. The largest increase in statement presence was item thirteen, “address nutrition stands for school meals beyond USDA minimum standards.” The item, which states, “addresses access to hand washing before meals” was most consistently missing in both time periods, while the statement “requires nutrition qualifications for school food service staff” was regularly missing in the 2009 evaluation but increased weakly in 2013.

The third and largest section, nutrition standards for competitive and other foods and beverages, contained twenty-nine different policy items. Overall, the section had mixed combinations of change scores with very few straightforward conclusions. For the items, “regulates vending machines” and “regulates school stores,” half the policy statements remained

strong statements, while a third increased from weak statements to strong. Whereas items regarding “limiting calories per serving size of beverages” and “limiting sugar or calories in flavored milk” were both consistently missing in the 2009 evaluation, they increased in strength in 2013, but only moderately.

The next section was physical education, which consists of sixteen policy items and had clear consistent relationships. Item fifty-two, “addresses physical education curriculum for each grade level” remain consistently strong from time one to time two. “Addressing physical education for elementary school students” remained weak statements for eleven of the districts while the other districts increased to strong statements. This pattern was also seen with addressing time per week for physical education of middle school students remaining weak from 2009 to 2013, or increasing in strength to a strong statement. Although statements addressing physical education for high schoolers were all but missing in time one, such statements increased in strength to at least weak statement or strong statement by time 2. Including a policies that specifies competency assessments for students and “addresses physical education classes, courses, or credits as an important part of the curriculum,” both were items that decreased across the board from a strong statement to weak. Both statements, “physical education program promotes inclusive play” and “addresses teacher-student ratio physical education” remained consistently missing at both evaluations.

Physical activity was the fifth section, containing ten policy statements to be evaluated. The first statement, “includes goals for physical activity that are designed to promote student wellness in a manner that the local education agency determines appropriate” consistently decreased in strength, from strong to weak. Opportunities for physical activity for every grade level was either consistently missing, or was a weak statement in time one but increased in

strength by time two. Occasions for staff to be physically active and providing safe and active routes to schools remained missing in both evaluations.

The sixth section was communication and promotion, which consists of twelve policy statements. The item regarding staff wellness programs specifically to address health of staff was consistently missing in time one and remained missing in ten of the district policies at time two. Eight districts increased to weak statements, with only one receiving a score for a strong statement. In addition, the statement specifying restricting marketing of unhealthy choices was consistently missing in time one, and increased weakly or remained missing at time two. The item, “specifies who in the district is responsible for wellness/health communication beyond required policy implementing reporting” also was constantly missing in both evaluations. The statement regarding addressing consistency of nutrition communication decreased in strength from time one to time two, going from strong to weak statements.

The final section evaluation was the smallest section with only six policy statements to evaluate. The first item, “establish a plan for measuring implementation of the local educational agency or at each school, as appropriate, charged with operational responsibility for ensuring that the school meets the local wellness policy,” remained overall a strong statement, while identifying funding support for activities and evaluation remained missing in both time one and time two.

This capstone evaluation also included a summary for each of the seven evaluation sections in order to provide conclusions about how each section has improved or remained the same; Table 1 shows the results below. For each section, the total number of change scores across the nineteen school districts was compiled. For the first section, with a total of one hundred and seventy answers, ninety-six items remained the same between 2009 and 2013, or

increased in strength, while the other seventy-four statements were missing or decreased in strength. The second section, regarding school meals, had a total of two hundred thirty-nine answers, over half of which increased in prominence or remained the same. The others decreased or remained missing. The third and largest evaluation section, with a total of five hundred fifteen responses, had sixty-five percent of evaluation items scored the same or increased in strength. The remaining thirty-five percent was still missing or decreased in strength from 2009 to 2013. The fourth section, regarding physical education, had a total of three hundred-five sets of responses with over half remaining the same or increasing in strength. The over forty-six percent continued to be missing or decreased. The fifth section, communication and promotion, had a total of two hundred fifteen responses with a much closer divide between the two categories. There were only slightly more items that increased in strength or stayed the same, then items that decreased in prominence or were missing in both evaluations. The last section on evaluation was the smallest section with one hundred seven responses. Again, only a slight majority of district responses stayed the same or increased in prominence compared to items where the statements decreased or remained missing.

Table 1.

Summary Count Wellness Policy Evaluation Results		
	Policy items that were missing at both assessments or decreased prominence (0-0, 1-0, 2-1, 2-0)	Policy items with same prominence at both assessments, or that increased (1-1, 2-2, 0-1, 0-2, 1-2)
Nutrition Education	74	97
USDA Food Standards	99	147
Nutrition Standards	177	374
Physical Education	147	176
Physical Activity	83	107
Communication & Promotion	106	122
Wellness Policy Evaluation	52	62

Survey Responses

Six principals completed the survey with varying answers to the ten questions. Among the responses there were two elementary schools and four high schools. Survey questions are presented in Appendix A. For the questions regarding rating the principal's knowledge of, and views regarding the implementation of the district's wellness policy, results can be seen in Table 2. The elementary school principals had much less or no knowledge of the policy, where as the high school principals reported average or above average knowledge.

Table 2.

How would you rate your knowledge of district's wellness policy? (1=No knowledge, 2=Some knowledge, 3=Average, 4=Above average, 5=Very knowledgeable)	
Type of School	Rate
Elementary	1
Elementary	1
High School	3
High School	1
High School	4
High School	3

The principals specified time, difficulty in breaking student habits, a focus on academic subjects and loss of revenue from competitive food sales as the biggest barriers to implementing their school districts' wellness policies, which can be shown in Table 3. The question regarding barriers to implementing wellness policies was most often marked with a focus on other academic subjects and testing as the biggest barrier. Concerning the same question, none of the six principals marked cultural barriers or staff, parents, students and community not prioritizing the wellness policy.

Table 3.

Which one barrier do you feel has impacted your school's ability to implement school district's wellness policy?	
School Type	Top Barrier
Elementary	
Elementary	Time
High School	Loss of revenue from competitive sales
High School	
High School	Difficulty in breaking student habits
High School	Focus on academic subjects

The question about the challenges in implementing nutrition education suggested that funding for teaching materials, lack of staff training, and competition with other core learn

requirements were the biggest barriers. Implemented nutritional education curriculum, accounting for culture and language differences and not knowing if children are receiving health messages were not marked as challenges to implementing nutrition education curriculum in schools. The top challenges, as noted by the six principals were time, difficulty teaching against learned behaviors in the home, and two stated competition with other core learning requirements, shown in the table below.

Table 4.

Which one challenge has impacted your school in implementing a nutrition education curriculum?	
School Type	Top Challenge
Elementary	
Elementary	Time
High School	Competition with other core learning requirements
High School	
High School	Difficulty teaching against learned behaviors in the home
High School	Competition with other core learning requirements

Two of the principals reported being part of an active wellness or health advisory committee. The last question asked principals to briefly describe steps they have taken to implement or evaluate their wellness policy. Four of the principals wrote a description that discussed their food programs. Two included new health lunch programs and another comments about how to regulate student stores with more nutritious options.

Chapter 5-Discussion

The importance of wellness policies extends beyond providing students with access to healthful foods and physical activity opportunities. In a study by Lee and colleagues, (2013), the authors stated that schools have an influence that extends beyond family in “potentially reducing

obesity among adolescents, particularly among disadvantaged populations.” There is growing research that suggests schools can impact students by giving them opportunities to learn about healthful choices and physical activity. This study has shown that the evaluation between 2009 and present show an overall increase in strength of wellness policy.

The last section of the evaluation, in regards to, *wellness policy evaluation and implementation* had the largest missing or weak statements in both 2009 and present evaluations. Schools have an opportunity to impact student’s behaviors and nutrition, “evidence that school-based obesity prevention interventions that include physical activity, nutrition, and healthy lifestyle component, along with modifications to school provided meals are associated with improvements in health and health behaviors” (Lee et al, 2013). Wellness policies are only successful at improving student behavior if their policies are effectively implemented and evaluated. This capstone study found that school districts repeatedly had strong statements regarding having a “plan” to evaluate the wellness policies however implementing, updating/revising, and funding the policies were much weaker statements. In a study by Schwartz and colleagues (2012), the authors found that the wording of polices makes a difference in implementation; if strong language is used, polices are more likely to be fully implemented (2012).

Based on the survey responses, knowledge of wellness policies may be vague, half the principals had “no knowledge” of their school district’s wellness polices. Also, a focus on wellness policy is not a main emphasis in curriculum. However it is hard to draw generalizable conclusions based on the survey due to the small response rate.

The introduction to the Healthy, Hunger Free Kids Act of 2010 had an effect on wellness policies; nutrition standards remained the same or increased. Nutrition education has the

potential to influence school-aged children within public schools, however this curriculum has often concentrated only in science and health classes (Celebuski et al, 1996). Though, when looking at current policies regarding the policy item of, “incorporating nutrition education in the larger community and within the entire school environment,” King County school districts had mixed responses. School district wellness policies remained relatively weak, however the importance of incorporating nutrition education curriculum is important, especially to create a school environment centered on healthy lifestyles.

The Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act also impacted competitive food standards; the act encouraged schools to reduce the amount and availability of unhealthful, fatty and sugar-high foods. In this study, policy items concerning competitive food standards have increased overall from 2009 to 2013 or remained the same. With the introduction to the act, the United States Department of Agriculture proposed its own standards on competitive foods sold or available during the school day, outside of meal programs and on school campus (Rimkus et al, 2013). The USDA imposed more restrictions on food requirements, outlining the amount of fat, total sugar, and calories competitive foods must meet. These requirements also extended to beverages sold on campuses and items sold as a part of fundraisers. This study has shown that with the establishment of these requirements, local wellness policies have changed their policies regarding competitive foods.

Limitations

This study did encounter a number of limitations. First, as previously stated, the survey had a low response rate. The survey provided information to begin to understand principals’ knowledge and perception of wellness policies, however due to the low response rate; this study could not provide generalizable results. Another limitation that can be drawn from the survey is

that the lack of knowledge principals may have on wellness policies might have impacted the number of responses. The comparative wellness policy evaluation also had limitations. The evaluation process in-and-of itself is subjective; it relies on the raters to make a choice of whether a statement is weak or strong. However, as an offsetting strength, the current study utilized the same methodology as the previous (2009) evaluation therefore this provides a similarity between evaluation processes.

Policy Implications

It is important to focus on assessment; methods to improve the evaluation of wellness policies should be addressed. In order for wellness policies to be the most effective, they need to be implemented and evaluated. “Even if all districts have ideal school wellness policies in place, it is unlikely that this alone will reverse the problem of obesity among our nation’s children if such policies are not implemented at the school level, they will not achieve the goals they are designed to reach” (Brener et al, 2011). Barnes and colleagues conducted a study to measure 6 United States school districts’ wellness policies, and recommended that districts “systematically evaluate the implementation of their wellness policies” (2011). In their conclusion they noted how important measuring the progress and improvements districts are making to implement wellness policies, encouraging districts to involve partners in monitoring and evaluation (Barnes et al, 2011). Large groups of stakeholders are used to effectively evaluate wellness policies, however as stated earlier, these policy statements were weak or missing in school district’s written policies.

In a study by Longley and associates (2009), which assessed the effects of the federal mandate wellness policies in public schools, the authors found that “additional funds are prime barriers to wellness policy implementation.” Funding for implementing and maintaining policies

will be necessary. With the introduction of both the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004 and the Healthy, Hunger Free Kids Act of 2010, schools were asked to minimize opportunities for unhealthy foods, increase availability of nutritious foods during school meal programs and throughout the school day. However neither act increased funding to schools, so while these requirements were issued, the means of increasing or continued funding to carry out these requirements were not raised. Financial support extends beyond offering healthier food items; support is also necessary for professional development and programmatic resources to support implementation (Barnes et al, 2011).

Lastly, it is important to have school administrators knowledgeable about district wellness policies. A barrier to the implementation and success of wellness policies is lack of coordination, including with staff, school administrators and the community (Schwartz et al, 2012). Without backing and support from school administrators, specifically principals schools lack a good advocate to implement these wellness policies, future work may need to be done to better assess principal knowledge.

References

1. Buhl, Amanda, Anna Carroll, Joyce Chen, Amy Hendrickson, Lisa Higin, Meghan Lyle, Kate Murphy, Sandi Navarro, Mario Obara, Elizabeth Payne, Shauna Pirotin, Ophelia Woo. "King County School Districts Wellness Policy Assessment" University of Washington. March 2009: pp.1-58
2. "National School Lunch Program and School Breakfast Program: Nutrition Standards for All Foods Sold in School as Required by the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010, Final Rule." Federal Register 78 (April 1, 2012) 13443-13454. Print.
3. Chriqui JF, Resnick EA, Schneider L, Schermbeck R, Adcock T, Carrion V, Chaloupka FJ. "School District Wellness Policies: Evaluating Progress and Potential for Improving Children's Health Five Years after the Federal Mandate. School Years 2006-07 through 2010-11." Volume 3. Chicago, IL: Bridging the Gap Program, Health Policy Center, Institute for Health Research and Policy, University of Illinois at Chicago, 2013, www.bridgingthegapresearch.org.
4. Rimkus L, Powell LM, Isgor Z, Adetoro ER, Barker DC, Chaloupka FJ. *Beverage Availability in Food Stores Nationwide – A BTG Research Brief*. Chicago, IL: Bridging the Gap Program, Health Policy Center, Institute for Health Research and Policy, University of Illinois at Chicago, 2013. www.bridgingthegapresearch.org
5. "Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004." (PL 108-265, 30 June 2004). United States at Large 204 (2004). Print.
6. United States. Cong. Senate. 108th Congress, 2nd Session. S. 2507. The Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004[Introduced in the U.S. Senate; 7 June 2004]. 108th Cong., 2nd session. Congressional Bill
7. Brener, Nancy D., Jamie F. Chriqui, Terrence P. O'Toloe, Marlene B. Schwartz, Tim McManus. "Establishing a Baseline Measure of School Wellness-Related Policies Implemented in a Nationally Representative Sample of School Districts." *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*. 2011; 111: 894-901.
8. Lee, Hedwig, Kathleen M. Harris, Joyce Lee. "Multiple Levels of Social Disadvantage and Links to Obesity in Adolescence and Young Adulthood." *Journal of School Health*. March 2013, Vol. 83, No. 3. American School Health Association
9. Schwartz, Marlene B, Kathryn E. Henderson, Roberta R. Friedam. Rudd Report School Wellness Policies 2009 The Rudd Center for Food Policy and Obesity, Yale University.
10. Longley, Carol Heard, Jeannie Sneed. "Effects of Federal Legislation on Wellness Policy Formation in School Districts in the United States." *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*. 2009; 109: 95-101.
11. Han-Markey, T.L., L. Wang, S. Schlotterbeck, E.A. Jackson, R. Grum, A. Leidal, K.

- Eagle. "A public school district's vending machine policy and changes over a 4-year period: Implementation of a national wellness policy." University of Michigan. 30 September 2010. *Public Health* 126: 335-337.
12. Schneider, L.M., R.M. Schermbeck, J.F. Chriqui, F.J. Chaloupka. "The Extent to Which School District Competitive Food and Beverage Policies Align with the 2010 Dietary Guidelines for Americans: Implications for Federal Regulations." *Journal of the Academy of Nutritional and Dietetics*. 2 June 2012. Vol. 112, No. 6:892-896.
 13. University of Washington Center for Public Health Nutrition. "WA School Wellness Policies Compliance with Sate and Federal Legislation." Policy Legislation and Nutrition. Brief ll-c 2009. www.cphn.org
 14. Kao, Janice. "Analysis of Washington State School District Nutrition and Fitness Policies." Master of Public Health, University of Washington. 2006
 15. Kumanyika, Shiriki K, Jeffrey P. Koplan, Vivica I. Kraak. "Progress in Preventing Childhood Obesity: How Do We Measure Up?" The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. Obesity Management. December 2006 232-234.
 16. An Act to Reauthorize Child Nutrition Programs, and for Other Purposes (Brief Title: Healthy Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010). (PL 111-296, 13, Dec. 2010). United Sates Statutes at Large 124 (2010): 3183-3266. Print.
 17. United States. Cong. Senate. 111th Congress, 2nd Session. S. 3307, Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010[Introduced in the U.S. Senate; 5, May 2010]. 111th Cong. 2nd sess. Congressional Bills.
 18. Prokop, Jessica L, Patricia Galon. "Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010: An Opportunity for School Nurses to Make a Difference." *The Journal of School Nursing*. 15 June 2011 27: 401-403. DOI: 10.1177/1059840511413390.
 19. Washington State Healthy Youth Survey Fact Sheet. Weight and Obesity for King County.2010. 11-26-2012. www.doh.wa.gov/cfh/nutritionpa
 20. DeMattia, Laure, Shannon Lee Denney "Childhood Obesity Prevention: Successful Community-Based Efforts" *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 2008 615L 83. DOI: 10.1177/0002716207309940.
 21. "School-Meals Makeover Stirs the Pot." *Education Week* 6 April, 2011. Vol. 30. N. 27, pg. 1.
 22. Brescoll, Victoria L. , Rogan Kersh, Kelly D. Brownell. "Assessing the Feasibility and Impact of Federal Childhood Obesity Policies." *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 2008 615: 178-194. DOI: 10.1177/0002716207309189.

23. Masse, Louise C., Marcy M. Fosh, Jamie F. Chriqui, Amy L. Yaroch, Tanya Agurs-Collins, Heidi M. Blanck, Audie A. Atienza, Mary L. McKenna, James F. Igoe. "Development of a School Nutrition-Environment State Policy Classification System (SNESPCS)." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*. October 2007; 33 (4S) 277-291.
24. Drewnowski, Adam, Colin D. Rehm, David Solet "Disparities in obesity rates: Analysis by ZIP code area." *National Institute of Health. Soc Sci Med*. 2007 December; 65(12): 2458-2463. DOI:10.1016/j.socscimed.2007.07.001
25. Desjardins, Elise, Anne L. Schwartz. "Collaborating to Combat Childhood Obesity." *Health Affairs*, 26, no.2 (2007):567-571 DOI:10.1377/hlthaff.26.2.567.
26. Anderson, Patricia M., Kristin F. Butcher. "Childhood Obesity: Trends and Potential Causes." Princeton University. *The Future of Children*, Vol. 16, No. 1, Childhood Obesity (Spring, 2006), pp. 19-45.
27. California School Boards Association. "The New Nutrition Standards: Implications for Student Wellness." Governance & Policy Services. November 2005: pp. 1-5.
28. Agron, Peggy, Victoria Berends, Karen Ellis, Martin Gonzalez. "School Wellness Policies: Perceptions, Barriers, and Needs Among School Leaders and Wellness Advocates." *Journal of School Health*. November 2010, Vol. 80, No. 11: pp. 527-535.
29. Gaines, Alisha B., Steven R. Lonis-Shumate, Sareen S. Gropper. "Evaluation of Alabama Public School Wellness Policies and State School Mandate Implementation." *School Health Policy. Journal of School Health*. May 2010, Vol. 8, No. 5: pp. 281-287.
30. Belansky, Elaine S., Nick Cutforth, Erin DeLong, Jill Litt, Lynn Gilbert, Sharon Scarbro, Bridget Beatty, Cathy Romaniello, Lois Brink, Julie A. Marshall. "Early Effects of the Federally Mandated Local Wellness Policy on School Nutrition Environments Appear Modest in Colorado's Rural, Low-Income Elementary Schools." *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*. May 2010: pp. 1712-1717. DOI: 10.1016.j.jada.2010.08.004.
31. United States. Cong. Senate. Committee on Education and Labor. *Using School Wellness Plans to Help Fight Childhood Obesity Hearing*. 10 May 2007. 110th Cong, 1st sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 2008.
32. Celebuski, Carin, Elizabeth Farris, Westat, Inc. "Nutrition Education in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools." National Center for Education Statistics. July 1996: pp.1-56
33. Schwartz, Marlene B., Kathryn E. Henderson, Jennifer Falbe, Sarah A. Novak, Christopher M. Wharton, Michael W. Long, Meghan L. O'Connell, Susan S. Fiore. "Strength and Comprehensiveness of District School Wellness Policies Predict Policy

Implementation at the School Level." *Journal of School Health*. June 2012, Vol. 82, No.6: pp. 262-267.

34. Pitt Barnes, Seraphine, Leah Robin, Terrence P. O'Toole, Nicola Dawkins, Laura Kettel Khan, Laura C. Leviton. "Results of Evaluability Assessments of Local Wellness Policies in 6 US School Districts." *Journal of School Health*. August 2011, Vol. 81, No. 8: pp. 502-511.
35. Longley, Carol Heard, Jeannie Sneed. "Effects of Federal Legislation on Wellness Policy Formation in School Districts in the United States." *Journal of the American Dietetic Association*. January 2009; 109:95-101.

Appendix A

Survey Questions

1. Please mark the type of your school
 - Elementary
 - Middle
 - High School
2. School name [fill in the blank]
3. How would you rate your knowledge of your district's school wellness policy:
 - No knowledge,
 - Some, but below average knowledge,
 - Average knowledge,
 - Above average knowledge,
 - Very knowledgeable
4. Rate the success your school has had with implementing your school district's Wellness Policy: on a scale of 1-5, 1 being unsuccessful to 5 being successful
5. What do you consider critical barriers to implementing your school district's wellness policy: mark all that apply
 - a) Lack of communication and coordination
 - b) Staff shortages or lack of staff development
 - c) Lack of shared vision and commitment
 - d) A focus on other academic subjects and testing
 - e) Lack of space
 - f) Cultural barriers
 - g) Wellness not cited as a value by staff, parents, students and community
 - h) Wellness not prioritized in curriculum
 - i) Time
 - j) Student preferences for competitive and/or off-campus foods and resistance to change
 - k) Funding
 - l) Lack of resources
 - m) Difficulty in breaking parent, teacher and student habits
 - n) Cost
 - o) Loss of revenue from competitive food sales, impacting clubs, athletics, PTA, etc.
 - p) Other: please list
6. Of the above barriers, which ONE barrier do you feel has impacted your school the most? (if you did not feel that there were any barriers, please write "None")
7. Are you or your school a member of an active school wellness or health advisory committee? Yes or No
8. What have been the main challenges in implementing a nutrition education curriculum in your school? Mark all that apply
 - a) Implemented nutritional education curriculum without a problem
 - b) Finding time in the school day schedule
 - c) Funding for teaching materials or staff training
 - d) Competition with other core learning requirements/not being the main focus
 - e) Scheduling PE requirements in elementary school day schedule
 - f) Not having a standardized or proven curriculum
 - g) Accounting for culture and language differences
 - h) Not knowing if children are receiving [health] messages
 - i) Difficulty teaching against learned behaviors in the home
 - j) Other
9. Of the above challenges, which ONE challenge has impacted your school the most?
10. Please briefly describe any steps your school has taken to monitor or evaluate the wellness policies [fill in the blank]

Appendix B

Nutrition Education Questions

	('09) 1	('13)1	('09) 2	('13)2	('09) 3	('13)3	('09) 4	('13)4	('09) 5	('13)5	('09) 6	('13)6	('09) 7	('13)7	('09) 8	('13)8	('09) 9
Auburn	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	1	2
Belleuve	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	2
Enumclaw	2	2	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	2
Federal Way	2	2	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	0	0	2
Highline	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	2
Issaquah	2	2	1	1	1	0	2	1	1	1	0	2	2	1	0	0	2
Kent	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	2
Lk. Wash.	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	1	2
Mercer Isl.	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	2	1	0	1	2
Northshore	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	2
Renton	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	2	2	1	0	1	2
Riverview	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Seattle	2	2	2	2	1	2	0	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Shoreline	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0
Skykomish	2	2	1	2	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	2	2
Snoqualmie	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	2	1	2	2	2
Tahoma	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	2
Tukwila	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	1	0	1	2	2	0	0	2
Vashon Isl.	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	0	0	2

CODING: 0=item is not mentioned, 1=weak statement is made regarding the item, 2=strong statement is made regarding the item

SUMMARY:

0-0 freq=	0	0-0 freq=	0	0-0 freq=	4	0-0 freq=	5	0-0 freq=	10	0-0 freq=	3	0-0 freq=	1	0-0 freq=	10	0-0 freq=	
0-1 freq=	1	0-1 freq=	2	0-1 freq=	1	0-1 freq=	1	0-1 freq=	2	0-1 freq=	10	0-1 freq=	1	0-1 freq=	5	0-1 freq=	
0-2 freq=	1	0-2 freq=	0	0-2 freq=	1	0-2 freq=	1	0-2 freq=	0	0-2 freq=	2	0-2 freq=	0	0-2 freq=	1	0-2 freq=	
1-0 freq=	0	1-0 freq=	1	1-0 freq=	1	1-0 freq=	1	1-0 freq=	3	1-0 freq=	0	1-0 freq=	0	1-0 freq=	1	1-0 freq=	
1-1 freq=	0	1-1 freq=	6	1-1 freq=	4	1-1 freq=	3	1-1 freq=	3	1-1 freq=	1	1-1 freq=	0	1-1 freq=	0	1-1 freq=	
1-2 freq=	0	1-2 freq=	4	1-2 freq=	2	1-2 freq=	1	1-2 freq=	0	1-2 freq=	2	1-2 freq=	0	1-2 freq=	0	1-2 freq=	
2-0 freq=	0	2-0 freq=	0	2-0 freq=	0	2-0 freq=	0	2-0 freq=	0	2-0 freq=	0	2-0 freq=	1	2-0 freq=	0	2-0 freq=	
2-1 freq=	0	2-1 freq=	1	2-1 freq=	2	2-1 freq=	6	2-1 freq=	0	2-1 freq=	0	2-1 freq=	14	2-1 freq=	0	2-1 freq=	
2-2 freq=	17	2-2 freq=	5	2-2 freq=	4	2-2 freq=	1	2-2 freq=	0	2-2 freq=	1	2-2 freq=	2	2-2 freq=	2	2-2 freq=	

Section 1: Nutrition Education (NutEd)

NutEd1=Goals for nutrition education to promote student wellness

NutEd2=Nutrition curriculum provided for each grade level

NutEd3=Coordinates nutrition education with the larger school community

NutEd4=Nutrition education extends beyond school environment

NutEd5=District provides nutrition education training for teachers

NutEd6=Nutrition education integrated into other subjects beyond health

NutEd7=Nutrition education teaches skills that are behavior-focused

NutEd8=Specifies number of nutrition education courses

NutEd9=Nutrition education quality addressed

USDA Nutrition Programs and School Meals Questions, page 1 of 2

	('09) 10	('13) 10	('09) 11	('13) 11	('09) 12	('13) 12	('09) 13	('13) 13	('09) 14	('13) 14	('09) 15	('13) 15	('09) 16	('13) 16
Auburn	2	2	1	1	0	2	1	2	0	1	1	1	0	1
Bellevue	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Enumclaw	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Federal Way	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	1	0	0
Highline	2	2	1	2	0	2	1	2	0	1	1	1	1	0
Issaquah	2	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	2	1	2	1	0	0
Kent	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lk. Wash.	2	2	1	1	0	0	1	2	1	2	1	2	0	1
Mercer Isl.	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	1
Northshore	2	2	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	1	2	2	1	2
Renton	2	2	2	2	0	1	1	2	0	1	1	1	1	2
Riverview	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	1	1	0	0
Seattle	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	0	1	1	2	1	2
Shoreline	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0
Skykomish	2	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	1	0	0
Snoqualmie	2	2	2	2	0	0	1	2	2	2	1	1	0	0
Tahoma	2	2	2	2	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	1	0	1
Tukwila	2	2	2	2	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	1	1	1
Vashon Isl.	2	2	1	1	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	1	1	2

CODING: 0=item is not mentioned, 1=weak statement is made regarding the item, 2=strong statement is made regarding the item

SUMMARY:

0-0 freq.=	0	0-0 freq.=	4	0-0 freq.=	15	0-0 freq.=	0	0-0 freq.=	3	0-0 freq.=	3	0-0 freq.=	9
0-1 freq.=	0	0-1 freq.=	2	0-1 freq.=	1	0-1 freq.=	2	0-1 freq.=	8	0-1 freq.=	0	0-1 freq.=	3
0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	2	0-2 freq.=	1	0-2 freq.=	2	0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	0
1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	1	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	1	1-0 freq.=	2
1-1 freq.=	0	1-1 freq.=	6	1-1 freq.=	0	1-1 freq.=	4	1-1 freq.=	1	1-1 freq.=	10	1-1 freq.=	2
1-2 freq.=	0	1-2 freq.=	1	1-2 freq.=	0	1-2 freq.=	10	1-2 freq.=	1	1-2 freq.=	1	1-2 freq.=	3
2-0 freq.=	1	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0
2-1 freq.=	2	2-1 freq.=	0	2-1 freq.=	1	2-1 freq.=	1	2-1 freq.=	1	2-1 freq.=	2	2-1 freq.=	0
2-2 freq.=	16	2-2 freq.=	5	2-2 freq.=	0	2-2 freq.=	1	2-2 freq.=	2	2-2 freq.=	2	2-2 freq.=	0

Section 2: USDA Nutrition Programs & School Meals (USDA)

USDA10=Guidelines for reimbursable meals not be less restrictive than USDA meal regulations

USDA11=Addresses access to School Breakfast Program

USDA12=Addresses access to Summer Food Service Program

USDA13=Address nutrition standards for school meals

USDA14=Specifies use of low-fat versions of foods

USDA15=Specifies strategies to increase participation in school meal programs

USDA16=Optimizes scheduling of meals

USDA Nutrition Programs and School Meals Questions, page 2 of 2

	('09) 17	('13) 17	('09) 18	('13) 18	('09) 19	('13) 19	('09) 20	('13) 20	('09) 21	('13) 21	('09) 22	('13) 22
Auburn	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	1
Bellevue	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Enumclaw	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0
Federal Way	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1
Highline	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	2
Issaquah	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	1
Kent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Lk. Wash.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Mercer Isl.	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	2	2	2	2
Northshore	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	2	2	2
Renton	1	2	0	1	0	1	1	1	2	1	0	1
Riverview	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
Seattle	2	2	0	0	1	2	0	1	1	2	0	1
Shoreline	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
Skykomish	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	2	1
Snoqualmie	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	2
Tahoma	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	2	0	1
Tukwila	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	2	0	1
Vashon Isl.	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	0	2	0	1

CODING: 0=item is not mentioned, 1=weak statement is made regarding the item, 2=strong statement is made regarding the item

SUMMARY:

0-0 freq.=	10	0-0 freq.=	15	0-0 freq.=	6	0-0 freq.=	8	0-0 freq.=	4	0-0 freq.=	1
0-1 freq.=	1	0-1 freq.=	2	0-1 freq.=	8	0-1 freq.=	2	0-1 freq.=	6	0-1 freq.=	9
0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	3	0-2 freq.=	2	0-2 freq.=	2	0-2 freq.=	1
1-0 freq.=	2	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	3	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	0
1-1 freq.=	1	1-1 freq.=	0	1-1 freq.=	0	1-1 freq.=	1	1-1 freq.=	1	1-1 freq.=	0
1-2 freq.=	4	1-2 freq.=	1	1-2 freq.=	1	1-2 freq.=	2	1-2 freq.=	0	1-2 freq.=	1
2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0
2-1 freq.=	0	2-1 freq.=	0	2-1 freq.=	0	2-1 freq.=	0	2-1 freq.=	1	2-1 freq.=	2
2-2 freq.=	0	2-2 freq.=	0	2-2 freq.=	0	2-2 freq.=	0	2-2 freq.=	4	2-2 freq.=	4

Section 2: USDA Nutrition Programs & School Meals (USDA)

USDA17=Ensures adequate time to eat

USDA18=Addresses access to hand washing

USDA19=Requires nutrition qualifications for school food service staff

USDA20=Ensures training for food service staff

USDA21=Addresses school meal environment

USDA22=Nutrition info for school meals available

Nutrition Standards for Competitive Foods & Beverages questions, page 1 of 4

	('09) 23	('13)23	('09) 24	('13)24	('09) 25	('13)25	('09) 26	('13) 26	('09) 27	('13) 27	('09) 28	('13) 28	('09) 29	('13) 29	('09) 30	('13)
Auburn	1	2	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	
Bellevue	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	0	2	1	0	
Enumclaw	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Federal Way	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	
Highline	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	
Issaquah	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	0	1	0	2	1	1	
Kent	1	1	2	1	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	
Lk. Wash.	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	0	1	0	
Mercer Isl.	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	1	0	1	1	
Northshore	1	2	1	2	1	2	0	1	1	2	1	1	0	1	0	
Renton	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Riverview	2	2	0	1	0	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	
Seattle	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	
Shoreline	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	
Skykomish	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	
Snoqualmie	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	0	1	0	0	
Tahoma	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	
Tukwila	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Vashon Isl.	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	1	0	

CODING: 0=item is not mentioned, 1=weak statement is made regarding the item, 2=strong statement is made regarding the item

SUMMARY:

0-0 freq=	0	0-0 freq=	1	0-0 freq=	1	0-0 freq=	2	0-0 freq=	3	0-0 freq=	4	0-0 freq=	2	0-0 freq=	5
0-1 freq=	0	0-1 freq=	1	0-1 freq=	1	0-1 freq=	2	0-1 freq=	1	0-1 freq=	0	0-1 freq=	6	0-1 freq=	6
0-2 freq=	0	0-2 freq=	0	0-2 freq=	0	0-2 freq=	0	0-2 freq=	0	0-2 freq=	0	0-2 freq=	0	0-2 freq=	0
1-0 freq=	0	1-0 freq=	0	1-0 freq=	0	1-0 freq=	0	1-0 freq=	2	1-0 freq=	5	1-0 freq=	1	1-0 freq=	1
1-1 freq=	5	1-1 freq=	2	1-1 freq=	2	1-1 freq=	3	1-1 freq=	5	1-1 freq=	6	1-1 freq=	4	1-1 freq=	5
1-2 freq=	4	1-2 freq=	5	1-2 freq=	6	1-2 freq=	3	1-2 freq=	7	1-2 freq=	2	1-2 freq=	0	1-2 freq=	0
2-0 freq=	0	2-0 freq=	0	2-0 freq=	0	2-0 freq=	0	2-0 freq=	0	2-0 freq=	0	2-0 freq=	1	2-0 freq=	0
2-1 freq=	1	2-1 freq=	1	2-1 freq=	1	2-1 freq=	1	2-1 freq=	0	2-1 freq=	1	2-1 freq=	4	2-1 freq=	1
2-2 freq=	7	2-2 freq=	8	2-2 freq=	6	2-2 freq=	7	2-2 freq=	0	2-2 freq=	0	2-2 freq=	0	2-2 freq=	0

Section 3: Nutrition Standards for Competitive Foods & Beverages (NutStd)

NutStd23=Nutrition guidelines for ALL foods available on school campus during school day

NutStd24=Regulates vending machines

NutStd25=Regulates school stores

NutStd26=Regulates food service a la carte

NutStd27=Regulates food served at class parties and other school celebrations

NutStd28=Regulates food from home for the whole class

NutStd29=Regulates food sold before school

NutStd30=Regulates food sold after school (beyond district-run-after-school programs)

Nutrition Standards for Competitive Foods & Beverages questions, page 2 of 4

	('09) 31	('13) 31	('09) 32	('13) 32	('09) 33	('13) 33	('09) 34	('13) 34	('09) 35	('13) 35	('09) 36	('13) 36	('09) 37	('13) 37
Auburn	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
Bellevue	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	0
Enumclaw	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Federal Way	0	2	1	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1
Highline	0	1	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	1
Issaquah	1	1	0	1	2	1	2	1	0	0	2	1	2	1
Kent	0	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Lk. Wash.	1	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	0	1	0	1	0	1
Mercer Isl.	1	1	2	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2
Northshore	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	1
Renton	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1
Riverview	0	1	0	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	2	0	1
Seattle	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	0	1	2	2
Shoreline	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Skykomish	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	2
Snoqualmie	0	0	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	0	1
Tahoma	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	1
Tukwila	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0
Vashon Isl.	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	0	2	1	2

CODING: 0=item is not mentioned, 1=weak statement is made regarding the item, 2=strong statement is made regarding the item

SUMMARY:

0-0 freq.=	4	0-0 freq.=	2	0-0 freq.=	3	0-0 freq.=	1	0-0 freq.=	7	0-0 freq.=	4	0-0 freq.=	5
0-1 freq.=	5	0-1 freq.=	4	0-1 freq.=	3	0-1 freq.=	1	0-1 freq.=	2	0-1 freq.=	3	0-1 freq.=	6
0-2 freq.=	1	0-2 freq.=	1	0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	1	0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	1	0-2 freq.=	0
1-0 freq.=	1	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	2	1-0 freq.=	2	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	0
1-1 freq.=	6	1-1 freq.=	5	1-1 freq.=	3	1-1 freq.=	4	1-1 freq.=	4	1-1 freq.=	3	1-1 freq.=	1
1-2 freq.=	1	1-2 freq.=	4	1-2 freq.=	2	1-2 freq.=	2	1-2 freq.=	2	1-2 freq.=	1	1-2 freq.=	1
2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	1	2-0 freq.=	1
2-1 freq.=	0	2-1 freq.=	2	2-1 freq.=	4	2-1 freq.=	4	2-1 freq.=	0	2-1 freq.=	2	2-1 freq.=	2
2-2 freq.=	0	2-2 freq.=	0	2-2 freq.=	3	2-2 freq.=	3	2-2 freq.=	0	2-2 freq.=	2	2-2 freq.=	1

Section 3: Nutrition Standards for Competitive Foods & Beverages (NutStd)

NutStd31=Regulates food sold at evening and community events on school grounds

NutStd32=Regulates food sold for fundraising

NutStd33=Addresses limiting sugar content of foods

NutStd34=Addresses limiting fat content of foods

NutStd35=Addresses limiting sodium content of foods

NutStd36=Addresses limiting calorie content per serving size of foods

NutStd37=Addresses limiting serving size of foods

Nutrition Standards for Competitive Foods & Beverages questions, page 3 of 4

	('09) 38	('13) 38	('09) 39	('13) 39	('09) 40	('13) 40	('09) 41	('13) 41	('09) 42	('13) 42	('09) 43	('13) 43	('09) 44	('13) 44
Auburn	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Bellevue	2	0	0	2	1	0	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	0
Enumclaw	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Federal Way	1	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	1
Highline	1	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	2	2	1	2	0	1
Issaquah	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	0	1	0	1
Kent	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
Lk. Wash.	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	1	1	2	0	2	0	1
Mercer Isl.	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	0	2
Northshore	0	2	0	0	1	2	1	2	1	2	0	1	0	1
Renton	1	1	1	1	1	2	0	2	0	2	0	1	0	1
Riverview	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	2
Seattle	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	1	2	2	2	2	0	2
Shoreline	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	2	1	1	1
Skykomish	2	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	1	0	1	0	1
Snoqualmie	0	1	0	2	1	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
Tahoma	1	1	1	0	1	2	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	0
Tukwila	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0
Vashon Isl.	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	2	0	2	0	1

CODING: 0=item is not mentioned, 1=weak statement is made regarding the item, 2=strong statement is made regarding the item

SUMMARY:

0-0 freq.=	3	0-0 freq.=	6	0-0 freq.=	3	0-0 freq.=	6	0-0 freq.=	2	0-0 freq.=	1	0-0 freq.=	5
0-1 freq.=	2	0-1 freq.=	2	0-1 freq.=	1	0-1 freq.=	6	0-1 freq.=	4	0-1 freq.=	9	0-1 freq.=	9
0-2 freq.=	1	0-2 freq.=	2	0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	1	0-2 freq.=	4	0-2 freq.=	4	0-2 freq.=	2
1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	3	1-0 freq.=	2	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	1
1-1 freq.=	6	1-1 freq.=	3	1-1 freq.=	4	1-1 freq.=	0	1-1 freq.=	2	1-1 freq.=	0	1-1 freq.=	1
1-2 freq.=	2	1-2 freq.=	1	1-2 freq.=	7	1-2 freq.=	1	1-2 freq.=	2	1-2 freq.=	2	1-2 freq.=	0
2-0 freq.=	1	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0
2-1 freq.=	2	2-1 freq.=	1	2-1 freq.=	0	2-1 freq.=	2	2-1 freq.=	1	2-1 freq.=	1	2-1 freq.=	0
2-2 freq.=	1	2-2 freq.=	0	2-2 freq.=	1	2-2 freq.=	2	2-2 freq.=	2	2-2 freq.=	1	2-2 freq.=	0

Section 3: Nutrition Standards for Competitive Foods & Beverages (NutStd)

NutStd38=Addresses increasing "whole foods" whole grains, unprocessed foods or fresh produce

NutStd39=Addresses limiting use of ingredients with question health effects in food or beverages

(e.g artificial sweeteners, HFCS, trans fat)

NutStd40=Addresses food not being used as a reward and/or withheld for punishment

NutStd41=Nutrition information available for foods other than school meals

NutStd42=Addresses limiting sugar content of beverages

NutStd43=Addresses limiting fat content of drinks other than milk

NutStd44=Addresses limiting calorie content per serving size of beverages

Nutrition Standards for Competitive Foods & Beverages questions, page 4 of 4

	('09) 45	('13) 45	('09) 46	('13) 46	('09) 47	('13) 47	('09) 48	('13) 48	('09) 49	('13) 49	('09) 50	('13) 50	('09) 51	('13) 51
Auburn	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Bellevue	2	1	1	2	0	2	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
Enumclaw	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Federal Way	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Highline	2	2	1	2	0	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	1
Issaquah	2	1	1	1	0	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0
Kent	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Lk. Wash.	1	1	0	2	0	2	1	2	0	0	2	1	0	0
Mercer Isl.	2	2	1	1	0	2	2	2	1	2	0	1	2	1
Northshore	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
Renton	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1
Riverview	1	2	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	2	0	1	1	0
Seattle	0	2	1	1	0	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Shoreline	2	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Skykomish	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	2	1	1	2	0	0
Snoqualmie	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Tahoma	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	2
Tukwila	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
Vashon Isl.	1	2	0	2	0	1	1	2	1	2	0	1	0	1

CODING: 0=item is not mentioned, 1=weak statement is made regarding the item, 2=strong statement is made regarding the item

SUMMARY:

0-0 freq.=	2	0-0 freq.=	1	0-0 freq.=	7	0-0 freq.=	4	0-0 freq.=	8	0-0 freq.=	10	0-0 freq.=	10
0-1 freq.=	1	0-1 freq.=	9	0-1 freq.=	6	0-1 freq.=	7	0-1 freq.=	3	0-1 freq.=	5	0-1 freq.=	2
0-2 freq.=	1	0-2 freq.=	3	0-2 freq.=	5	0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	1	0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	0
1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	1	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	1
1-1 freq.=	6	1-1 freq.=	3	1-1 freq.=	0	1-1 freq.=	1	1-1 freq.=	1	1-1 freq.=	0	1-1 freq.=	1
1-2 freq.=	2	1-2 freq.=	2	1-2 freq.=	0	1-2 freq.=	2	1-2 freq.=	3	1-2 freq.=	2	1-2 freq.=	2
2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0
2-1 freq.=	4	2-1 freq.=	0	2-1 freq.=	0	2-1 freq.=	0	2-1 freq.=	1	2-1 freq.=	1	2-1 freq.=	2
2-2 freq.=	2	2-2 freq.=	0	2-2 freq.=	0	2-2 freq.=	3	2-2 freq.=	0	2-2 freq.=	0	2-2 freq.=	0

Section 3: Nutrition Standards for Competitive Foods & Beverages (NutStd)

NutStd45=Addresses limiting regular soda

NutStd46=Addresses limiting beverages other than soda containing added caloric sweeteners (teas, juice drinks, energy drinks)

NutStd47=Addresses limiting sugar/calorie content flavored milk

NutStd48=Addresses limiting fat content milk

NutStd49=Addresses serving size limits for beverages

NutStd50=Addresses limiting caffeine content of beverages

NutStd51=Addresses access to free drinking water

Physical Education questions, page 1 of 2

	('09)52	('13)52	('09)53	('13)53	('09)54	('13)54	('09)55	('13)55	('09)56	('13)56	('09)57	('13)57	('09)58	('13)58	('09)59	('13)59	('09)60	('13)60
Auburn	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	2	2	2	0	2	1	0	0	2	
Bellevue	2	2	1	2	1	2	0	2	2	2	2	0	2	1	0	1	2	
Enumclaw	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	0	0	2	
Federal Wy.	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	0	0	2	
Highline	2	2	1	2	1	2	0	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	0	0	2	
Issaquah	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	0	1	2	
Kent	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	0	1	2	
Lk. Wash.	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	0	0	2	
Mercer Isl.	2	2	1	2	1	1	0	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	0	1	2	
Northshore	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	2	1	2	0	2	1	0	0	2	
Renton	2	2	1	2	1	2	0	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	0	2	2	
Riverview	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	
Seattle	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	
Shoreline	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	
Skykomish	2	2	1	2	1	2	0	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	0	1	2	
Snoqualmie	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	0	0	2	
Tahoma	2	2	1	2	1	2	0	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	0	1	2	
Tukwila	2	2	1	2	1	2	0	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	0	1	2	
Vashon Isl.	2	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	2	

CODING: 0=item is not mentioned, 1=weak statement is made regarding the item, 2=strong statement is made regarding the item

SUMMARY:

0-0 freq=	0	0-0 freq=	0	0-0 freq=	0	0-0 freq=	0	0-0 freq=	0	0-0 freq=	1	0-0 freq=	0	0-0 freq=	10	0-0 freq=	1
0-1 freq=	0	0-1 freq=	1	0-1 freq=	1	0-1 freq=	11	0-1 freq=	2	0-1 freq=	1	0-1 freq=	2	0-1 freq=	7	0-1 freq=	0
0-2 freq=	0	0-2 freq=	0	0-2 freq=	0	0-2 freq=	7	0-2 freq=	0	0-2 freq=	0	0-2 freq=	0	0-2 freq=	1	0-2 freq=	0
1-0 freq=	0	1-0 freq=	0	1-0 freq=	0	1-0 freq=	0	1-0 freq=	0	1-0 freq=	0	1-0 freq=	0	1-0 freq=	0	1-0 freq=	0
1-1 freq=	2	1-1 freq=	10	1-1 freq=	11	1-1 freq=	0	1-1 freq=	0	1-1 freq=	0	1-1 freq=	0	1-1 freq=	0	1-1 freq=	1
1-2 freq=	0	1-2 freq=	7	1-2 freq=	6	1-2 freq=	0	1-2 freq=	0	1-2 freq=	0	1-2 freq=	0	1-2 freq=	0	1-2 freq=	0
2-0 freq=	0	2-0 freq=	0	2-0 freq=	0	2-0 freq=	0	2-0 freq=	0	2-0 freq=	3	2-0 freq=	0	2-0 freq=	0	2-0 freq=	0
2-1 freq=	3	2-1 freq=	0	2-1 freq=	0	2-1 freq=	0	2-1 freq=	7	2-1 freq=	12	2-1 freq=	10	2-1 freq=	0	2-1 freq=	11
2-2 freq=	13	2-2 freq=	0	2-2 freq=	0	2-2 freq=	0	2-2 freq=	9	2-2 freq=	1	2-2 freq=	6	2-2 freq=	0	2-2 freq=	5

Section 4: Physical Education (PE)

PE52=Addresses physical education curriculum for each grade level

PE53=Addresses time per week of physical education for elementary school students

PE54=Addresses time per week of physical education for middle school students

PE55=Addresses time per week of physical education for high school students

PE56=Physical education promotes a physically active lifestyle

PE57=Specifies competency assessment

PE58=Addresses physical education quality

PE59=Physical education program promotes inclusive play

PE60=Addresses physical education classes, courses or credits as an important part of curriculum

Physical Education questions, page 2 of 2

	('09) 61	('13)61	('09) 62	('13) 62	('09) 63	('13) 63	('09) 64	('13) 64	('09) 65	('13) 65	('09) 66	('13) 66	('09) 67	('13) 67	('09) 68	('13) 68
Auburn	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Bellevue	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0
Enumclaw	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0
Federal Way	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Highline	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Issaquah	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Kent	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0
Lk. Wash.	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1
Mercer Isl.	0	1	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	2	1
Northshore	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Renton	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1
Riverview	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Seattle	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	2
Shoreline	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
Skykomish	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1
Snoqualmie	1	2	0	0	2	2	0	1	2	1	0	0	1	2	2	1
Tahoma	0	2	1	0	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1
Tukwila	1	2	1	0	1	2	0	2	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	1
Vashon Isl.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

CODING: 0=item is not mentioned, 1=weak statement is made regarding the item, 2=strong statement is made regarding the item

SUMMARY:

0-0 freq.=	7	0-0 freq.=	14	0-0 freq.=	9	0-0 freq.=	6	0-0 freq.=	8	0-0 freq.=	15	0-0 freq.=	9	0-0 freq.=	7
0-1 freq.=	4	0-1 freq.=	0	0-1 freq.=	2	0-1 freq.=	7	0-1 freq.=	3	0-1 freq.=	2	0-1 freq.=	2	0-1 freq.=	0
0-2 freq.=	3	0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	3	0-2 freq.=	1	0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	0
1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	3	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	1	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	0
1-1 freq.=	1	1-1 freq.=	1	1-1 freq.=	2	1-1 freq.=	1	1-1 freq.=	1	1-1 freq.=	1	1-1 freq.=	3	1-1 freq.=	8
1-2 freq.=	3	1-2 freq.=	0	1-2 freq.=	3	1-2 freq.=	1	1-2 freq.=	1	1-2 freq.=	0	1-2 freq.=	1	1-2 freq.=	0
2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	1	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0
2-1 freq.=	0	2-1 freq.=	0	2-1 freq.=	1	2-1 freq.=	0	2-1 freq.=	1	2-1 freq.=	0	2-1 freq.=	0	2-1 freq.=	3
2-2 freq.=	0	2-2 freq.=	0	2-2 freq.=	1	2-2 freq.=	0	2-2 freq.=	0	2-2 freq.=	0	2-2 freq.=	3	2-2 freq.=	0

Section 4: Physical Education (PE)

PE61=Addresses frequency of required physical education (daily_

PE62=Addresses teacher-student ratio for physical education

PE63=Addresses safe and adequate equipment and facilities for physical education

PE64=Addresses amount of time devoted to moderate to vigorous activity in physical education

PE65=Addresses qualifications for physical education instructors

PE66=District provides physical education training for physical education teachers

PE67=Addresses physical education waiver requirements

PE68=Requires students to participate in an annual health assessment

Physical Activity questions, page 1 of 2

	('09) 69	('13) 69	('09) 70	('13)70	('09) 71	('13) 71	('09) 72	('13) 72	('09)73	('13)73
Auburn	2	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	1
Bellevue	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	2
Enumclaw	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0
Federal Way	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0
Highline	2	1	1	2	0	1	0	1	1	1
Issaquah	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	1
Kent	2	1	1	2	0	0	1	1	1	2
Lk. Wash.	2	2	0	1	0	0	2	2	2	2
Mercer Isl.	2	2	1	2	0	0	2	2	1	2
Northshore	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0
Renton	2	2	1	2	0	0	1	2	1	2
Riverview	2	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0
Seattle	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	1
Shoreline	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	1	1	0
Skykomish	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	1	2	1
Snoqualmie	2	2	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	1
Tahoma	2	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	2
Tukwila	2	2	1	2	0	0	1	1	1	1
Vashon Isl.	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0

CODING: 0=item is not mentioned, 1=weak statement is made regarding the item, 2=strong statement is made regarding the item

SUMMARY:

0-0 freq.=	0	0-0 freq.=	0	0-0 freq.=	17	0-0 freq.=	1	0-0 freq.=	4
0-1 freq.=	1	0-1 freq.=	3	0-1 freq.=	1	0-1 freq.=	8	0-1 freq.=	2
0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	3	0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	0
1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	2
1-1 freq.=	0	1-1 freq.=	4	1-1 freq.=	0	1-1 freq.=	5	1-1 freq.=	2
1-2 freq.=	0	1-2 freq.=	8	1-2 freq.=	0	1-2 freq.=	1	1-2 freq.=	4
2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0
2-1 freq.=	10	2-1 freq.=	0	2-1 freq.=	0	2-1 freq.=	0	2-1 freq.=	2
2-2 freq.=	7	2-2 freq.=	0	2-2 freq.=	0	2-2 freq.=	3	2-2 freq.=	2

Section 5: Physical Activity (PhyAct)

PhyAct69=Includes goals for physical activity to promote student wellness

PhyAct70=Physical activity provided for every grade level

PhyAct71=Includes physical activity opportunities for school staff

PhyAct72=Regular physical activity opportunities are provided throughout the school day

PhyAct73=Addresses physical activity through intramurals or interscholastic activities

Physical Activity questions, page 2 of 2

	('09) 74	('13) 74	('09) 75	('13) 75	('09) 76	('13) 76	('09) 77	('13) 77	('09) 78	('13) 78
Auburn	2	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1
Bellevue	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	1	0
Enumclaw	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Federal Way	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Highline	2	1	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0
Issaquah	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	1
Kent	2	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Lk. Wash.	2	1	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	1
Mercer Isl.	1	2	1	1	0	1	2	1	1	1
Northshore	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Renton	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Riverview	1	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0
Seattle	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Shoreline	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1
Skykomish	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	2
Snoqualmie	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Tahoma	2	2	1	0	2	1	2	2	2	2
Tukwila	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1
Vashon Isl.	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

CODING: 0=item is not mentioned, 1=weak statement is made regarding the item, 2=strong statement is made regarding the item

SUMMARY:

0-0 freq.=	3	0-0 freq.=	12	0-0 freq.=	6	0-0 freq.=		0-0 freq.=	5
0-1 freq.=	2	0-1 freq.=	0	0-1 freq.=	7	0-1 freq.=	2	0-1 freq.=	5
0-2 freq.=	1	0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	1
1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	1	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	1	1-0 freq.=	1
1-1 freq.=	2	1-1 freq.=	1	1-1 freq.=	0	1-1 freq.=	2	1-1 freq.=	2
1-2 freq.=	2	1-2 freq.=	3	1-2 freq.=	0	1-2 freq.=	0	1-2 freq.=	1
2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0
2-1 freq.=	3	2-1 freq.=	0	2-1 freq.=	2	2-1 freq.=	4	2-1 freq.=	0
2-2 freq.=	5	2-2 freq.=	1	2-2 freq.=	3	2-2 freq.=	4	2-2 freq.=	3

Section 5: Physical Activity (PhyAct)

PhyAct74=Addresses community use of school facilities for physical activity outside of the school day

PhyAct75=Addresses safe, active routes to school

PhyAct76=Addresses not using physical activity as punishment

PhyAct77=Addresses recess frequency or amount in elementary school

PhyAct78=Addresses recess quality to promote physical activity

Communication & Promotion questions, page 1 of 2

	(09) 79	('13) 79	(09) 80	('13) 80	(09) 81	('13) 81	(09) 82	('13) 82	(09) 83	('13) 83	(09) 84	(2'13) 84
Auburn	0	1	0	0	2	0	2	2	1	2	0	0
Bellevue	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Enumclaw	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Federal Way	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0
Highline	0	1	0	0	1	0	2	0	2	1	0	0
Issaquah	2	2	0	0	2	1	0	0	2	1	0	0
Kent	2	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	0
Lk. Wash.	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0
Mercer Isl.	1	1	0	1	1	1	2	2	2	2	0	0
Northshore	1	1	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	2	0	0
Renton	2	2	0	2	2	1	0	0	2	2	0	0
Riverview	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Seattle	1	2	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	0	0
Shoreline	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Skykomish	0	1	0	1	2	2	0	1	2	2	0	0
Snoqualmie	1	2	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	2	0	0
Tahoma	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	2	2	0	0
Tukwila	2	2	0	1	2	2	0	1	2	2	0	0
Vashon Isl.	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1

CODING: 0=item is not mentioned, 1=weak statement is made regarding the item, 2=strong statement is made regarding the item

SUMMARY

:

0-0 freq.=	2	0-0 freq.=	10	0-0 freq.=	3	0-0 freq.=	12	0-0 freq.=	0	0-0 freq.=	8
0-1 freq.=	7	0-1 freq.=	7	0-1 freq.=	0	0-1 freq.=	3	0-1 freq.=	4	0-1 freq.=	8
0-2 freq.=	1	0-2 freq.=	1	0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	3	0-2 freq.=	1
1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	2	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	1
1-1 freq.=	2	1-1 freq.=	0	1-1 freq.=	4	1-1 freq.=	0	1-1 freq.=	2	1-1 freq.=	0
1-2 freq.=	1	1-2 freq.=	0	1-2 freq.=	0	1-2 freq.=	0	1-2 freq.=	1	1-2 freq.=	0
2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	2	2-0 freq.=	1	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0
2-1 freq.=	1	2-1 freq.=	0	2-1 freq.=	5	2-1 freq.=	0	2-1 freq.=	2	2-1 freq.=	0
2-2 freq.=	4	2-2 freq.=	0	2-2 freq.=	2	2-2 freq.=	2	2-2 freq.=	6	2-2 freq.=	0

Section 6: Communication & Promotion (ComPromo)

ComPromo79=Involve parents, students, and representatives of the school food authority
 ComPromo80=Includes staff wellness programs specifically addressing the health of staff
 ComPromo81=Addresses consistency of nutrition communication

ComPromo82=Encourages staff to be role models for healthy behaviors
 ComPromo83=Specifies who in the district is responsible for wellness/health communication beyond required policy implementation reporting
 ComPromo84=Specifies district using CDC model

Communication & Promotion questions, page 2 of 2

	('09) 85	('13) 85	('09) 86	('13) 86	('09) 87	('13) 87	('09) 88	('13) 88	('09) 89	('13) 9	('09) 90	('13) 90
Auburn	0	1	2	0	2	0	2	1	0	2	0	0
Bellevue	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Enumclaw	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Federal Way	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
Highline	1	0	2	0	2	0	1	1	0	1	0	0
Issaquah	1	1	2	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2
Kent	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Lk. Wash.	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
Mercer Isl.	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	1	2	1	2	2
Northshore	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	2
Renton	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0
Riverview	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	0
Seattle	1	1	1	1	0	0	2	2	2	2	2	2
Shoreline	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Skykomish	0	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	0	1	0	0
Snoqualmie	2	1	1	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	2	2
Tahoma	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
Tukwila	1	1	2	2	2	2	1	1	0	1	0	0
Vashon Isl.	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1

CODING: 0=item is not mentioned, 1=weak statement is made regarding the item, 2=strong statement is made regarding the item

SUMMARY:

0-0 freq.=	3	0-0 freq.=	6	0-0 freq.=	4	0-0 freq.=	5	0-0 freq.=	10	0-0 freq.=	7
0-1 freq.=	5	0-1 freq.=	1	0-1 freq.=	1	0-1 freq.=	2	0-1 freq.=	4	0-1 freq.=	5
0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	1	0-2 freq.=	1
1-0 freq.=	1	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	2	1-0 freq.=	1	1-0 freq.=	1	1-0 freq.=	0
1-1 freq.=	7	1-1 freq.=	3	1-1 freq.=		1-1 freq.=	6	1-1 freq.=	1	1-1 freq.=	1
1-2 freq.=	0	1-2 freq.=	1	1-2 freq.=	0	1-2 freq.=	1	1-2 freq.=	0	1-2 freq.=	0
2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	2	2-0 freq.=	2	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0
2-1 freq.=	2	2-1 freq.=	2	2-1 freq.=	1	2-1 freq.=	2	2-1 freq.=	1	2-1 freq.=	2
2-2 freq.=	0	2-2 freq.=	3	2-2 freq.=	3	2-2 freq.=	0	2-2 freq.=	0	2-2 freq.=	2

Section 6: Communication & Promotion
(ComPromo)

ComPromo85=Addresses methods to solicit or encourage input from stakeholder groups

ComPromo86=Specifies how district will engage parents or community to meet district wellness goals

ComPromo87=Specifies what content/information district communicates to parents

ComPromo88=Specifies marketing to promote health choices

ComPromo89=Specifies restricting marketing of unhealthful choices

ComPromo90=Establishes a health advisory committee or school health council that is ongoing beyond policy development

Evaluation questions, page 1 of 1

	('09) 91	('13) 91	('09) 92	('13) 92	('09) 93	('13) 93	('09) 94	('13) 94	('09) 95	('13) 95	('09) 96	('13) 9
Auburn	2	2	2	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	
Bellevue	2	2	2	1	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	
Enumclaw	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Federal Way	0	1	0	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	
Highline	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	1	0	0	1	
Issaquah	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	2	0	1	2	
Kent	2	1	2	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	
Lk. Wash.	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	
Mercer Isl.	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	1	
Northshore	2	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	0	0	2	
Renton	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	1	
Riverview	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Seattle	1	2	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	
Shoreline	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Skykomish	2	2	2	1	1	2	3	2	0	0	1	
Snoqualmie	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	0	0	2	
Tahoma	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	0	0	1	
Tukwila	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	0	0	1	
Vashon Isl.	1	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	

CODING: 0=item is not mentioned, 1=weak statement is made regarding the item, 2=strong statement is made regarding the item

SUMMARY:

0-0 freq.=	1	0-0 freq.=	0	0-0 freq.=	2	0-0 freq.=	4	0-0 freq.=	17	0-0 freq.=	5
0-1 freq.=	3	0-1 freq.=	1	0-1 freq.=	5	0-1 freq.=	4	0-1 freq.=	1	0-1 freq.=	2
0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	1	0-2 freq.=	1	0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	0	0-2 freq.=	0
1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	0	1-0 freq.=	3
1-1 freq.=	1	1-1 freq.=	3	1-1 freq.=	0	1-1 freq.=	2	1-1 freq.=	0	1-1 freq.=	4
1-2 freq.=	1	1-2 freq.=	0	1-2 freq.=	2	1-2 freq.=	1	1-2 freq.=	0	1-2 freq.=	0
2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	1	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	0	2-0 freq.=	1
2-1 freq.=	3	2-1 freq.=	5	2-1 freq.=	3	2-1 freq.=	3	2-1 freq.=	0	2-1 freq.=	3
2-2 freq.=	9	2-2 freq.=	6	2-2 freq.=	5	2-2 freq.=	3	2-2 freq.=	0	2-2 freq.=	0

Section 7: Evaluation (Eval)

Eval91=Establish plan for measuring implementation of the local wellness policy, including designation of one or more persons within the local education agency

Eval92=Addresses a plan for policy implementation, including a person or group responsible

Eval93=Addresses a plan for policy evaluation, including a person/group responsible for tracking outcomes

Eval94=Addresses the audience and frequency of a report on compliance and/or evaluation

Eval95=Identifies funding support for wellness activities or policy evaluation

Eval96=Identifies a plan for revising the policy