

MAINE SCHOOL WELLNESS POLICY EVALUATION

FINAL REPORT
MAY 30, 2008

PREPARED BY

ANGIE CRADOCK, JESSICA BARRETT, JILL KRECHOWIZC, MEGAN LEE

HARVARD PREVENTION RESEARCH CENTER
HARVARD SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH

In Partnership with

The Maine – Harvard Prevention Research Center School Wellness Policy Work Group

Anne-Marie Davee, MS, RD, LD, USM Muskie, Maine Nutrition Network

Brenda Obert, MHPRC Steering Committee

David Crawford, MPH, MaineCDC, Physical Activity, Nutrition and Healthy Weight Program

Gail Lombardi, MS, RD, Maine Department of Education, Child Nutrition Services

Tracy Tweedie, MPH, STOP Director, Vital Pathways

Jaki Ellis, MS, CHES, MaineCDC, Coordinated School Health Program

Karen O'Rourke, MPH, Maine Center for Public Health

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
BACKGROUND.....	6
SCHOOL POLICIES AND NUTRITION AND PHYSICAL ACTIVITY	6
<i>Local School Wellness Policy Creation and Evaluation at Local, State, and National Levels.....</i>	7
<i>Strategies Used by Other States.....</i>	8
<i>Other Strategies.....</i>	10
<i>Maine Local School Wellness Policy Development History</i>	11
METHODS.....	13
SAMPLE	13
LOCAL SCHOOL WELLNESS POLICY MEASURE DEVELOPMENT AND SCORING	13
<i>Nutrition Education</i>	14
<i>Standards for USDA Meals.....</i>	14
<i>Nutrition Guidelines</i>	15
<i>Physical Education</i>	15
<i>Physical Activity</i>	15
<i>Communication and Promotion.....</i>	16
<i>Evaluation.....</i>	16
CODING.....	16
<i>Inter-Rater Reliability.....</i>	17
OTHER STUDY VARIABLES	17
ANALYSIS	18
RESULTS.....	18
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS.....	18
RESULTS FOR INDIVIDUAL POLICY ITEMS	19
SUMMARY SCORES	20
SUMMARY SCORES BY SAU CHARACTERISTICS	21
<i>School Enrollment.....</i>	21
<i>Proportion of Students in Free and Reduced Price Lunch Programs.....</i>	21
<i>School Health Coordinator.....</i>	22
<i>County Population</i>	22
DISCUSSION.....	22
REFERENCES	26
TABLES	28
TABLE 1. RESPONSE RATES BY SAU CHARACTERISTICS	28
TABLE 2. DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE, SAUs INCLUDED AND SAUs PROVIDING POLICIES	29
TABLE 3. CODING RESULTS FOR INDIVIDUAL POLICY ITEMS (N=190)	30
TABLE 3. CODING RESULTS FOR INDIVIDUAL POLICY ITEMS (N=190), CONTINUED	31
TABLE 4. SUMMARY SCORES (N=190)	32
TABLE 4. SUMMARY SCORES (N=190), CONTINUED.....	33
TABLE 5. SCORES BY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT (N=190)	34
TABLE 5. SCORES BY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT (N=190), CONTINUED	35
TABLE 6. SCORES BY PERCENT ENROLLMENT IN FREE & REDUCED PRICE LUNCH (N=188).....	36
TABLE 6. SCORES BY PERCENT ENROLLMENT IN FREE & REDUCED PRICE LUNCH (N=188), CONTINUED	37
TABLE 7. SCORES IN SAUs WITH AND WITHOUT A SCHOOL HEALTH COORDINATOR (SHC) (N=190).....	38
TABLE 7. SCORES IN SAUs WITH AND WITHOUT A SCHOOL HEALTH COORDINATOR (SHC) (N=190), CONTINUED	39
TABLE 8. SCORES BY COUNTY POPULATION (N=172)	40
TABLE 8. SCORES BY COUNTY POPULATION (N=172), CONTINUED	41

APPENDICES.....	42
APPENDIX A. ASSESSMENT TOOLS FOR SCHOOL NUTRITION POLICIES	42
APPENDIX B. MEMBERS OF THE MAINE-HARVARD PREVENTION RESEARCH CENTER SCHOOL WELLNESS POLICY WORK GROUP	43
APPENDIX C. TYPES OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS IN MAINE.....	44
APPENDIX D. CODING TOOL FOR ABSTRACTING SCHOOL WELLNESS POLICIES, REVISED BY THE HARVARD PREVENTION RESEARCH CENTER FOR MAINE WELLNESS POLICY PROJECT ON MARCH 26, 2008.....	46
APPENDIX E. SCORES BY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT	66

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The school environment is essential in creating a place for children and adolescents to develop healthy eating and physical activity habits. In 2004, the US Congress passed Section 204 of the Federal Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act with a new provision requiring that all local school systems participating in the National School Lunch and Breakfast program must have a Local School Wellness Policy in place by June 30, 2006. A recent Institute of Medicine Report notes that since the development and

KEY FINDINGS
<ul style="list-style-type: none">◆ On average, Local School Wellness Policies addressed half of the 96 items in the school wellness policy coding tool◆ One-third of the items were addressed with strong and directive language◆ When ranked by level (i.e., Low, Medium, High), the majority of Local School Wellness Policies were in the middle rank for Comprehensiveness (87%) and Strength (60%)◆ None of the policies were ranked in the highest level for strength score◆ SAUs with lower enrollment had more comprehensive policies compared to SAUs with higher enrollment◆ SAUs with 50% or more of students enrolled in free and reduced price lunch programs had more comprehensive policies compared to SAUs with fewer students eligible for these programs

implementation of Local School Wellness Policies is relatively recent, ongoing review, implementation and monitoring of these policies are suggested in order to ensure compliance and to identify potential areas of policy that may need modification. With these ideas in mind, the **Maine Center for Public Health and the members of the Maine – Harvard Prevention Research Center School Wellness Policy Work Group decided to conduct a baseline assessment of the current status of Local School Wellness Policy adoption in Maine.**

A complete list of Maine municipalities by School Administration Unit (SAU) for the 2006 school year was obtained from the Maine Department of Education website, and Local School Wellness Policies were requested from SAU representatives by contacts at the Maine Center for Public Health and local Maine project partners. Among 231 eligible

SAUs, **190 Local School Wellness Policies were collected and coded** using a tool developed by a group of researchers funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Healthy Eating Research Program and modified by the Maine – Harvard Prevention Research Center School Wellness Policy Work Group for use specifically in Maine.

On average the policies coded addressed half of the 96 items in the Local School Wellness Policy coding tool. One-third of the items were addressed with strong language and specified as a required component of policy. Several items were always coded as required policy components according to Maine law. Other items that were frequently mentioned as required were goals for nutrition education, nutrition education programs that teach lifelong skills, guidelines for reimbursable school meals that are not less restrictive than USDA regulations, goals for physical activity, ongoing health advisory committee, measuring implementation of policies, and having plans for implementation of policies. Items that were rarely included

in the policies were requirements for nutrition education courses or hours of instruction, guidance on calorie content of beverages, sugar and/or calorie content of flavored milk, annual health assessments, and funding support for wellness activities or policy evaluation.

When ranked by level (i.e., Low, Medium, High), the majority of Local School Wellness Policies were in the middle rank for Comprehensiveness (87%) and Strength (60%). None of the policies were ranked in the highest level for strength score. On average, SAUs with lower enrollment (less than 1,200 students) had more comprehensive policies compared to SAUs with higher enrollment. Similarly, SAUs with 50% or more of students enrolled in free and reduced price lunch programs had more comprehensive policies than SAUs with fewer students eligible for these programs. Summary measures of overall comprehensiveness and strength in Local School Wellness Policies from SAUs with school health coordinators were similar to SAUs without school health coordinators. There were no statistically significant differences in comprehensiveness or strength of policy language in SAUs according to the size of the county population in which they were located.

Associations between lower school enrollment and higher percent enrollment in free and reduced price lunch programs and between school health coordinator presence and higher school enrollment may have influenced score comparisons among SAUs with differences in these descriptive characteristics. We did not

KEY IMPLICATIONS
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◆ In some areas, the policies could be strengthened by focusing on the wording choice and specificity of language ◆ Data from this assessment can be used to identify specific policy areas that need attention by local school systems and to plan technical assistance and training that support improvements in Local School Wellness Policies ◆ These data provide a baseline assessment for further study of health and wellness outcomes

explore the relationship between Local School Wellness Policy scores and resources provided to SAUs through Team Nutrition Trainings and Maine Nutrition Network projects. Further analysis is needed in order to understand the relationship between school wellness resources and Local School Wellness Policy scores in Maine.

In this study, we have not compared policy scores with actual environments, nor have we measured the extent to which the policies are being followed or implemented in an actual SAU or school. Therefore the Local School Wellness Policies may not adequately represent the environments in

which students are educated. However, these findings have important practice and research implications. In some areas, the **policies could be strengthened by focusing on the wording choice and specificity of language.** These data can also be used to identify specific policy areas that need attention by local school systems and **to plan technical assistance and training that support improvements in Local School Wellness Policies** as they evolve in the state of Maine. They provide a baseline assessment for further study of health and wellness outcomes.

BACKGROUND

SCHOOL POLICIES AND NUTRITION AND PHYSICAL ACTIVITY

The school environment is essential in creating a place for children and adolescents to develop healthy eating and physical activity habits. Children less than 18 years of age spend a significant portion of their day in the school setting and consume up to two meals and snacks at school (Story, Kaphingst, & French, 2006). Children in school today have many choices for foods to eat, including the school meal, a la carte items, and vending machine foods. Several small studies showed that competitive foods and beverages may be associated with less healthful eating practices at school (Institute of Medicine, 2007). Kubik et al. found that adding a la carte items had a significant and negative impact on fruit and vegetable intake, as well as increased calorie consumption (Kubik, Lytle, Hannan, Perry, & Story, 2003). Since taste preferences are developed in childhood (Drewnowski, 1997), Local School Wellness Policies can be an effective way to implement and maintain guidelines about a healthy school environment, and to ensure proper nutrition education and physical education practices are in place.

Nutrition policies provide a framework for school community stakeholders to promote healthy eating. Rather than focusing on the behavior of individual students, school policies impact the school physical and cultural environment which allows for a positive setting that is more conducive to improving student dietary behaviors (Wechsler, Devereaux, Davis, & Collins, 2000). As noted in the Institute of Medicine Report, children and teenagers are more likely to modify behavior when the environment coincides with educational practices (Institute of Medicine, 2007). Learning about nutrition and physical activity in the school environment also makes the lessons longer-lasting when the cafeteria and physical activity environment can serve as learning labs.

Despite agreement that Local School Wellness Policies can positively impact student behavior, there is a relative paucity in terms of research studying the relationship between having a Local School Wellness Policy in place and nutrition (Nicklas & Johnson, 2004) and physical activity outcomes. One of the few published studies compares excess body weight, diet, and physical activity across 282 schools in the province of Nova Scotia with and without school nutrition policies or programs. There were two categories of schools with nutrition programs: schools with policies in place to offer healthy menu alternatives and schools with coordinated programs incorporating each aspect of the CDC school-based recommendations for healthy eating programs. Overall, the results showed that schools with policies consistent with the CDC recommendations for school-based healthy eating programs had substantially fewer overweight and obese students. In contrast, students from schools that only provided healthy menu alternatives did not have substantially healthier bodyweights than students from schools without programs. The authors suggest that students insufficiently choose healthier options unless they are part of an integrated school-wide approach (Veugelers & Fitzgerald, 2005).

Another available study used a direct approach to measure student perceptions rather than health outcomes after the implementation of a Local School Wellness Policy in a California high school. Vecchiarelli and colleagues sampled students within two high schools using a 45-item questionnaire including measures of consumption of fruits, vegetables, junk food, student perception of change in their dietary behaviors as a result of the nutrition policies and attitudes toward the school nutrition environment. The results indicate that between 50-55% of students reported that policies impacted their food and beverage consumption at school, but less than 20% of students reported that their behavior at home changed because of the nutrition environment at school (Vecchiarelli, Takayanagi, & Neumann, 2006).

A recent issue of the *Journal of School Health* showcases the results of the School Health Policies and Programs Study 2006 (SHPPS), which documents key school health policies across the eight school health components: health education, physical education and activity, health services, mental health and social services, nutrition services, healthy and safe school environment, faculty and staff health promotion, and family and community involvement. Overall, policy development at the state level on the eight program areas has expanded since the 2000 SHPPS assessment. However, the authors point to an urgent need to evaluate the impact or effectiveness of specific policies, practices and interventions on children's health outcomes (Kann, Brener, & Wechsler, 2007).

Clearly, few studies to date have examined the presence of school-level wellness policies and their impact on nutrition and physical activity outcomes. However, the studies reviewed above reveal modest positive impacts on student behavior, especially when the entire school environment is addressed by clear wellness policy guidelines (Veugeliers & Fitzgerald, 2005).

LOCAL SCHOOL WELLNESS POLICY CREATION AND EVALUATION AT LOCAL, STATE, AND NATIONAL LEVELS

In 2004, the US Congress passed Section 204 of the Federal Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004, requiring that each local school agency participating in the National School Lunch and Breakfast program must have a Local School Wellness Policy in place by June 30, 2006 (Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004, 2004). The Act requires that Local School Wellness Policies include the following:

- 1) Goals for nutrition education, physical activity and other school-based activities designed to promote student wellness;
- 2) Nutrition guidelines selected by the local educational agency;
- 3) Assurance that guidelines for reimbursable school meals shall not be less restrictive than regulations and guidance issued by the Child Nutrition Act and the Richard B Russell National School Lunch Act;

- 4) A plan for measuring implementation of the Local School Wellness Policy, including designation of one or more persons, charged with operational responsibility for ensuring that the school meets the Local School Wellness Policy; and
- 5) Involvement of parents, students, and representatives of the school food authority, the school board, school administrators, and the public in the development of the Local School Wellness Policy (Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004, 2004).

As school departments across the US have sought to comply with these federal directives by developing Local School Wellness Policies, there has been a parallel development in terms of policy assessment tools by states and other agencies charged with child nutrition and wellness. The goal of these assessment strategies is to systematically and reliably classify wellness policies related to the school environment and offer concrete areas for policy improvement. The following section provides a brief overview of assessment tools developed by other agencies and states in order to understand the range of strategies currently being employed. More details can be found in **Appendix A**.

STRATEGIES USED BY OTHER STATES

Utah was one of the first states to systematically evaluate their Local School Wellness Policies to determine how well policy recommendations were incorporated into procedural documents. The assessment included three components: federal compliance, state compliance and policy language (i.e. weak statements were given a score of 0 and strong language a score of 1). Under federal compliance, the Local School Wellness Policy was compared with each category required by the Child Nutrition Reauthorization Act (CNRA) of 2004 to measure compliance. For the state compliance component the policy was compared to guidelines developed by Utah's Action for Healthy Kids coalition. The results of Utah's Local School Wellness Policy evaluation, published in the September 2007 American School Health Association journal reveal that 77% of the 40 public school districts met all 5 federally mandated CNRA components with the most frequently missed category being guidelines for competitive foods. The results for state-level compliance were rather mixed with some areas such as content for vending machines being most often addressed, whereas areas such as identifying safe walking and biking routes to school were often excluded. Finally, the policy language evaluation revealed that strong language most often applied to items already mandated by the state board or already in place, while rather weak language was used for the remainder of the items (Metos & Nanney, 2007). Overall, this study was the first to document how well districts are doing to implement both federal and state guidelines, and it points to the need for a comprehensive assessment tool that can be used to compare Local School Wellness Policy implementation across states.

Given the relatively recent 2004 federal requirement for states to assist their districts in the development of Local School Wellness Policies, the majority of available resources from other states reflect the policy development stage rather than evaluation of implemented policies, such as Utah. However, some states have developed assessment strategies or tools which offer some insight into how other states have measured or plan to measure their Local School Wellness Policies. This section will discuss policy assessment tools from four other selected states, namely: New Hampshire, Colorado, Michigan and Pennsylvania.

First, the AFHK-New Hampshire Healthy Schools Coalition created a ‘School Wellness Policy Assessment Form’ which is based upon two inputs: 1) the federal policy requirements in the areas of nutrition education, physical activity, nutrition guidelines for all foods available on the school campus during the school day and evaluation; and 2) the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) suggested guidelines. The tool was created by using USDA recommended guidelines for the five components of the law and intended for use by superintendents and others involved with the implementation of school wellness. The goal is to offer a rating system so that schools can consider the merits of existing Local School Wellness Policies when writing their own (New Hampshire Department of Education, 2005).

A second state, Colorado, developed an assessment tool for school districts and schools to evaluate the current status of their Local School Wellness Policies. The four sections covered by this tool are nutrition education, physical activity, nutrition guidelines for all foods, and USDA meal guidelines. Each section includes several items which are scored according to whether the item is not applicable, applicable but not addressed, partially implemented or fully implemented. The goal of this assessment tool is to detail ‘examples of evidence’ that districts and schools can use to determine the extent to which Local School Wellness Policies are being implemented and what additional work remains to be done. Similar to New Hampshire’s tool, this form was intended for use by to be filled out by a team of members on the Local School Wellness Policy committee at either the district or school level.

The Healthy School Action Tool (HSAT) was created by the state of Michigan to assist individual school buildings to assess their current nutrition, physical education/activity and tobacco environment. The tool covers 7 areas: commitment to nutrition and physical activity, quality meals, other healthy food options, pleasant eating experience, nutrition education, marketing and commitment to physical activity using a 0-4 rating scale ranging from “item not being considered” to “item in place and fully implemented”.

Lastly, the state of Pennsylvania’s Department of Education developed a checklist with fourteen questions about the Local School Wellness Policy development process and then a separate section covering nutrition guidelines, goals for nutrition and physical activity, goals for other school-based activities and a general comments section. The checklist, like the three previous tools from other states, is intended to be completed by the individual schools.

Overall, most of the strategies discussed, apart from Utah, reflect assessment tools that were developed as the districts within the state were creating their own Local School Wellness Policy and hence are not geared for use by outside evaluators.

OTHER STRATEGIES

Two recent articles published in the *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* showcase two policy assessment tools developed by a team of researchers using a comprehensive review of published literature, reports from government and nongovernmental sources, input from an expert panel, and select experts (Masse, Chiqui, Igoe, Atienza, Kruger, Kohl Iii et al., 2007; Masse, Frosh, Chiqui, Yaroch, Agurs-Collins, Blanck et al., 2007). The tools, the School Nutrition-Environment State Classification System (SNESPCS) and the Physical Education-Related State Policy Classification System (PERSPCS), were developed to assess the range of policy approaches to address childhood obesity at the state level. The topic areas addressed by each of the tools reflect the best available evidence at the time of their development regarding school policy for both the school nutrition environment and the physical education component. Specifically, the nutrition tool addresses the following areas: competitive foods in three areas (a la carte, vending machines and other venues), reimbursable school meals, school meal environment, food service director qualifications, coordinating or advisory councils, nutrition education, marketing (both advertising and preferential pricing) and finally, body mass index screening. The specific areas addressed for the physical education tool (PERSPCS) include: PE time requirement, staffing requirement for PE, curriculum standards for PE, assessment of health-related fitness and recess time for elementary school.

At the national level, Local School Wellness Policy assessments were conducted by both the School Nutrition Association (SNA) and the Action for Healthy Kids. These two assessments are geared to collect information about school-level progress on policy development across the US. The SNA analysis included assessment on several categories using an online survey completed by SNA director level members. The Action for Healthy Kids assessment was based upon the Wellness Policy Fundamentals document and an expanded checklist with yes/no answers for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC).

Building on many of the components of these other assessment strategies, a working group of grantees with funding from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation program, Healthy Eating Research, created an assessment instrument that would provide a common and reliable method for abstracting and evaluating Local School Wellness Policies in both state and national studies. The researchers collected model policies and scoring and evaluation tools developed prior to 2006. Then, building on these tools and guidelines from Action for Healthy Kids, the National Alliance for Nutrition and Activity, the Clinton Foundation and the National Cancer Institute, they created a common tool and coding manual for use in their respective studies.

(Schwartz, M.B., Lund, A., Greves, M., McDonnell, E., Probart, C., Samuelson, A., and Lytle, L. (2008) Coding tool for abstracting School Wellness Policies Developed by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Healthy Eating Research Program. Available from author.) The authors (personal communication) indicated that initial results from reliability and validity studies suggested the tool would be a useful instrument for evaluating the content and strength of policy at the school district level.

MAINE LOCAL SCHOOL WELLNESS POLICY DEVELOPMENT HISTORY

Prior to the federal legislation regarding Local School Wellness Policies, state statutes and rules existed in Maine that limited student access to foods and beverages of minimal nutritional value. The Maine Department of Education Rule Chapter 51 was modified to limit sales of foods and beverages of minimal nutritional standards on school grounds at any time of the day, with limited exceptions, over which the local school board has discretion. State of Maine Legislative Directive 796, “An Act to Implement the Recommendations of the Commission to Study Public Health that Concern School, Children and Nutrition” became public law in 2005. This law directs the Maine Department of Education (MDOE) to encourage nutrition education in public schools as part of a coordinated school health program and the school food service program. The law also requires food service programs to post caloric information for prepackaged a la carte menu items at the point of sale after August 31, 2008, and to develop standards for portion sizes offered outside of the school meal plan. All three components are to be addressed in the Local School Wellness Policy.

During this same year (2005), Maine received a Team Nutrition Training grant that provided funding to assist Maine school districts with development and adoption of their Local School Wellness Policies. Four regional trainings on Local School Wellness Policies were conducted in the fall of 2005 with 2-3 school district staff persons representing 75 school district teams in Maine. An additional training was held in the spring of 2006. Teams usually included school food service directors, school health coordinators, school nurses, and/or members of school administration. The MDOE encouraged the establishment of wellness teams for policy development and implementation beyond the training session. Members of the wellness teams were suggested to be the stakeholders identified in the federal law, i.e. parents, students, school food service staff, school administrators, and community members. The intent of these regional trainings was to provide school teams with sample Local School Wellness Policy criteria as well as the information they needed to get a Local School Wellness Policy approved in their district by the start of the 2006-2007 school year, per the federal statute. Two sample Local School Wellness Policies were distributed to school administrators – one from the Maine School Management Association and another prepared by MDOE.

Other opportunities for training and technical assistance with Local School Wellness Policy development were sponsored by MDOE at food service staff trainings, at a joint superintendent/food service director

training, and at regional food service meetings. These opportunities were used to identify and provide additional technical assistance and support to schools, as needed. Additionally, MDOE developed a tool that was distributed to school health coordinators and food service directors to aid in policy development. Components of the HealthierUS School Challenge were built into the tool. As part of the coordinated review effort conducted by MDOE staff in each district every 5 years, Local School Wellness Policies are monitored by reviewing the following: 1) date of Local School Wellness Policy adoption, 2) person(s) responsible for monitoring implementation, and 3) plan for Local School Wellness Policy evaluation.

As noted in the Institute of Medicine Report, *Nutrition Standards for Foods at School* (Institute of Medicine, 2007), the development and implementation of Local School Wellness Policies is relatively recent. Therefore, ongoing review, implementation and monitoring of these policies are suggested in order to ensure compliance and to identify potential areas of policy that may need modification. With these ideas in mind, the Maine Center for Public Health and the members of the Maine – Harvard Prevention Research Center School Wellness Policy Work Group (see **Appendix B** for list and affiliation of members) decided to conduct a baseline assessment of the current status of Local School Wellness Policy adoption in Maine. This group developed the following research questions:

- 1) Have Maine’s Local School Wellness Policies resulted in an improved nutrition environment in schools and increased opportunities for physical activity beyond current state and federal requirements?
- 2) What are the characteristics of schools that have exemplary policies and those that have weak policies? (e.g. rural, urban, school health coordinator, free and reduced price lunch, size, etc.)
- 3) Are there gaps in the Local School Wellness Policies that can be addressed through state level policy, training or programs?

Guided by these research questions, the Maine Local School Wellness Policy evaluation was conducted in order to identify gaps in content, implementation, and evaluation of Local School Wellness Policies; to identify areas for support services and training in order to strengthen Local School Wellness Policy implementation; and to describe the current status of Local School Wellness Policies in the state of Maine.

The following sections discuss the methodology used for assessment, the results and discuss the findings and their implications for future technical assistance and training, potential uses for results in monitoring ongoing policy implementation and future research activities that may be useful in documenting changes in Maine schools.

METHODS

SAMPLE

The MDOE classifies the state's educational structure into school administrative units (SAUs). Each SAU is a unit of one or more schools, municipalities, districts, or regions that share a common school administration, such as a superintendent, school committee, and/or facilities. There are several different types of SAUs, which include cities or towns with individual supervision, school administrative districts, community school districts, unions of towns, Maine Indian education, units under agent supervision, technology centers, technology regions, and education in unorganized territory. Descriptions of these different types of SAUs can be found in **Appendix C**, taken from the Maine Department of Education website (<http://www.maine.gov/education/eddir/saudef.htm>).

A complete list of Maine municipalities by School Administration Unit (SAU) for the 2006 school year was obtained through the MDOE website (<http://maine.gov/education/eddir/schcontact.htm>). The unit of analysis was defined as the SAU. Initially, a total of 302 SAUs were identified; however, we excluded from further analysis 62 SAUs that did not operate a school during the period of study (identified by list on the MDOE website and amended by contact at MDOE), 8 regional schools that were not required to develop a Local School Wellness Policy, and one school for which enrollment information could not be obtained (Chebeague Island, which was identified by contacts at the Maine Center for Public Health as not participating in the National School Lunch Program). The Maine – Harvard Prevention Research Center School Wellness Policy Work Group assisted in locating sample information and identifying eligible SAUs.

Local School Wellness Policies were requested from SAU representatives by contacts at the Maine Center for Public Health and local Maine project partners. Of the 231 SAUs eligible for study, a total of 190 SAUs (82%) provided a Local School Wellness Policy. In some cases, a policy applied to more than one SAU. Several (n=62) SAUs shared a policy with at least one other SAU. Most SAUs with shared policies (n=50) were in unions that had worked to create a joint Local School Wellness Policy. Response rates by SAU characteristics and overall are presented in **Table 1**.

LOCAL SCHOOL WELLNESS POLICY MEASURE DEVELOPMENT AND SCORING

Local School Wellness Policies were coded according to a modified version of the Coding Tool for Abstracting School Wellness Policies (Schwartz, Lund, Greves, McDonnell, Probart, Samuelson et al., 2008). This instrument is a coding system designed by a group of researchers funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Healthy Eating Research Program to create a common and reliable method for evaluating Local School Wellness Policies. The group reviewed existing evaluation tools from the states of Connecticut,

Washington, and Pennsylvania, and guidelines from Action for Healthy Kids, the National Alliance for Nutrition and Activity, The Clinton Foundation, and the National Cancer Institute, and selected items to be included in the coding measure. The instrument consists of 96 items in seven sections: Nutrition Education, Standards for USDA Meals, Nutrition Guidelines, Physical Education, Physical Activity, Communication and Promotion, and Evaluation. Federal Wellness Policy requirements are incorporated into the sections as appropriate. The coding tool was revised by the Maine – Harvard Prevention Research Center School Wellness Policy Work Group as needed for use specifically in Maine (see **Appendix D** for revised coding tool). This group performed sample coding of policies in order to identify policy coding items relating to existing Maine-specific rules and regulations.

The following sections describe the content of the seven sections included in the coding tool.

NUTRITION EDUCATION

The federal requirements state that Local School Wellness Policies should include goals for nutrition education that are designed to promote student wellness in a manner that the local education agency determines is appropriate. The Nutrition Education section examines whether policies address the scope and content of nutrition curriculum. This section assesses whether policies include statements about providing nutrition curriculum for each grade level, coordinating nutrition education with the larger school community, extending nutrition education beyond the school environment, providing nutrition education training for teachers, integrating nutrition education into other subjects beyond health education, teaching lifelong skills that are behavior focused and/or interactive and/or participatory, specifying the number of nutrition education courses or contact hours, and addressing nutrition education quality.

STANDARDS FOR USDA MEALS

The Federal Wellness Policy requirements state that Local School Wellness Policies should assure that guidelines for reimbursable school meals shall not be less restrictive than USDA school meal regulations. Items in this section assess the language of policies regarding access to and/or promotion of school meal programs, including the USDA School Breakfast Program and the Summer Food Service Program, as well as strategies to increase participation in school meal programs. This section examines language about the content of school meals, particularly whether policies address nutrition guidelines for school meals beyond USDA minimum standards, or specify the use of low-fat versions of foods or low-fat preparation methods. Other items assess whether policies address the school meal environment and related issues, such as optimizing scheduling to improve student nutrition, ensuring adequate time to eat, providing access to hand-washing before meals, and making available nutrition information for school meals. This section also assesses nutrition qualifications of school meals staff and training or professional development for food service staff.

NUTRITION GUIDELINES

The Nutrition Guidelines section examines whether Local School Wellness Policies include nutrition guidelines for all foods available on each school campus during the school day with the objective of promoting student health and reducing childhood obesity. Items addressed in this section relate to places food is served (i.e. vending machines, school stores, a la carte, class parties and other school celebrations, and food from home for the whole class), times food is served (i.e. before school, after school, evening and community events on school grounds, and food sold for fundraising), and nutrition guidelines for both foods and beverages. Nutrition guidelines for foods and beverages include limiting sugar, fat, sodium, calories per serving, ingredients with questionable health effects, regular soda and other sugar-sweetened beverages, sugar and calories in flavored milk, fat in milk, and caffeine. Language about increasing whole grains, unprocessed foods, and fresh produce, not using food as a reward or punishment, providing nutrition information for foods other than school meals, and providing access to free drinking water is also assessed.

PHYSICAL EDUCATION

In this section, physical education (PE) language is examined with regards to scope, content, and management. This section assesses whether Local School Wellness Policies address PE curriculum and time per week of PE for each grade level, PE classes or credits, frequency of required PE, teacher-student ratio for PE, safe and adequate equipment and facilities for PE, the amount of moderate to vigorous activity in PE, PE waiver requirements, qualifications for PE instructors, and professional development for PE staff. This section also assesses whether policies include statements regarding PE quality, promoting a physically active lifestyle in PE, promoting inclusive play, specifying a competency assessment, and specifying an annual health exam.

PHYSICAL ACTIVITY

The Physical Activity section assesses whether the Local School Wellness Policies include goals for physical activity that are designed to promote student wellness. Items assessed include whether the policies address physical activity opportunities throughout the day, such as recess frequency and quality in elementary schools, and opportunities other than recess, as well as physical activity opportunities outside of the school day, such as intramurals or interscholastic activities, community use of school facilities for physical activity outside of the school day, and safe active routes to school. This section also examines language for physical activity at every grade level, physical activity opportunities for school staff, and not using physical activity as punishment.

COMMUNICATION AND PROMOTION

Statements about involving parents, students, and representatives of the school food authority, the school board, school administrators, and the public in the development of the Local School Wellness Policy are examined in this section. Items assessed in this section include whether the policies address staff wellness programs, consistency of nutrition messages, encouraging staff to role model healthy behaviors, specifying who is responsible for wellness and health communication beyond required policy implementation reporting, using the CDC Coordinated School Health Model or another coordinated or comprehensive method, methods to solicit or encourage input from stakeholders, how to engage parents or the community to meet wellness goals, what content and information is communicated to parents, marketing to promote healthy choices, restricting marketing of unhealthful choices, and establishing a health advisory committee or school health council that is ongoing beyond policy development.

EVALUATION

In this section, language about measuring implementation and evaluation of the Local School Wellness Policy is examined. Items assessed include whether policies address a plan for policy implementation and a person or group responsible, a plan for policy evaluation and a person or group responsible, the audience and frequency of a report on compliance or evaluation, funding support for wellness activities or policy evaluation, and a plan for revising the policy.

CODING

Each item is coded as a 0, 1, or 2. A score of 0 (Not Mentioned) indicates that the item was not mentioned, a score of 1 (Weak Statement) indicates that the item is mentioned but either the statement is vague or the item is only recommended, and a score of 2 (Meets/Exceeds Expectations) indicates that the item is specifically described and required. Scores of individual policy items are aggregated into Comprehensiveness and Strength scores, which are calculated by section and in total. The Comprehensiveness score indicates the proportion of items that are mentioned, and is calculated by counting the number of items scoring either a 1 or 2 and dividing by the total number of items (in the section or the entire scale). The Strength score indicates the proportion of items that are addressed with specific and directive language, and is calculated by counting the number of items scoring a 2 and dividing by the total number of items. Due to regulations specific to Maine, 13 items were identified by the Maine – Harvard Prevention Research Center School Wellness Policy Work Group as having an automatic code of 2, while one item was identified as receiving an automatic code of 1. These changes due to Maine Learning Results, MDOE Chapter 51, and MDOE Chapter 435 are outlined in the coding tool (**Appendix D**).

INTER-RATER RELIABILITY

Two raters independently coded each policy. Discrepancies in coding of items were reviewed by a reconciler and when appropriate, by members of the Maine – Harvard Prevention Research Center School Wellness Policy Work Group. This group also coded sample policies provided by the Maine School Management Association and the MDOE. An inter-rater reliability assessment was conducted on 20 policies that were each coded by both raters. The percentage of agreement indicated high levels of inter-rater agreement. Overall, inter-rater agreement ranged from a low of 80% (for nutrition education integrated into other subjects) to a high of 100% (for several items), with an average of 98%. The percentage of agreement was high across sections, ranging from 80% to 100% in Nutrition Education, 90% to 100% in USDA Standards, 85% to 100% in Nutrition Guidelines, 90% to 100% in Physical Education, 95% to 100% in Physical Activity, 90% to 100% in Communication and Promotion, and 95% to 100% in Evaluation.

OTHER STUDY VARIABLES

Descriptive data for each SAU, including a unique SAU code, superintendent code, SAU type (i.e., SAU under individual supervision, Maine School Administrative District, Maine School Administrative Union, Maine Consolidated School District, Regional School District/or Other SAU type), county, student enrollment, and proportion of students in free and reduced price lunch programs were obtained through the Maine Department of Education website (<http://www.maine.gov/education/index.shtml>). The proportions of students in free and reduced price lunch programs were not available for six eligible SAUs (Isle au Haut, MSAD 65, Monhegan Plt, Frenchboro, Cranberry Isles, and MSAD 07). Enrollment data (2006-2007 school year) were obtained from the Maine Education Data Management System (MEDMS) and the Maine Department of Education Free and Reduced Lunch Report. Enrollment data were not available for nine SAUs (eight regional schools and Chebeague Island). MEDMS enrollment data were used when available, and Free and Reduced Lunch Report enrollment data were used for four SAUs (Maine School of Science and Math, Arthur R. Gould School, Governor Baxtor School for the Deaf, and Mountain View Youth Development Center) for which MEDMS enrollment data were not available. In 221 SAUs for which enrollment data were available from both MEDMS and the Free and Reduced Lunch Report, the two reported enrollments were found to be highly correlated ($r=0.99$, $p<0.0001$). County-level data, including 2003 urban influence code, FIPS code, and 2000 Census county population, were obtained from the US Department of Agriculture Economic Research Service website (<http://www.ers.usda.gov/Data/UrbanInfluenceCodes/>). SAUs with a School Health Coordinator (SHC) through Healthy Maine Partnerships for the 2006-2007 school year were identified via the Maine – Harvard

Prevention Research Center School Wellness Policy Work Group. In cases where School Administrative Unions were identified as having a SHC, each SAU in the union was coded as having a SHC.

ANALYSIS

Descriptive statistics were calculated for all variables and comparisons were made between eligible SAUs and SAUs providing Local School Wellness Policies based on SAU type, county population, SHC versus no SHC, school enrollment, and percent enrollment in free and reduced price lunch programs. Associations between these descriptive characteristics were analyzed among coded policies. Comprehensiveness and Strength scores for each of the 7 sections and for the entire scale were calculated for all policies coded, and scores were ranked as Low, Medium, or High based on the potential range of scores from 0 to 1. A Low score ranged from 0 to 0.332, a Medium score ranged from 0.333 to 0.665, and a High score ranged from 0.666 to 1. Summary statistics for the scores and score ranks were calculated. Differences in scores and score ranks were analyzed by school enrollment, percent enrollment in free and reduced price lunch, SHC versus no SHC, and county population. The Maine – Harvard Prevention Research Center School Wellness Policy Work Group selected these descriptive variables and identified category cutpoints based on operational definitions and activities of the MDOE. A 50% cutpoint for percent enrollment in free and reduced price lunch programs was selected due to funding qualifications. A school enrollment cutpoint of 1,200 is related to the Maine school administration reorganization law, “An Act To Remove Barriers to the Reorganization of School Administrative Units” (LD2323), which will result in consolidated school districts with enrollment of no less than 1,200 students, beginning in the 2009-2010 school year. In order to determine differences in mean scores among categories of school enrollment, percent enrollment in free and reduced price lunch, SHC versus no SHC, and county population, two-sample t-tests were performed. Non-parametric tests for differences in underlying score distributions were examined using Wilcoxon rank sum tests. A 0.05 level of significance was employed for all tests. All statistical analyses were performed using SAS v9.1 (SAS Institute, Inc., Cary, NC). The Maine – Harvard Prevention Research Center School Wellness Policy Work Group reviewed initial findings and provided input and contextual information for inclusion in this report.

RESULTS

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Descriptive statistics of the sample are shown in **Table 2**. Among the 231 eligible SAUs, the most common SAU type was Union (38%), followed by SAD (30%), Individual (23%), CSD (6%), and Other (2%). Counties that were most frequently represented were Hancock (12%), Washington (12%), and Penobscot (10%), while those represented the least frequently were Franklin (1%), Piscataquis (1%), and

Somerset (2%). Similar proportions of SAUs were located in counties with populations of less than 70,000 (49%) and 70,000 or greater (51%). School Health Coordinators were present in 28 percent of SAUs. Three-quarters (76%) of SAUs had school enrollment less than 1,200, while one-quarter (24%) had a larger enrollment. Nearly one-third (31%) of SAUs had 50% or greater enrollment in free and reduced price lunch programs.

SAUs providing Local School Wellness Policies (n=190) were not significantly different from all eligible SAUs based on the characteristics analyzed (SAU type, county population, SHC versus no SHC, school enrollment, and percent enrollment in free and reduced price lunch programs). Among SAUs providing policies, some of these characteristics were associated. Compared to SAUs with school enrollment of 1,200 or greater, a significantly greater proportion of SAUs with school enrollment of less than 1,200 had 50% or greater enrollment in free and reduced price lunch programs (35% vs. 13%, $p=0.002$) and were located in counties with population of less than 70,000 (91% vs. 58%, $p<0.0001$), and a significantly lower proportion had SHCs (28% vs. 45%, $p=0.02$). A greater proportion of SAUs with 50% or greater enrollment in free and reduced price lunch programs had SHCs compared to SAUs with less than 50% enrollment in free and reduced price lunch programs (42% vs. 29%), but the difference was not significant ($p=0.10$). The type of policy used (sample policy, shared policy, or unique policy) was significantly associated with school enrollment, the presence of SHCs, and county population. A greater proportion of SAUs with school enrollment of 1,200 or greater had unique policies compared to SAUs with school enrollment less than 1,200 (84% vs. 29%, $p<0.0001$), while sample policies (11% vs. 27%) and shared policies (5% vs. 44%) policies were used less frequently. SAUs with SHCs were more likely to use unique policies than SAUs without SHCs (59% vs. 38%) and less likely to use sample policies (3% vs. 32%, $p<0.0001$). A greater proportion of SAUs in counties with population of 70,000 or greater had unique policies compared to SAUs in smaller counties (52% vs. 27%), and a smaller proportion shared policies (27% vs. 46%, $p=0.003$).

RESULTS FOR INDIVIDUAL POLICY ITEMS

Results for individual policy items are shown in **Table 3**. Several items were always coded as required policy components according to Maine law. These items include nutrition guidelines for vending machines, school stores, food service a la carte, food before school, food after school, food sold for fundraising, nutrition information for others foods, regular soda, and beverages other than soda; PE classes/credits, qualifications for PE instructors, and PE waiver requirements; and restricting marketing of unhealthful food choices. Other items that were very often mentioned as required were goals for nutrition education, nutrition education teaches lifelong skills, guidelines for reimbursable school meals not less restrictive than USDA

regulations, goals for physical activity, ongoing health advisory committee, measuring implementation, and plan for implementation.

One item was never mentioned: number of nutrition education courses or hours. Other items that were rarely mentioned include: nutrition education beyond the school environment; USDA School Breakfast Program; Summer Food Service Program; use of low-fat versions of foods and methods of preparation; access to hand-washing; nutrition qualifications of meal staff; availability of nutrition information for school meals; time per week of PE for elementary, middle, and high school; frequency of required PE; teacher to student ratio for PE; amount of moderate to vigorous activity in PE; annual health assessments; safe active routes to school; not using physical activity as a punishment; recess quality to promote physical activity; use of the CDC Coordinated School Health Model; and funding support for wellness activities or policy evaluation. Several items relating to nutrition guidelines were also rarely mentioned, including nutrition guidelines for sugar and sodium content of foods; calorie content per serving size; ingredients with questionable effects; sugar, fat, calorie, and caffeine content of beverages; sugar and calorie content of flavored milk; fat content of milk; serving size limits for beverages; and access to free drinking water.

SUMMARY SCORES

Summary statistics for Comprehensiveness and Strength scores for each section and in total are shown in **Table 4**. Scores were calculated for a total of 190 Local School Wellness Policies that were coded. (Scores for individual SAUs can be found in **Appendix E**.) The overall mean Comprehensiveness score was 0.52, indicating that on average approximately half of the items coded were mentioned in the policy text. The mean Strength score was 0.33, indicating that on average one-third of the items coded were specifically described in the policy text as required components, or required by Maine law. Comprehensiveness scores ranged from 0.26 to 0.83, and Strength scores ranged from 0.19 to 0.55 (both out of a possible 0 to 1). The majority of scores fell into the Medium score rank category (87% for Comprehensiveness, 60% for Strength). More Strength scores than Comprehensiveness scores fell into the Low category (40% for Strength, 6% for Comprehensiveness), and while there were some High Comprehensiveness scores (7%) there were no High Strength scores.

Scores varied by section. Sections with the highest Comprehensiveness scores were Evaluation (mean=0.69) and Communication and Promotion (mean=0.64), while sections with the lowest Comprehensiveness scores were Standards for USDA Child Nutrition Program/Reimbursable School Meals (mean=0.39) and Physical Education (mean=0.47). Sections with the highest Strength scores were Evaluation (mean=0.44) and Nutrition Education (mean=0.39), while sections with the lowest Strength scores were Standards for USDA Child Nutrition Program/Reimbursable School Meals (mean=0.17) and Physical Activity (mean=0.27). Three sections had high proportions of Comprehensiveness scores in the

High category: Evaluation (75%), Communication and Promotion (57%), and Physical Activity (55%). All sections had low proportions of Strength scores in the High category, and the Physical Education section had none. Three sections had high proportions of Strength scores in the Low category: Standards for USDA Child Nutrition Program/Reimbursable School Meals (95%), Physical Activity (84%), and Nutrition Guidelines for Competitive and Other Foods Distributed at School (62%).

SUMMARY SCORES BY SAU CHARACTERISTICS

SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

Scores by school enrollment category are shown in **Table 5**. There were 135 SAUs (71%) with enrollment of less than 1,200 and 55 SAUs (29%) with enrollment of 1,200 or greater. Overall, SAUs with less than 1,200 students enrolled had significantly higher Comprehensiveness scores compared to SAUs with 1,200 or greater students enrolled (mean $<1,200=0.54$, mean $\geq 1,200=0.49$; $p=0.02$). SAUs with less than 1,200 enrolled had significantly higher Comprehensiveness scores in the USDA Standards section (mean $<1,200=0.42$, mean $\geq 1,200=0.32$; $p=0.001$). All other comparisons among Comprehensiveness scores showed no significant differences. Total Strength scores were not significantly different among SAUs of different enrollment categories (mean $<1,200=0.33$, mean $\geq 1,200=0.32$; $p=0.18$). Section Strength scores differed for the Standards for USDA Child Nutrition Program/Reimbursable School Meals section, where SAUs with smaller enrollment had significantly higher scores than those with greater enrollment (mean $<1,200=0.18$, mean $\geq 1,200=0.14$; $p=0.04$). All other comparisons among Strength scores showed no significant differences.

PROPORTION OF STUDENTS IN FREE AND REDUCED PRICE LUNCH PROGRAMS

Table 6 shows scores by the proportion of students in free and reduced price lunch programs. There were 135 SAUs (72%) with less than 50% enrollment in free and reduced price lunch, and 53 SAUs (28%) with 50% or greater. SAUs with 50% or greater enrollment in free and reduced price lunch programs had significantly higher total Comprehensiveness scores than SAUs with less than 50% enrollment in these programs (mean $<50\%=0.51$, mean $\geq 50\%=0.55$; $p=0.04$). Significant differences in Comprehensiveness scores were observed for Physical Education (mean $<50\%=0.46$, mean $\geq 50\%=0.50$; $p=0.02$). Significant differences in Strength scores were also observed for the Physical Education section (mean $<50\%=0.31$, mean $\geq 50\%=0.34$; $p=0.05$).

SCHOOL HEALTH COORDINATOR

Table 7 shows scores comparing SAUs with a school health coordinator to those without (SHC versus no SHC). There were 63 SAUs (33%) with SHCs and 127 (67%) with no SHCs. Total scores did not differ between SAUs with SHCs and those without for either Comprehensiveness (mean SHC=0.53, mean no SHC=0.52; $p=0.86$) or Strength (mean SHC=0.34, mean no SHC=0.32; $p=0.38$). Comprehensiveness scores differed significantly among SAUs with SHCs and those without for two sections: Nutrition Guidelines (mean SHC=0.54, mean no SHC=0.47; $p=0.01$), and Communication and Promotion (mean SHC=0.59, mean no SHC=0.67; $p=0.03$). Nutrition Guidelines section Comprehensiveness scores were higher among SAUs with SHCs compared to those without, whereas Communication and Promotion section scores were lower among SAUs with SHCs compared to those without SHCs. Nutrition Guidelines section Strength scores were also significantly higher among SAUs with SHCs compared to those without (mean SHC=0.40, mean no SHC=0.35; $p=0.02$). No other section scores showed significant differences between SAUs with SHCs and those without SHCs.

COUNTY POPULATION

In **Table 8**, differences in scores by county population are shown. 79 SAUs (46%) were located in counties with populations of less than 70,000, and 93 SAUs (54%) were located in counties with populations of 70,000 or greater. SAUs in multiple counties were excluded from the analysis. Total Comprehensiveness scores (mean <70,000=0.52, mean $\geq 70,000=0.52$; $p=0.94$) and total Strength scores (mean <70,000=0.33, mean $\geq 70,000=0.33$; $p=0.75$) were similar among SAUs of different county population. Comprehensiveness scores were significantly higher among SAUs with county population 70,000 or greater compared to less than 70,000 in the Nutrition Education (mean <70,000=0.55, mean $\geq 70,000=0.59$; $p=0.03$) and Physical Education (mean <70,000=0.45, mean $\geq 70,000=0.49$; $p=0.03$) sections, and they were lower in the Nutrition Guidelines section (mean <70,000=0.52, mean $\geq 70,000=0.47$; $p=0.04$). Strength scores were significantly higher among SAUs with county population of 70,000 or greater for Nutrition Education (mean <70,000=0.37, mean $\geq 70,000=0.42$; $p=0.01$), Physical Education (mean <70,000=0.30, mean $\geq 70,000=0.33$; $p=0.04$), and Evaluation (mean <70,000=0.41, mean $\geq 70,000=0.45$; $p=0.04$) sections; while they were significantly lower for the Nutrition Guidelines section (mean <70,000=0.40, mean $\geq 70,000=0.35$; $p=0.002$).

DISCUSSION

SUMMARY OF KEY FINDINGS

The results of the Local School Wellness Policy assessment indicate that on average the policies coded addressed half of the 96 items in the Local School Wellness Policy coding tool. One-third of the items were

addressed with strong language and specified as a required component of the policy. When ranked by level (i.e., Low, Medium, High), the majority of Local School Wellness Policies (87%) were in the middle rank for Comprehensiveness and Strength (60%). Across sections, over half of SAUs scored in the top ranking level for Comprehensiveness in three sections (i.e., Evaluation, Communication and Promotion and Physical Activity), while for Comprehensiveness in the other areas (i.e., Standards for Meals, Nutrition Education, Nutrition Guidelines for Competitive Foods and Physical Education) the majority of SAUs were ranked in the middle level. As the measures are related, generally the proportion of items that were addressed with strong and directive language (i.e., Strength score) was usually higher in sections with greater Comprehensiveness. However, for the Physical Activity section, despite a large proportion of the SAUs having Comprehensiveness score rankings in the highest category (55%) the language of the policy was insufficiently specific and directive as 84% of SAUs were ranked at the lowest level of Strength for that section. These findings indicate that technical assistance in developing strong, directive and specific language related to physical activity might be a potential area for consideration as SAUs generally have Local School Wellness Policies that already address the majority of item components.

In coding items, strong language was present when the item was specific by, for example, including a plan for implementation with wording indicating that the component was required (e.g., the district will provide parents with healthy snack ideas in monthly newsletters and in orientation information). Together, these items imply that there is a commitment for action and the expectation that the action will be taken. Results for individual coding items varied. Several items (e.g., qualifications for physical education instructors) were given automatic codes due to existing policies including the Maine Learning Results, or MDOE rules. These items were most frequently considered automatically mentioned with strong language, even if the Local School Wellness Policy did not specifically include text regarding the individual item. Other items, such as use of low-fat versions of foods and methods of preparation, availability of nutrition information for school meals, annual health assessments, safe active routes to school, funding support, and several specific nutrition guidelines, were notably absent from SAU Local School Wellness Policies and could be considered potential points for targeted technical assistance and training.

Comparisons of Comprehensiveness and Strength scores by enrollment, proportion enrollment in free and reduced price lunch, SHC versus no SHC, and county population revealed several score differences. On average, SAUs with lower enrollment (less than 1,200 students) had more comprehensive Local School Wellness Policies compared to SAUs with higher enrollment (1,200 students or more). SAUs with lower enrollment also addressed a greater proportion of items with strong language in the USDA Standards section. Scores also differed by percent enrollment in free and reduced price lunch programs. SAUs with 50% or more of students enrolled in free and reduced price lunch programs had more comprehensive policies than those SAUs with fewer students eligible for these programs. Overall, summary measures of overall

comprehensiveness and strength in Local School Wellness Policies from SAUs with school health coordinators were similar to those SAUs without school health coordinators (SHC). Similarly, there were no statistically significant differences in comprehensiveness or strength of policy language in SAUs according to the size of the county population in which they were located (county population less than 70,000 compared to 70,000 or greater).

CONTEXT OF FINDINGS IN MAINE

There are several contextual factors that may influence observed policy scores and differences in score comparisons among SAUs. Local School Wellness Policies were initially written with the intent of being working policies, policies that would evolve over time, and they were not meant to be comprehensive. SAUs may have left certain items out of their policies based on local needs and in accordance with state or local policies and practices that were already established. Some items may have been left out because they were not included in sample policy documents or trainings provided to SAUs.

SAUs with lower enrollment may have had more comprehensive policies due to potentially easier consensus and fewer political barriers to policy passage. These SAUs have smaller constituencies, and therefore fewer people to disagree over items proposed for inclusion in the Local School Wellness Policy. Similarly, smaller districts may have fewer opposing stakeholders at the district level due to high relative importance of schools.

More comprehensive policies among SAUs with a greater proportion enrollment in free and reduced price lunch programs may be related to greater attention to these schools from advocacy groups focused on school wellness. For example, the Maine Nutrition Network, a public-private partnership focused on nutrition and physical activity initiatives in the state of Maine, has two projects that focus on schools with 50% or greater enrollment in free and reduced price lunch programs (<http://www.maine-nutrition.org/Projects/Projects.htm>). Maine-ly Nutrition is a project that provides teachers and school nurses at Maine schools with 50% or more of students eligible for free and reduced price lunch programs with training and resources to implement nutrition education in the classroom. Take Time! is a project that provides resources for integrating physical activity opportunities into the school day, with additional support materials and training provided to schools with 50% or more of students eligible for free and reduced price lunch programs.

Relationships that are unaccounted for in these data may affect policy score comparisons. Some of the descriptive characteristics analyzed were associated. Two notable relationships are that SAUs with lower school enrollment (less than 1,200 students) were more likely to have 50% or greater enrollment in free and reduced price lunch programs, and school health coordinators were more likely to be present in SAUs with higher school enrollment (1,200 students or more). These associations may have influenced score comparisons among SAUs with different enrollment, percent enrollment in free and reduced price lunch

programs, and school health coordinator status. Additionally, the relationship between Local School Wellness Policy scores and trainings and other resources provided to SAUs remain unexplored. Through Team Nutrition Training, school district staff in 75 SAUs received training to assist in the development and adoption of their Local School Wellness Policies. Attendees of these trainings were given sample Local School Wellness Policy criteria and information to help them get a Local School Wellness Policy approved in their district, and they may have developed stronger or more comprehensive Local School Wellness Policies as a result. Policy strength and comprehensiveness could also be related to the resources provided by the Maine Nutrition Network to schools with 50% or greater enrollment in free and reduced price lunch programs. In the 2007-2008 school year, 100 schools in 56 districts received nutrition education training and resources through the Maine-ly Nutrition program. In the 2006-2007 school year, 34 schools participated in the Take Time! program, including 9 schools in 2 districts that implemented the program as a district-wide policy. Further analysis is needed in order to understand the relationship between school wellness resources and Local School Wellness Policy scores in Maine.

LIMITATIONS

There are limitations that must be considered in interpreting these results. First, two raters coded each Local School Wellness Policy. Although inter-rater agreement was high, suggesting that this measurement error was minimized, there is the potential that both coders miscoded or misclassified items in a similar way. We do not currently have data from other states or national samples collected using this tool against which we can compare our findings. Ranking and categories (e.g. low, medium, high) are entirely data-based and are not based on research or intervention evidence for effect on student health or wellness outcomes. Section scores should be interpreted with caution because sections contained varying numbers of policy items, and sections with few items had a limited number of possible score values. We are currently not able to compare policy scores with actual environments, nor are we measuring the extent to which the policies outlined in documentation provided by SAUs are being followed or implemented in an actual SAU or school. Thus, Local School Wellness Policies may not adequately represent the environments in which students are educated. Response rates were adequate overall and by categories used for score comparisons. However, Local School Wellness Policies were not received from all eligible SAUs, and SAUs not providing policies may be different from those providing policies in ways that could be related to school wellness outcomes. There may also have been some inconsistency in complete information among the policies that were received. Some SAUs have local regulations that append their policies that are called associated guidelines. These associated guidelines were sent by some but not all SAUs. We are not able to estimate what proportion of guidelines we may be missing at this time. Results comparing SAUs with SHCs versus those without may be limited by timing discrepancies between Local School Wellness Policy development and SHC presence.

SAUs with SHCs were identified for the 2006-2007 school year, not for the 2005-2006 school year during which Local School Wellness Policies were written.

IMPLICATIONS

Despite these noted limitations, these findings have important practice and research implications. Local School Wellness Policies provide a sustainable framework for school community stakeholders to promote healthy eating and physical activity habits. Data from this assessment of Local School Wellness Policies in Maine can be used to identify specific policy areas that need attention by local school systems and to plan technical assistance and training that support policy improvements. As policies are reviewed, local school systems can add language to reflect other policies or practices that are already in place. In some areas, Local School Wellness Policies could be strengthened by focusing on the wording choice and specificity of language. State law could also address some school wellness items. SAU reports can be useful in communicating with school wellness team and other community members to ensure that SAUs develop Local School Wellness Policies that follow standard guidelines and are locally appropriate. Data from this assessment may also be useful as a baseline for further study of health and wellness outcomes.

REFERENCES

- (2004). Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004, *Public Law 108-265*.
- Drewnowski, A. (1997). Taste preferences and food intake. *Annual Review of Nutrition*, 17(1), 237-253.
- Institute of Medicine (2007). Nutrition Standards for Foods in Schools: Leading the Way Toward Healthier Youth.
- Kann, L., Brener, N.D., & Wechsler, H. (2007). Overview and Summary: School Health Policies and Programs Study 2006. *Journal of School Health*, 77(8), 385-397.
- Kubik, M.Y., Lytle, L.A., Hannan, P.J., Perry, C.L., & Story, M. (2003). The Association of the School Food Environment With Dietary Behaviors of Young Adolescents. *Am J Public Health*, 93(7), 1168-1173.
- Masse, L.C., Chiqui, J.F., Igoe, J.F., Atienza, A.A., Kruger, J., Kohl Iii, H.W., Frosh, M.M., & Yaroch, A.L. (2007). Development of a Physical Education-Related State Policy Classification System (PERSPCS). *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 33(4, Supplement 1), S264-S276.
- Masse, L.C., Frosh, M.M., Chiqui, J.F., Yaroch, A.L., Agurs-Collins, T., Blanck, H.M., Atienza, A.A., McKenna, M.L., & Igoe, J.F. (2007). Development of a School Nutrition-Environment State Policy Classification System (SNESPCS). *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 33(4, Supplement 1), S277-S291.
- Metos, J., & Nanney, M.S. (2007). The Strength of School Wellness Policies: One States' Experience. *Journal of School Health*, 77(7), 367-372.
- New Hampshire Department of Education (2005). Local Wellness Policy Toolkit.
- Nicklas, J., & Johnson, R. (2004). Position of the American Dietetic Association: dietary guidance for healthy children ages 2 to 11. *J Am Diet Assoc*, 104, 660-677.
- Schwartz, M.B., Lund, A., Greves, M., McDonnell, E., Probart, C., Samuelson, A., & Lytle, L. (2008). Coding Tool for Abstracting School Wellness Policies: Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Healthy Eating Research Program.
- Story, M., Kaphingst, K.M., & French, S. (2006). The Role of Schools in Obesity Prevention. *The Future of Children*, 16(1), 109-142.

- Vecchiarelli, S., Takayanagi, S., & Neumann, C. (2006). Students' Perceptions of the Impact of Nutrition Policies on Dietary Behaviors. *Journal of School Health*, 76(10), 525-531.
- Veugelaers, P.J., & Fitzgerald, A.L. (2005). Effectiveness of School Programs in Preventing Childhood Obesity: A Multilevel Comparison. *Am J Public Health*, 95(3), 432-435.
- Wechsler, H., Devereaux, R.S., Davis, M., & Collins, J. (2000). Using the School Environment to Promote Physical Activity and Healthy Eating. *Preventive Medicine*, 31(2), S121-S137.

TABLES

TABLE 1. RESPONSE RATES BY SAU CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristic	Total (# Excluded)	Eligible SAUs	Eligible SAUs with Policy	Response Rate %
SAU Type				
Individual	81 (27)	54	40	74%
Union	122 (34)	88	76	86%
SAD	72 (2)	70	64	91%
CSD	15 (0)	15	8	53%
Other ¹	12 (8)	4	2	50%
County				
Androscoggin	11 (0)	11	9	82%
Aroostook	33 (12)	21	19	90%
Cumberland	21 (2)	19	16	84%
Franklin	8 (5)	3	2	67%
Hancock	30 (2)	28	23	82%
Kennebec	19 (0)	19	18	95%
Knox	10 (1)	9	6	67%
Lincoln	18 (5)	13	11	85%
Oxford	11 (7)	4	4	100%
Penobscot	32 (8)	24	20	83%
Piscataquis	8 (6)	2	2	100%
Sagadahoc	7 (1)	6	4	67%
Somerset	10 (6)	4	4	100%
Waldo	7 (1)	6	5	83%
Washington	41 (14)	27	18	67%
York	1 (0)	14	11	79%
Multiple Counties	22 (1)	21	18	86%
County Population				
Less than 70,000	150 (48)	102	79	77%
70,000 or Greater	130 (22)	108	93	86%
Multiple Counties	22 (1)	21	18	86%
School Health Coordinator (SHC)				
Yes	75 (11)	64	63	98%
No	227 (60)	167	127	76%
School Enrollment²				
Less than 1,200	175 (0)	175	135	77%
1,200 or Greater	56 (0)	56	55	98%
None Enrolled	62 (62)	0	0	N/A
Percent Enrolled in Free and Reduced Price Lunch³				
Less than 50%	156 (0)	156	135	87%
50% or Greater	69 (0)	69	53	77%
No Free and Reduced Lunch Program	71 (71)	0	0	N/A
TOTAL	302 (71)	231	190	82%

¹Other includes Regional & Other schools

²Public Attending Enrollment from the Maine Education Data Management System (MEDMS). Enrollment according to the Maine Department of Education Free and Reduced Lunch Report was used for 4 SAUs that did not have MEDMS data available. 9 SAUs had no enrollment information available.

³Free and reduced price lunch data were not available for 6 eligible SAUs (2 of which provided policies).

TABLE 2. DESCRIPTION OF SAMPLE, SAUS INCLUDED AND SAUS PROVIDING POLICIES

Characteristic	Included (N=231)		Policy Received (N=190)	
	n	%	n	%
SAU Type	<i>n=231</i>		<i>n=190</i>	
Individual	54	23	40	21
Union	88	38	76	40
SAD	70	30	64	34
CSD	15	6	8	4
Other ¹	4	2	2	1
County	<i>n=231</i>		<i>n=190</i>	
Androscoggin	11	5	9	5
Aroostook	21	9	19	10
Cumberland	19	8	16	8
Franklin	3	1	2	1
Hancock	28	12	23	12
Kennebec	19	8	18	9
Knox	9	4	6	3
Lincoln	13	6	11	6
Oxford	4	2	4	2
Penobscot	24	10	20	11
Piscataquis	2	1	2	1
Sagadahoc	6	3	4	2
Somerset	4	2	4	2
Waldo	6	3	5	3
Washington	27	12	18	9
York	14	6	11	6
Multiple Counties	21	9	18	9
County Population²	<i>n=210</i>		<i>n=172</i>	
Less than 70,000	102	49	79	46
70,000 or Greater	108	51	93	54
School Health Coordinator (SHC)	<i>n=231</i>		<i>n=190</i>	
Yes	64	28	63	33
No	167	72	127	67
School Enrollment³	<i>n=231</i>		<i>n=190</i>	
Less than 1,200	175	76	135	71
1,200 or Greater	56	24	55	29
Percent Enrolled in Free and Reduced Price Lunch⁴	<i>n=225</i>		<i>n=188</i>	
Less than 50%	156	69	135	72
50% or Greater	69	31	53	28

¹Other includes Regional & Other schools

²21 SAUs covering multiple counties were excluded (18 of which provided policies).

³Public Attending Enrollment from the Maine Education Data Management System (MEDMS). Enrollment according to the Maine Department of Education Free and Reduced Lunch Report was used for 4 SAUs that did not have MEDMS data available.

⁴Free and reduced price lunch data were not available for 6 SAUs (2 of which provided policies).

TABLE 3. CODING RESULTS FOR INDIVIDUAL POLICY ITEMS (N=190)

Items	Not Mentioned (score=0)		Weak Statement (score=1)		Meets/Exceeds Expectations (score=2)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Nutrition Education						
FW: goals for NE	1	1	0	0	189	99
Nutrition curriculum each grade	129	68	24	13	37	19
NE with larger school community	19	10	163	86	8	4
NE beyond school environment	158	83	27	14	5	3
NE training for teachers	137	72	20	11	33	17
NE integrated into other subjects	39	21	48	25	103	54
NE teaches lifelong skills	13	7	11	6	166	87
Number of NE courses or hours	190	100	0	0	0	0
NE quality	49	26	7	4	134	71
Standards for USDA Child Nutrition Program/Reimbursable School Meals						
FW: guidelines not less restrictive	8	4	1	1	181	95
School Breakfast Program (USDA)	158	83	16	8	16	8
Summer Food Service Program	185	97	4	2	1	1
Guidelines beyond USDA minimum	124	65	44	23	22	12
Low-fat versions/methods	171	90	19	10	0	0
Strategies to increase participation	57	30	120	63	13	7
Optimizes scheduling	72	38	113	59	5	3
Adequate time to eat	66	35	110	58	14	7
Hand-washing	172	91	11	6	7	4
Nutrition qualifications of meal staff	175	92	1	1	14	7
Training for food service staff	83	44	90	47	17	9
School meal environment	61	32	14	7	115	61
Nutrition information	166	87	12	6	12	6
Nutrition Guidelines for Competitive and Other Foods Distributed at School						
FW: NG for ALL foods at school	5	3	123	65	62	33
Vending machines	0	0	0	0	190	100
School stores	0	0	0	0	190	100
Food service a la carte	0	0	0	0	190	100
Class parties and celebrations	34	18	147	77	9	5
Food from home for the whole class	34	18	147	77	9	5
Food before school	0	0	0	0	190	100
Food after school	0	0	0	0	190	100
Food at evening/community events	133	70	54	28	3	2
Food sold for fundraising	0	0	0	0	190	100
Sugar content of foods	161	85	14	7	15	8
Fat content of foods	145	76	23	12	22	12
Sodium content of foods	151	79	24	13	15	8
Calorie content per serving size	185	97	4	2	1	1
Serving size of foods	139	73	34	18	17	9
Whole, unprocessed, & fresh food	129	68	26	14	35	18
Ingredients w/ questionable effects	171	90	6	3	13	7
Food as a reward or punishment	135	71	32	17	23	12
Nutrition info for other foods	0	0	0	0	190	100
Sugar content of beverages	159	84	16	8	15	8
Fat content of drinks	168	88	14	7	8	4
Calorie content of beverages	189	99	0	0	1	1
Regular soda	0	0	0	0	190	100
Beverages other than soda	0	0	0	0	190	100
Sugar/calorie content of milk	189	99	1	1	0	0
Fat content of milk	156	82	7	4	27	14
Serving size limits for beverages	162	85	11	6	17	9
Caffeine content of beverages	177	93	2	1	11	6
Free drinking water	173	91	11	6	6	3

TABLE 3. CODING RESULTS FOR INDIVIDUAL POLICY ITEMS (N=190), CONTINUED

Items	Not Mentioned (score=0)		Weak Statement (score=1)		Meets/Exceeds Expectations (score=2)	
	n	%	n	%	n	%
Physical Education						
PE curriculum for each grade	0	0	168	88	22	12
Time/week of PE for elementary	176	93	11	6	3	2
Time/week of PE for middle	177	93	11	6	2	1
Time/week of PE for high school	182	96	6	3	2	1
Physically active lifestyle	17	9	113	59	60	32
Competency assessment	51	27	2	1	137	72
Addresses PE quality	144	76	20	11	26	14
Inclusive play	77	41	7	4	106	56
Addresses PE classes or credits	0	0	0	0	190	100
Frequency of required PE	175	92	14	7	1	1
Teacher-student ratio for PE	178	94	12	6	0	0
Safe/adequate equipment/facilities	96	51	15	8	79	42
Moderate to vigorous activity	173	91	4	2	13	7
Qualifications for PE instructors	0	0	0	0	190	100
Prof. development for PE staff	86	45	101	53	3	2
PE waiver requirements	0	0	0	0	190	100
Annual health assessment	188	99	2	1	0	0
Physical Activity						
FW: goals for PA	4	2	0	0	186	98
PA for every grade level	7	4	139	73	44	23
PA for school staff	61	32	117	62	12	6
PA throughout the day	41	22	45	24	104	55
Intramurals or interscholastic	54	28	33	17	103	54
Community use facilities for PA	88	46	95	50	7	4
Safe active routes to school	173	91	9	5	8	4
Not using PA as punishment	155	82	23	12	12	6
Recess freq. or amt for elementary	30	16	130	68	30	16
Recess quality to promote PA	165	87	11	6	14	7
Communication and Promotion						
FW: Stakeholders involved in development of wellness policy	62	33	2	1	126	66
Staff wellness programs	49	26	111	58	30	16
Consistency of nutrition messages	18	9	48	25	124	65
Staff to role model	62	33	15	8	113	59
Responsibility for communication	73	38	105	55	12	6
Coordinated School Health Model	178	94	6	3	6	3
Methods to solicit input	58	31	126	66	6	3
How to engage parents/community	70	37	102	54	18	9
Content communicated to parents	138	73	7	4	45	24
Marketing healthy choices	90	47	91	48	9	5
Restricting marketing	0	0	0	0	190	100
Ongoing health advisory committee	21	11	13	7	156	82
Evaluation						
FW: Measuring implementation	9	5	12	6	169	89
Plan for implementation	16	8	14	7	160	84
Plan for evaluation	42	22	135	71	13	7
Audience and frequency of a report	23	12	27	14	140	74
Funding support	188	99	2	1	0	0
Plan for revising the policy	71	37	104	55	15	8

TABLE 4. SUMMARY SCORES (N=190)

Section	Comprehensiveness	
	Score	Strength Score
Nutrition Education		
Mean (SD)	0.57 (0.13)	0.39 (0.13)
95% Confidence Interval	0.55-0.59	0.38-0.41
Median	0.56	0.44
Range	0.22-0.89	0.11-0.78
Score Rank, n (%)		
Low	5 (3)	38 (20)
Medium	128 (67)	145 (76)
High	57 (30)	7 (4)
# of Items=9		
Standards for USDA Child Nutrition Program/Reimbursable School Meals		
Mean (SD)	0.39 (0.20)	0.17 (0.11)
95% Confidence Interval	0.37-0.42	0.15-0.19
Median	0.46	0.15
Range	0.00-0.85	0.00-0.77
Score Rank, n (%)		
Low	63 (33)	180 (95)
Medium	114 (60)	9 (5)
High	13 (7)	1 (1)
# of Items=13		
Nutrition Guidelines for Competitive and Other Foods Distributed at School		
Mean (SD)	0.49 (0.15)	0.37 (0.11)
95% Confidence Interval	0.47-0.51	0.35-0.38
Median	0.41	0.31
Range	0.31-0.86	0.31-0.76
Score Rank, n (%)		
Low	3 (2)	117 (62)
Medium	159 (84)	62 (33)
High	28 (15)	11 (6)
# of Items=29		
Physical Education		
Mean (SD)	0.47 (0.12)	0.32 (0.09)
95% Confidence Interval	0.45-0.48	0.30-0.33
Median	0.53	0.35
Range	0.24-0.82	0.18-0.65
Score Rank, n (%)		
Low	36 (19)	81 (43)
Medium	149 (78)	109 (57)
High	5 (3)	0 (0)
# of Items=17		

TABLE 4. SUMMARY SCORES (N=190), CONTINUED

Section	Comprehensiveness	
	Score	Strength Score
Physical Activity		
Mean (SD)	0.59 (0.20)	0.27 (0.14)
95% Confidence Interval	0.56-0.62	0.25-0.29
Median	0.70	0.30
Range	0.00-1.00	0.00-0.80
Score Rank, n (%)		
Low	26 (14)	160 (84)
Medium	59 (31)	24 (13)
High	105 (55)	6 (3)
# of Items=10		
Communication and Promotion		
Mean (SD)	0.64 (0.22)	0.37 (0.13)
95% Confidence Interval	0.61-0.67	0.35-0.38
Median	0.75	0.42
Range	0.17-1.00	0.08-0.67
Score Rank, n (%)		
Low	19 (10)	49 (26)
Medium	62 (33)	136 (72)
High	109 (57)	5 (3)
# of Items=12		
Evaluation		
Mean (SD)	0.69 (0.20)	0.44 (0.15)
95% Confidence Interval	0.67-0.72	0.41-0.46
Median	0.83	0.50
Range	0.00-0.83	0.00-0.83
Score Rank, n (%)		
Low	7 (4)	22 (12)
Medium	41 (22)	152 (80)
High	142 (75)	16 (8)
# of Items=6		
Total		
Mean (SD)	0.52 (0.11)	0.33 (0.07)
95% Confidence Interval	0.51-0.54	0.32-0.34
Median	0.56	0.33
Range	0.26-0.83	0.19-0.55
Score Rank, n (%)		
Low	11 (6)	76 (40)
Medium	165 (87)	114 (60)
High	14 (7)	0 (0)
# of Items=96		

Score Ranks: Low=0-0.332, Medium=0.333-0.665, High=0.666-1

TABLE 5. SCORES BY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT (N=190)

Section	Comprehensiveness Score		Strength Score	
	Less than 1,200 (N=135)	1,200 or Greater (N=55)	Less than 1,200 (N=135)	1,200 or Greater (N=55)
Nutrition Education				
Mean (SD)	0.57 (0.13)	0.57 (0.14)	0.40 (0.13)	0.39 (0.13)
95% Confidence Interval	0.55-0.59	0.53-0.61	0.38-0.42	0.35-0.42
Median	0.56	0.56	0.44	0.44
Range	0.22-0.89	0.33-0.89	0.11-0.67	0.11-0.78
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	5 (4)	0 (0)	28 (21)	10 (18)
Medium	92 (68)	36 (65)	102 (76)	43 (78)
High	38 (28)	19 (35)	5 (4)	2 (4)
Standards for USDA Child Nutrition Program/Reimbursable School Meals				
Mean (SD)	0.42 (0.19)	0.32 (0.19) † ‡	0.18 (0.12)	0.14 (0.09) † ‡
95% Confidence Interval	0.39-0.46	0.27-0.37	0.16-0.20	0.12-0.17
Median	0.46	0.31	0.15	0.15
Range	0.00-0.85	0.00-0.85	0.00-0.77	0.00-0.46
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	32 (24)	31 (56)	127 (94)	53 (96)
Medium	92 (68)	22 (40)	7 (5)	2 (4)
High	11 (8)	2 (4)	1 (1)	0 (0)
Nutrition Guidelines for Competitive and Other Foods Distributed at School				
Mean (SD)	0.50 (0.15)	0.48 (0.13)	0.37 (0.11)	0.35 (0.09)
95% Confidence Interval	0.47-0.52	0.44-0.51	0.35-0.39	0.33-0.38
Median	0.41	0.41	0.31	0.31
Range	0.31-0.86	0.31-0.86	0.31-0.76	0.31-0.72
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	2 (2)	1 (2)	84 (62)	33 (60)
Medium	112 (83)	47 (85)	41 (30)	21 (38)
High	21 (16)	7 (13)	10 (7)	1 (2)
Physical Education				
Mean (SD)	0.47 (0.12)	0.45 (0.10) ‡	0.32 (0.09)	0.31 (0.09)
95% Confidence Interval	0.45-0.50	0.42-0.48	0.30-0.33	0.29-0.34
Median	0.53	0.47	0.35	0.35
Range	0.24-0.82	0.29-0.82	0.18-0.59	0.18-0.65
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	29 (22)	7 (13)	54 (40)	27 (49)
Medium	102 (76)	47 (85)	81 (60)	28 (51)
High	4 (3)	1 (2)	0 (0)	0 (0)

TABLE 5. SCORES BY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT (N=190), CONTINUED

Section	Comprehensiveness Score		Strength Score	
	Less than 1,200 (N=135)	1,200 or Greater (N=55)	Less than 1,200 (N=135)	1,200 or Greater (N=55)
Physical Activity				
Mean (SD)	0.61 (0.20)	0.55 (0.18) ‡	0.28 (0.14)	0.26 (0.12)
95% Confidence Interval	0.57-0.64	0.51-0.60	0.25-0.30	0.23-0.29
Median	0.70	0.60	0.30	0.30
Range	0.00-1.00	0.20-0.90	0.00-0.80	0.10-0.70
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	17 (13)	9 (16)	114 (84)	46 (84)
Medium	35 (26)	24 (44)	16 (12)	8 (15)
High	83 (61)	22 (40)	5 (4)	1 (2)
Communication and Promotion				
Mean (SD)	0.66 (0.22)	0.59 (0.20) ‡	0.37 (0.13)	0.36 (0.14)
95% Confidence Interval	0.62-0.70	0.54-0.65	0.35-0.39	0.33-0.40
Median	0.75	0.58	0.42	0.33
Range	0.17-1.00	0.17-0.92	0.08-0.67	0.08-0.67
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	14 (10)	5 (9)	32 (24)	17 (31)
Medium	38 (28)	24 (44)	99 (73)	37 (67)
High	83 (61)	26 (47)	4 (3)	1 (2)
Evaluation				
Mean (SD)	0.71 (0.19)	0.65 (0.21) ‡	0.44 (0.15)	0.43 (0.16)
95% Confidence Interval	0.68-0.74	0.60-0.71	0.41-0.46	0.39-0.47
Median	0.83	0.67	0.50	0.50
Range	0.00-0.83	0.00-0.83	0.00-0.83	0.00-0.67
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	5 (4)	2 (4)	16 (12)	6 (11)
Medium	24 (18)	17 (31)	109 (81)	43 (78)
High	106 (79)	36 (65)	10 (7)	6 (11)
Total				
Mean (SD)	0.54 (0.11)	0.49 (0.10) † ‡	0.33 (0.07)	0.32 (0.07) ‡
95% Confidence Interval	0.52-0.55	0.47-0.52	0.32-0.34	0.30-0.34
Median	0.56	0.50	0.33	0.31
Range	0.26-0.83	0.31-0.74	0.19-0.55	0.19-0.51
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	8 (6)	3 (5)	42 (31)	34 (62)
Medium	116 (86)	49 (89)	93 (69)	21 (38)
High	11 (8)	3 (5)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Score Ranks: Low=0-0.332, Medium=0.333-0.665, High=0.666-1

NOTE: Data are Public Attending Enrollment from the Maine Education Data Management System (MEDMS). Enrollment according to the Maine Department of Education Free and Reduced Lunch Report was used for 2 SAUs that did not have MEDMS enrollment data available.

†Mean scores significantly different among SAUs with enrollment less than 1,200 and those with 1,200 or greater ($p<0.05$), according to t-test.

‡Score distributions significantly different among SAUs with enrollment less than 1,200 and those with 1,200 or greater ($p<0.05$), according to Wilcoxon rank sum test.

TABLE 6. SCORES BY PERCENT ENROLLMENT IN FREE & REDUCED PRICE LUNCH (N=188)

Section	Comprehensiveness Score		Strength Score	
	Less than 50% (N=135)	50% or Greater (N=53)	Less than 50% (N=135)	50% or Greater (N=53)
Nutrition Education				
Mean (SD)	0.56 (0.13)	0.60 (0.15)	0.39 (0.12)	0.41 (0.15)
95% Confidence Interval	0.54-0.58	0.55-0.64	0.37-0.41	0.37-0.45
Median	0.56	0.56	0.44	0.44
Range	0.22-0.89	0.22-0.89	0.11-0.78	0.11-0.67
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	2 (2)	3 (6)	27 (20)	9 (17)
Medium	94 (70)	32 (60)	105 (78)	40 (75)
High	39 (29)	18 (34)	3 (2)	4 (8)
Standards for USDA Child Nutrition Program/Reimbursable School Meals				
Mean (SD)	0.38 (0.19)	0.43 (0.22)	0.16 (0.09)	0.20 (0.15)
95% Confidence Interval	0.35-0.41	0.37-0.49	0.14-0.18	0.16-0.24
Median	0.46	0.46	0.15	0.15
Range	0.00-0.85	0.00-0.85	0.00-0.62	0.00-0.77
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	48 (36)	15 (28)	130 (96)	48 (91)
Medium	81 (60)	31 (58)	5 (4)	4 (8)
High	6 (4)	7 (13)	0 (0)	1 (2)
Nutrition Guidelines for Competitive and Other Foods Distributed at School				
Mean (SD)	0.49 (0.14)	0.50 (0.15)	0.36 (0.11)	0.36 (0.09)
95% Confidence Interval	0.46-0.51	0.46-0.54	0.35-0.38	0.33-0.38
Median	0.41	0.41	0.31	0.31
Range	0.31-0.86	0.31-0.86	0.31-0.76	0.31-0.62
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	2 (2)	1 (2)	82 (61)	35 (66)
Medium	117 (87)	42 (79)	44 (33)	18 (34)
High	16 (12)	10 (19)	9 (7)	0 (0)
Physical Education				
Mean (SD)	0.46 (0.12)	0.50 (0.10) † ‡	0.31 (0.10)	0.34 (0.07) † ‡
95% Confidence Interval	0.44-0.48	0.47-0.53	0.30-0.33	0.32-0.35
Median	0.47	0.53	0.35	0.35
Range	0.24-0.82	0.29-0.76	0.18-0.65	0.18-0.47
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	29 (21)	5 (9)	64 (47)	15 (28)
Medium	103 (76)	46 (87)	71 (53)	38 (72)
High	3 (2)	2 (4)	0 (0)	0 (0)

**TABLE 6. SCORES BY PERCENT ENROLLMENT IN FREE & REDUCED PRICE LUNCH (N=188),
CONTINUED**

Section	Comprehensiveness Score		Strength Score	
	Less than 50% (N=135)	50% or Greater (N=53)	Less than 50% (N=135)	50% or Greater (N=53)
Physical Activity				
Mean (SD)	0.58 (0.19)	0.62 (0.21)	0.26 (0.13)	0.30 (0.15)
95% Confidence Interval	0.55-0.61	0.57-0.68	0.24-0.29	0.26-0.35
Median	0.70	0.70	0.30	0.30
Range	0.00-1.00	0.20-1.00	0.00-0.80	0.10-0.80
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	17 (13)	9 (17)	113 (84)	45 (85)
Medium	48 (36)	9 (17)	20 (15)	4 (8)
High	70 (52)	35 (66)	2 (2)	4 (8)
Communication and Promotion				
Mean (SD)	0.62 (0.21)	0.69 (0.22) ‡	0.36 (0.14)	0.37 (0.12)
95% Confidence Interval	0.59-0.66	0.63-0.75	0.34-0.39	0.34-0.40
Median	0.67	0.83	0.42	0.42
Range	0.17-0.92	0.25-1.00	0.08-0.67	0.08-0.67
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	12 (9)	7 (13)	38 (28)	11 (21)
Medium	49 (36)	11 (21)	93 (69)	41 (77)
High	74 (55)	35 (66)	4 (3)	1 (2)
Evaluation				
Mean (SD)	0.68 (0.20)	0.74 (0.19) ‡	0.43 (0.15)	0.47 (0.13)
95% Confidence Interval	0.64-0.71	0.68-0.79	0.40-0.45	0.43-0.50
Median	0.83	0.83	0.50	0.50
Range	0.00-0.83	0.00-0.83	0.00-0.83	0.00-0.67
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	5 (4)	2 (4)	17 (13)	3 (6)
Medium	33 (24)	8 (15)	107 (79)	45 (85)
High	97 (72)	43 (81)	11 (8)	5 (9)
Total				
Mean (SD)	0.51 (0.11)	0.55 (0.12) † ‡	0.32 (0.07)	0.34 (0.07)
95% Confidence Interval	0.49-0.53	0.52-0.58	0.31-0.34	0.32-0.36
Median	0.55	0.56	0.33	0.33
Range	0.26-0.76	0.31-0.83	0.19-0.55	0.19-0.55
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	10 (7)	1 (2)	58 (43)	18 (34)
Medium	118 (87)	45 (85)	77 (57)	35 (66)
High	7 (5)	7 (13)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Score Ranks: Low=0-0.332, Medium=0.333-0.665, High=0.666-1

NOTE: Free and reduced price lunch data were not available for 2 SAUs.

†Mean scores significantly different among SAUs with free and reduced price lunch enrollment less than 50% and those with 50% or greater ($p<0.05$), according to t-test.

‡Score distributions significantly different among SAUs with free and reduced price lunch enrollment less than 50% and those with 50% or greater ($p<0.05$), according to Wilcoxon rank sum test.

**TABLE 7. SCORES IN SAUS WITH AND WITHOUT A SCHOOL HEALTH COORDINATOR (SHC)
(N=190)**

Section	Comprehensiveness Score		Strength Score	
	SHC (N=63)	No SHC (N=127)	SHC (N=63)	No SHC (N=127)
Nutrition Education				
Mean (SD)	0.59 (0.15)	0.56 (0.13)	0.38 (0.14)	0.40 (0.12)
95% Confidence Interval	0.56-0.63	0.54-0.58	0.34-0.42	0.38-0.42
Median	0.56	0.56	0.44	0.44
Range	0.33-0.89	0.22-0.89	0.11-0.67	0.11-0.78
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	0 (0)	5 (4)	15 (24)	23 (18)
Medium	38 (60)	90 (71)	45 (71)	100 (79)
High	25 (40)	32 (25)	3 (5)	4 (3)
Standards for USDA Child Nutrition Program/Reimbursable School Meals				
Mean (SD)	0.40 (0.23)	0.39 (0.18)	0.18 (0.16)	0.16 (0.08)
95% Confidence Interval	0.34-0.45	0.36-0.42	0.14-0.22	0.15-0.18
Median	0.46	0.46	0.15	0.15
Range	0.00-0.85	0.00-0.85	0.00-0.77	0.00-0.62
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	24 (38)	39 (31)	55 (87)	125 (98)
Medium	32 (51)	82 (65)	7 (11)	2 (2)
High	7 (11)	6 (5)	1 (2)	0 (0)
Nutrition Guidelines for Competitive and Other Foods Distributed at School				
Mean (SD)	0.54 (0.18)	0.47 (0.12) † ‡	0.40 (0.13)	0.35 (0.09) † ‡
95% Confidence Interval	0.49-0.58	0.45-0.49	0.36-0.43	0.34-0.37
Median	0.45	0.41	0.31	0.31
Range	0.31-0.86	0.31-0.86	0.31-0.72	0.31-0.76
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	2 (3)	1 (1)	32 (51)	85 (67)
Medium	44 (70)	115 (91)	23 (37)	39 (31)
High	17 (27)	11 (9)	8 (13)	3 (2)
Physical Education				
Mean (SD)	0.45 (0.12)	0.48 (0.11)	0.31 (0.09)	0.32 (0.09)
95% Confidence Interval	0.42-0.48	0.46-0.50	0.29-0.33	0.31-0.34
Median	0.47	0.53	0.35	0.35
Range	0.24-0.76	0.24-0.82	0.18-0.47	0.18-0.65
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	15 (24)	21 (17)	30 (48)	51 (40)
Medium	47 (75)	102 (80)	33 (52)	76 (60)
High	1 (2)	4 (3)	0 (0)	0 (0)

TABLE 7. SCORES IN SAUS WITH AND WITHOUT A SCHOOL HEALTH COORDINATOR (SHC) (N=190), CONTINUED

Section	Comprehensiveness Score		Strength Score	
	SHC (N=63)	No SHC (N=127)	SHC (N=63)	No SHC (N=127)
Physical Activity				
Mean (SD)	0.56 (0.24)	0.61 (0.17)	0.27 (0.19)	0.27 (0.11)
95% Confidence Interval	0.50-0.62	0.58-0.64	0.23-0.32	0.25-0.29
Median	0.60	0.70	0.20	0.30
Range	0.00-1.00	0.00-1.00	0.00-0.80	0.00-0.70
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	14 (22)	12 (9)	48 (76)	112 (88)
Medium	22 (35)	37 (29)	10 (16)	14 (11)
High	27 (43)	78 (61)	5 (8)	1 (1)
Communication and Promotion				
Mean (SD)	0.59 (0.22)	0.67 (0.21) † ‡	0.36 (0.15)	0.37 (0.12)
95% Confidence Interval	0.54-0.65	0.63-0.70	0.32-0.40	0.35-0.39
Median	0.58	0.75	0.42	0.42
Range	0.17-1.00	0.17-0.92	0.08-0.67	0.08-0.67
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	9 (14)	10 (8)	19 (30)	30 (24)
Medium	25 (40)	37 (29)	42 (67)	94 (74)
High	29 (46)	80 (63)	2 (3)	3 (2)
Evaluation				
Mean (SD)	0.67 (0.17)	0.70 (0.21) ‡	0.43 (0.16)	0.44 (0.15)
95% Confidence Interval	0.63-0.72	0.67-0.74	0.39-0.47	0.41-0.46
Median	0.67	0.83	0.50	0.50
Range	0.17-0.83	0.00-0.83	0.00-0.67	0.00-0.83
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	1 (2)	6 (5)	9 (14)	13 (10)
Medium	18 (29)	23 (18)	44 (70)	108 (85)
High	44 (70)	98 (77)	10 (16)	6 (5)
Total				
Mean (SD)	0.53 (0.13)	0.52 (0.10)	0.34 (0.08)	0.32 (0.06)
95% Confidence Interval	0.49-0.56	0.50-0.54	0.31-0.36	0.31-0.34
Median	0.55	0.56	0.33	0.33
Range	0.26-0.83	0.26-0.76	0.19-0.55	0.19-0.50
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	5 (8)	6 (5)	29 (46)	47 (37)
Medium	51 (81)	114 (90)	34 (54)	80 (63)
High	7 (11)	7 (6)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Score Ranks: Low=0-0.332, Medium=0.333-0.665, High=0.666-1

†Mean scores significantly different among SAUs with SHCs and those without ($p<0.05$), according to t-test.

‡Score distributions significantly different among SAUs with SHCs and those without ($p<0.05$), according to Wilcoxon rank sum test.

TABLE 8. SCORES BY COUNTY POPULATION (N=172)

Section	Comprehensiveness Score		Strength Score	
	Less than 70,000 (N=79)	70,000 or Greater (N=93)	Less than 70,000 (N=79)	70,000 or Greater (N=93)
Nutrition Education				
Mean (SD)	0.55 (0.14)	0.59 (0.13) † ‡	0.37 (0.14)	0.42 (0.11) † ‡
95% Confidence Interval	0.52-0.58	0.57-0.62	0.33-0.40	0.39-0.44
Median	0.56	0.56	0.44	0.44
Range	0.22-0.89	0.22-0.89	0.11-0.67	0.11-0.78
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	4 (5)	1 (1)	23 (29)	12 (13)
Medium	59 (75)	57 (61)	52 (66)	78 (84)
High	16 (20)	35 (38)	4 (5)	3 (3)
Standards for USDA Child Nutrition Program/Reimbursable School Meals				
Mean (SD)	0.41 (0.22)	0.39 (0.19)	0.17 (0.13)	0.17 (0.11)
95% Confidence Interval	0.36-0.46	0.35-0.43	0.14-0.20	0.15-0.20
Median	0.46	0.46	0.15	0.15
Range	0.00-0.85	0.08-0.85	0.00-0.62	0.08-0.77
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	24 (30)	31 (33)	73 (92)	89 (96)
Medium	45 (57)	59 (63)	6 (8)	3 (3)
High	10 (13)	3 (3)	0 (0)	1 (1)
Nutrition Guidelines for Competitive and Other Foods Distributed at School				
Mean (SD)	0.52 (0.17)	0.47 (0.12) †	0.40 (0.14)	0.35 (0.07) †
95% Confidence Interval	0.48-0.56	0.45-0.50	0.37-0.43	0.33-0.36
Median	0.41	0.41	0.31	0.31
Range	0.31-0.86	0.34-0.86	0.31-0.76	0.31-0.69
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	2 (3)	0 (0)	45 (57)	60 (65)
Medium	62 (78)	83 (89)	24 (30)	32 (34)
High	15 (19)	10 (11)	10 (13)	1 (1)
Physical Education				
Mean (SD)	0.45 (0.13)	0.49 (0.10) †	0.30 (0.10)	0.33 (0.08) † ‡
95% Confidence Interval	0.42-0.48	0.46-0.51	0.28-0.32	0.31-0.35
Median	0.53	0.53	0.29	0.35
Range	0.24-0.82	0.29-0.82	0.18-0.59	0.18-0.65
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	26 (33)	7 (8)	40 (51)	35 (38)
Medium	52 (66)	82 (88)	39 (49)	58 (62)
High	1 (1)	4 (4)	0 (0)	0 (0)

TABLE 8. SCORES BY COUNTY POPULATION (N=172), CONTINUED

Section	Comprehensiveness Score		Strength Score	
	Less than 70,000 (N=79)	70,000 or Greater (N=93)	Less than 70,000 (N=79)	70,000 or Greater (N=93)
Physical Activity				
Mean (SD)	0.59 (0.21)	0.59 (0.19)	0.26 (0.16)	0.29 (0.13)
95% Confidence Interval	0.54-0.63	0.55-0.63	0.22-0.29	0.26-0.31
Median	0.70	0.70	0.30	0.30
Range	0.00-1.00	0.20-1.00	0.00-0.70	0.10-0.80
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	11 (14)	13 (14)	66 (84)	78 (84)
Medium	21 (27)	30 (32)	10 (13)	12 (13)
High	47 (59)	50 (54)	3 (4)	3 (3)
Communication and Promotion				
Mean (SD)	0.61 (0.23)	0.66 (0.20)	0.35 (0.14)	0.37 (0.12)
95% Confidence Interval	0.56-0.66	0.62-0.70	0.32-0.38	0.35-0.40
Median	0.67	0.75	0.42	0.42
Range	0.17-0.92	0.17-0.92	0.08-0.67	0.08-0.67
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	10 (13)	8 (9)	23 (29)	24 (26)
Medium	29 (37)	27 (29)	53 (67)	68 (73)
High	40 (51)	58 (62)	3 (4)	1 (1)
Evaluation				
Mean (SD)	0.69 (0.20)	0.70 (0.21)	0.41 (0.16)	0.45 (0.14) † ‡
95% Confidence Interval	0.64-0.73	0.65-0.74	0.37-0.44	0.42-0.48
Median	0.83	0.83	0.50	0.50
Range	0.00-0.83	0.00-0.83	0.00-0.67	0.00-0.83
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	4 (5)	3 (3)	13 (16)	7 (8)
Medium	15 (19)	21 (23)	59 (75)	80 (86)
High	60 (76)	69 (74)	7 (9)	6 (6)
Total				
Mean (SD)	0.52 (0.13)	0.52 (0.10)	0.33 (0.08)	0.33 (0.06)
95% Confidence Interval	0.49-0.55	0.50-0.54	0.31-0.34	0.32-0.34
Median	0.56	0.56	0.33	0.33
Range	0.26-0.76	0.32-0.83	0.19-0.51	0.23-0.55
Score Rank, n (%)				
Low	8 (10)	2 (2)	29 (37)	39 (42)
Medium	62 (78)	86 (92)	50 (63)	54 (58)
High	9 (11)	5 (5)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Score Ranks: Low=0-0.332, Medium=0.333-0.665, High=0.666-1

NOTE: 18 SAUs covering multiple counties were excluded.

†Mean scores significantly different among SAUs with county population less than 70,000 and those with 70,000 or greater ($p<0.05$), according to t-test.

‡Score distributions significantly different among SAUs with county population less than 70,000 and those with 70,000 or greater ($p<0.05$), according to Wilcoxon rank sum test.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A. ASSESSMENT TOOLS FOR SCHOOL NUTRITION POLICIES

Assessment Tools for School Nutrition Policies									
Tool Name	SNESPCS	PERSPCS	SNA Local School Wellness Policy Analysis Criteria	Action for Healthy Kids	Utah	Colorado	Michigan	Pennsylvania	New Hampshire
Source	Morse et al. 2007	Morse et al. 2007	School Nutrition Association 2006	Action for Healthy Kids website	Morris, J & Nanney, M.S. (2007)	http://www.cde.state.co.us/educational/nutrition/Guide.htm	Team Nutrition Healthy School Environment Grants	Dept. of Ed, Division of Food and Nutrition	Evaluation Checklist
Policy Level	State	State	School	School	District	District or School	School	School	Policy/Legislation/Resource
Variables Selected	1. Competitive foods 2. The school meal environment 3. Food service director qualifications 4. Coordinating or advisory councils 5. Nutrition education 6. Marketing 7. Screening of body mass index in schools	1. PE time requirements 2. Staffing requirements for PE 3. Curriculum standards for PE 4. Assessment of health-related fitness 5. Recess time	1. Policy Characteristics (date, length, format) 2. Nutrient Guidelines (school meals, A la Carte, Vending, School Fundraisers, Classroom parties, Food as Rewards, Field Trips) 3. Nutrition Education 4. Physical Activity (Recess, PE, Other school-based activities, PA comments) 5. Implementation and Evaluation	1. Nutrition Education 2. Nutrition standards 3. School meals 4. Other school health 5. Implementation 6. Measurability/evaluation	1. Federal compliance 2. State compliance 3. Other school health guidelines developed by Utah Action for Healthy Kids	1. Goals for Nutrition Education, Physical Activity and Other School Based Activities 2. Nutritional guidelines for all foods available on each campus during the school day 3. USDA Meal Guidelines and Regulations	1. A commitment to Nutrition and Physical Activity 2. Quality Meals 3. Other Healthy Food Options 4. Pleasant Eating Experience 5. Nutrition Education 6. Marketing 7. Commitment to PA	14 questions about policy development to be completed by local education agency. Also, completed by local	1. Nutrition Education 2. Physical Activity 3. Nutrition Standards 4. School Environment 5. Evaluation 6. Policy Development Committee
Methods	Developed from a conceptual framework and was informed by reviewing the scientific and gray literatures and through consultations with an expert panel and key experts.	Developed from a conceptual framework and was informed by reviewing the scientific and gray literatures and through consultations with an expert panel and key experts.	Online survey completed by 652 SNA director level members which collected info about progress on policies developed by local school districts.	256 policies from 49 states were assessed using Wellness Policy Fundamentals and expanded WIC checklist	District policies were gathered by phone or from district Web pages.		0=not in place-not being considered 1=not in place-but aware of need 2=not in place-but plans being made 3=in place-partially implemented 4=in place-fully implemented		
Coding System			1) Was the area addressed? 2) Mandated, encouraged, DCA, prescriptive, ideas 3) Comments	Yes/No	Two levels: 1) if item was addressed 2) language given a score of '0' if only recommended and a '1' if mandated	1=not applicable 2=applicable but not addressed 3=partially implemented 4=fully implemented			Comments with Yes/No answer
Comments	Only for Nutrition Policy	Only for Physical Activity	Authors would like to also evaluate after-school activities and walking to school			Approved until 11/03/2007			

**APPENDIX B. MEMBERS OF THE MAINE-HARVARD PREVENTION RESEARCH CENTER SCHOOL
WELLNESS POLICY WORK GROUP**

Anne-Marie Davee, MS, RD, LD, USM Muskie, Maine Nutrition Network

Brenda Obert, MHPRC Steering Committee

David Crawford, MPH, MaineCDC, Physical Activity, Nutrition and Healthy Weight Program

Gail Lombardi, MS, RD, Maine Department of Education, Child Nutrition Services

Tracy Tweedie, MPH, STOP Director, Vital Pathways

Jaki Ellis, MS, CHES, MaineCDC, Coordinated School Health Program

Karen O'Rourke, MPH, Maine Center for Public Health

We would also like to acknowledge Dani Kalian and Melissa Chadwick from the Maine Center for Public Health and Jamie Thompson from the USM Muskie Maine Nutrition Network for their outstanding work collecting the Local School Wellness Policies.

APPENDIX C. TYPES OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS IN MAINE

CITIES OR TOWNS WITH INDIVIDUAL SUPERVISION

A city or town with individual school supervision is a single municipality. A school committee administers the education of all grades in the city or town through a superintendent of schools. The city or town charter usually determines the method of budget approval. In many cities and towns, the City Council or Town Council has final budget approval. Since it is a single municipality, cost sharing is not a factor.

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE DISTRICTS

A school administrative district (S.A.D.) is a combination of two or more municipalities who pool all their educational resources to educate all students. One school committee (comprised of representatives from each of the municipalities) administers the education of grades K-12 through a superintendent of schools. Budget approval is by majority vote of those present and voting at a district budget meeting. The member municipalities share the S.A.D. costs based on a formula which includes state valuation and/or number of pupils. NOTE: There are a few S.A.D.s comprised of one town because of unique situations.

COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICTS

A community school district (C.S.D.) is a combination of two or more municipalities and/or districts formed to build, maintain, and operate a school building or buildings to educate any or all grades. For example, a C.S.D. may be formed to build and operate a grade 7-12 school for all towns in the C.S.D. These same towns will maintain individual control (or belong to a union) for the education of their K-6 students. A community school district may also include education of all grades K-12.

C.S.D. school committees are apportioned according to the one person-one vote principle. The member municipalities share the C.S.D. costs, based on a formula including number of pupils in each town and/or state valuation or any combination of each. Community School District budgets are approved by majority vote of voters present and voting at a district budget meeting.

UNIONS OF TOWNS

A Union is a combination of two or more school administrative units joined together for the purpose of sharing the costs of a superintendent and the superintendent's office. Each member school administrative unit maintains its own budget, has its own school board, and operates in every way as a separate unit except for the sharing of superintendent services.

In addition, a union school committee exists, comprised of representatives of each member unit school committee and conducts the business of the union. All votes of the union committee are cast on a weighted basis in proportion to the population of the towns involved.

MAINE INDIAN EDUCATION

There are three reservations of Indian children in Maine. These three reservations are organized exactly as a union of towns described above.

UNITS UNDER AGENT SUPERVISION

A unit under agent supervision generally is a relatively small unit requiring less than full-time administration. Units under district superintendents procure services of superintendents on their own by negotiating with a nearby superintendent and school board. Agents are appointed by the commissioner on a temporary basis if the local unit is unable to locate a superintendent on its own.

TECHNOLOGY CENTER (19 Centers)

A technology center is a facility or program providing technical education to secondary students. A center is governed by a single school administrative unit. It may serve students from other affiliated school administrative units. It may include satellite center facilities and programs. A technology satellite program is a facility or program providing technical education to secondary students, which is administered by a school administrative unit affiliated with a technology center.

TECHNOLOGY REGION (8 Regions)

A technology region is a quasi-municipal corporation established by the Legislature for the delivery of technology programs which is comprised of all the school administrative units within the geographical boundaries set forth in 20-A MRSA, section 8451. A region is governed by a cooperative board formed and operating in accordance with 20-A MRSA, Chapter 313.

EDUCATION IN UNORGANIZED TERRITORY

Education in Maine's unorganized territory (E.U.T.) is a responsibility of the State. The education of territory children is accomplished by the state operating schools which are in unorganized townships and by the assignment of agent superintendents to assure that each child in an unorganized township receives education. These agents are assigned by the Commissioner of Education.

SOURCE: Maine Department of Education website (<http://www.maine.gov/education/eddir/saudef.htm>)

APPENDIX D. CODING TOOL FOR ABSTRACTING SCHOOL WELLNESS POLICIES, REVISED BY
THE HARVARD PREVENTION RESEARCH CENTER FOR MAINE WELLNESS POLICY PROJECT ON
MARCH 26, 2008

CODING TOOL FOR ABSTRACTING SCHOOL WELLNESS POLICIES

Developed by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Healthy
Eating Research Program, Working Group 1

Revised by the Harvard Prevention Research Center for
Maine Wellness Policy project on March 26, 2008

Chair: Marlene B. Schwartz (Connecticut)
Members: Anne Lund and Mollie Greves (Washington)
Elaine McDonnell and Claudia Probart
(Pennsylvania)
Anne Samuelson and Leslie Lytle (Minnesota)

In 2006, all school districts participating in the National School Lunch Program were required to develop a written School Wellness Policy. This coding system was designed by a group of researchers funded by the RWJF Healthy Eating Research Program to abstract these policies. The purpose of the instrument is to have a common and reliable method for abstracting and evaluating school wellness policies in both state and national studies.

Methods

The working group collected model policies and scoring and evaluation tools that had been developed prior to 2006. These included state measures created in Connecticut, Washington, and Pennsylvania, as well as guidelines from Action for Healthy Kids (AFHK), National Alliance for Nutrition and Activity (NANA), The Clinton Foundation, and the National Cancer Institute (NCI).

All of the items from the existing measures were combined into a document that organized each policy component into the following categories: Nutrition Education, Nutrition Standards for School Meals, Nutrition Standards for Competitive Foods, Physical Activity, Physical Education, Communication and Promotion, Evaluation, and Other School Based Activities. Using this document, the group systematically reviewed every item from each category and reached consensus on whether it should be included in the coding measure. As the group reviewed each section of the policy guides, the decision was made to incorporate the elements under "Other School Based Activities" into the other sections in order to streamline and simplify the tool. Further, efforts were made to limit redundancy between sections and create parallel variables between similar sections (e.g., nutrition education and physical education).

Coding Manual

Items are designed to be coded as a 0, 1, or 2, using the definitions below. This coding manual lists each item followed by an explanation of the item and examples of "1" and "2" statements.

Code		Explanation
0	= Not Mentioned	The item is not included in the text of the policy or procedures.
1	= Weak Statement Other weak wording: strive, as feasible, advocate, may be	<p>The item is mentioned, but the policy will be hard to enforce because either the statement is vague, and / or the item is only recommended. For example, if the words "should" or "may" are used, the item will be scored as a "1." If there are clear "loopholes" in the policy that weaken the enforcement of the item, the score is a "1." Score "1" if the policy mentions potential future plan to act without specifying when the plan will be established.</p> <p>Words that often imply the policy is weakened in an area and should score a 1 include: <i>may, can, could, should, might, encourage, suggest, urge, some, partial, make an effort, and try</i>. An exception to this would be if the district is unable to enforce action on the item, like teachers role modeling healthy behaviors, or encouraging the use of sports facilities by community groups (in this case the item would score a 2).</p>
2	= Meets / Exceeds Expectations	<p>To score a "2," the item needs to be specifically described (e.g., a concept followed by specific plans or strategies for implementation) and there must be wording indicating that this component of the policy is required (e.g., shall or will). A "2" means that the policy makers are committed to making the item happen.</p> <p>Words that typically imply that action is required include: <i>shall, will, must, have to, insist, require, all, total, comply, and enforce</i>.</p>

Coding hint

One method for deciding between a 1 and a 2 is to consider the scenario of a parent going to the board of education in a district to discuss something happening in a school. If the policy is written in a way that it is not clear exactly how the school should behave regarding the issue at hand, score the item as a "1." If the policy is written in a way that the parent and board of education will have no trouble deciding if the school is or is not compliant with the policy, score the item as a "2."

The Federal Wellness Policy requirements are incorporated into the beginning of sections as appropriate and are labeled "Federal Wellness". The wording in the tool for these items was taken from the federal requirements. Due to the non-specific wording of these requirements, it is not difficult for a policy to meet the expectations of the item, so the coding default should be a "2=meets/exceeds expectations," unless the item clearly fails to meet the federal requirements. If the item is entirely absent, the score should be "0" and a score of "1" should be given if the language is particularly weak.

Coding Manual

Scoring Total strength is calculated by counting the number of two's and dividing by total

Policies are scored to determine Comprehensiveness and Strength. Comprehensiveness reflects the proportion of item topics that are simply mentioned. Strength reflects the proportion of items that are addressed with *specific* and *directive* language.

number of items in the scale

Score	Explanation
Comprehensiveness Proportion by section	Comprehensiveness is calculated by counting the number of non-zeros obtained and dividing it by the number of items in the section
Strength Proportion by section	Strength is calculated by counting the number of two's and dividing by the number of items in the section
Total Comprehensiveness Proportion	Total comprehensiveness is calculated by counting the number of non-zeros obtained and dividing by total number of items in the scale
Total Strength Proportion	Total strength is calculated by counting the number of two's and dividing by total number of items in the scale

For example, if the Nutrition Education scores are:

I. Nutrition Education			
NE1	FW: goals for NE	0	1 2
NE2	Nutrition curriculum each grade	0	1 2
NE3	NE with larger school community	0	1 2
NE4	NE beyond school environment	0	1 2
NE5	NE training for teachers	0	1 2
NE6	NE integrated into other subjects	0	1 2
NE7	NE teaches lifelong skills	0	1 2
NE8	Number of NE courses or hours	0	1 2
NE9	NE quality	0	1 2

Comprehensiveness Proportion = $6 / 9 = .67$

Strength Proportion = $4 / 9 = .44$

I. Nutrition Education

Item Code Guide

NE1	Federal Wellness: Includes goals for nutrition education that are designed to promote student wellness in a manner that the local education agency determines is appropriate	0	No goals for nutrition education are mentioned
		2	Any nutrition education goal statement is mentioned
NE2	Nutrition curriculum provided for each <u>grade level</u>	0	Not mentioned
		1	Describes general curriculum for "K-12" or "all levels," and/or it is unclear if each grade will receive nutrition education
		2	Clear that nutrition education is taught in each grade E.g., "Nutrition topics shall be integrated within the comprehensive health education curriculum taught at every grade level (K-12)."
NE3	Coordinates nutrition education with the <u>larger school community</u>	0	Not mentioned
		1	Vague and/or suggested E.g., "The entire school environment, not just the classroom, shall be <u>aligned</u> with healthy school goals to positively influence a student's understanding, beliefs, and habits as they relate to good nutrition and regular physical activity."
		2	Specific and required strategies mentioned E.g., "The nutrition education program shall work with school meal programs through school gardens and by having the cafeteria serve as a learning lab."
NE4	Nutrition education extends <u>beyond the school environment</u>	0	Not mentioned
		1	Vague and/or suggested E.g., "To the extent possible, families and community organizations are involved in nutrition education."
		2	Specific strategies mentioned: Team Nutrition schools, student community nutrition projects, opportunities for students to volunteer in nutrition, homework students can do with families (reading and interpreting nutrition facts labels, preparing healthy recipes), etc. E.g., "Families are invited to attend exhibitions of student nutrition projects"; "School staff will cooperate with other agencies and community groups to provide opportunities for student projects related to nutrition."
NE5	District provides <u>nutrition education training for teachers</u>	0	Not mentioned. Training on the school wellness policy does not qualify for a 1 or 2.
		1	Type of training is vague and/or provision of training is suggested E.g., "In service training for staff will be encouraged."
		2	Provision of nutrition education training is required E.g., "Student Nutrition Education: The school district will train staff and implement the principles of the health curriculum in all grade levels."
NE6	Nutrition education is <u>integrated into other subjects</u> beyond health education	0	Not mentioned
		1	Vague and/or suggested E.g., "...will encourage teachers to integrate nutrition education into the broader curriculum."
		2	Specific and required strategies mentioned E.g., "Nutrition education will be integrated into mathematics and English classes"; "Nutrition education will be integrated into the broader curriculum."

I. Nutrition Education (continued)

NE7	Nutrition education teaches <u>lifelong skills</u> that are behavior focused and/or interactive and/or participatory	0	Not mentioned
		1	Skills are vague and/or skill-based nutrition education is suggested E.g., "All students should possess the knowledge and skills necessary to make nutritious and enjoyable food choices for a lifetime."
		2	Skill-based nutrition education is required or specific skills or activities are identified (e.g., understanding calorie balance, energy expenditure, and nutrition facts labels; media awareness)
		2= References Maine Learning Results	
NE8	Specifies <u>number</u> of nutrition education courses or contact hours	0	Not mentioned
		1	Amount of nutrition education is vague and/or suggested E.g., "An appropriate number of class hours should be designated for nutrition education."
		2	Number of hours or courses are specified and required E.g., "... <u>will</u> ensure that four hours of class time will be designated for nutrition education every month."
NE9	Nutrition education <u>quality</u> is addressed	0	Not mentioned
		1	Vague and/or suggested E.g., "... <u>should</u> provide high quality nutrition education."
		2	Curriculum is aligned with academic standards or benchmarks, comprehensive in scope and sequence. Possible wording: "ongoing sequential/systematic/standards based."

II. Standards for USDA Child Nutrition Program/Reimbursable School Meals

US10	<u>Federal Wellness</u> : Assures that guidelines for reimbursable school meals shall not be less restrictive than USDA school meal regulations	0	Guidelines clearly detract from USDA School Lunch regulations, or there is no mention of USDA School Meals
		1	Policy states that district "should" or "strives" to meet federal/USDA school meal regulations/guidelines
		2	Policy states that district will meet federal/USDA school meal regulations/guidelines E.g., "The district <u>shall</u> provide school breakfasts and lunches that meet the nutritional standards required by the USDA School Breakfast and National School Lunch Programs."
US11	Access to and /or promotion of the <u>School Breakfast Program (USDA)</u>	0	Not mentioned
		1	Promotes a breakfast program without specifying the "School Breakfast Program" (USDA) E.g., "...encouraging students to eat a healthy breakfast every day."
		2	Includes language to institutionalize the School Breakfast Program E.g., "All schools will provide breakfast through the USDA School Breakfast Program."
US12	Addresses access to and /or promotion of the <u>Summer Food Service Program</u>	0	Not mentioned
		1	Promotes a summer food program without specifying the "Summer Food Service Program" (USDA)
		2	Includes language to institutionalize the Summer Food Service Program

II. Standards for USDA Child Nutrition Program/Reimbursable School Meals (continued)

US13	Addresses <u>nutrition guidelines</u> for school meals <u>beyond USDA</u> (National School Lunch Program)/(School Breakfast Program) minimum standards	0	Not mentioned
		1	Vague and/or suggested, OR only the HHS/USDA <u>Dietary Guidelines for Americans</u> are specified E.g., "...encourage the consumption and choice of nutrient dense food, such as whole grains, fruits, and vegetables"; "...should assist students to comply with the <u>Dietary Guidelines for Americans</u> ."
		2	School meals are required to meet specific guidelines (E.g., 4 fruits and/or non-fried vegetables per day; only 1% and fat-free milk served; at least half of grains are whole grain; eliminates trans fats)
US14	Specifies use of <u>low-fat versions</u> of foods and/or <u>low-fat methods</u> for preparing foods	0	Not mentioned. Low-fat food mandated by law does not qualify for 1 or 2.
		1	Vague and/or suggested E.g., "Cooking methods to reduce fat in school meals shall be used whenever possible."
		2	Specific and required E.g., "All cooked foods offered as part of a meal will be baked or steamed"; "Purchasing programs and preparation methods will be used to decrease fat, calories, and sodium levels in food."
US15	Specifies <u>strategies to increase participation</u> in school meal programs. "School Meal Programs" can be assumed to refer to breakfast and/or lunch	0	Not mentioned. Notifying parents of eligibility requirements for free and reduced price meals is a federal requirement and does not qualify for 1 or 2.
		1	Weak language but specific strategy E.g., "School meals shall be <u>made attractive</u> to students by appealing to their taste preferences" (<i>Made attractive is vague. How?</i>).
		2	Specific strategy required such as promotional mailings or events, alternative breakfast systems, altered bus schedules, closed campus, or student input on the menu E.g., "Students will have the opportunity to provide input on local, cultural, and ethnic favorites"; "Shall provide periodic food promotions to encourage taste testing of healthy new foods being introduced on the menu." <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;">2= Encourages a closed campus, soliciting input from students</div>
US16	<u>Optimizes scheduling</u> to improve student nutrition	0	Not mentioned
		1	Vague and/or suggested E.g., non-specific reference to "appropriate times"; "...making <u>every effort</u> to have recess before lunch in cases where they are back to back"; "Lunch should be scheduled during appropriate hours"; "A short recess may be scheduled sometime before lunch so that the children will come to lunch less distracted and ready to eat."
		2	Specific strategy required, such as lunch between 11am-1pm, lunch to follow recess, or no events during meals unless students may eat E.g., "Recess will be scheduled before lunch"; "No events shall be held during lunch period unless students may eat during the event."
US17	Ensures <u>adequate time to eat</u>		If no guidelines are mentioned, score according to state law
		0	Not mentioned
		1	Vague and/or suggested E.g., "Schools are encouraged to permit all full-day students a daily lunch period of not less than 20 minutes"; "Personnel will schedule enough time so students do not have to spend too much time waiting in line."
		2	Requires meal periods to include ≥20 minutes for lunch and/or ≥10 minutes for breakfast E.g., "After obtaining food, students will have at least 20 minutes to eat lunch"; "Students will be provided adequate time (minimum of 20 minutes) to eat lunch."

II. Standards for USDA Child Nutrition Program/Reimbursable School Meals (continued)

US18	Addresses <u>access to hand-washing</u> before meals	0	Not mentioned
		1	Vague and/or suggested E.g., "School personnel will encourage all students in developing the healthy practice of washing hands before eating."
		2	Ensures assistance with hand washing or access to proper facility E.g., "School personnel will assist all students in developing the healthy practice of washing hands before eating"; "Students shall have convenient access to hand-washing facilities."
US19	Requires <u>Nutrition qualifications</u> of school meals staff	0	Not mentioned
		1	Qualifications are suggested
		2	Qualifications are required E.g., "...shall be directed by a qualified nutrition professional"; Acceptable: "Foodservice staff that is properly qualified according to <u>current professional standards</u> will administer the Child Nutrition Programs"; "...shall ensure that the Food Service Manager has <u>appropriate degree and certification</u> ."
US20	Ensures <u>training or professional development</u> for food service staff	0	Not mentioned
		1	Vague and/or suggested, OR if only food safety training is addressed (food handling permit, HACCP, etc.)
		2	Specific and required. Food safety training does not qualify for a 2. E.g., "...shall ensure that professional development in the area of food and nutrition is provided for food service staff."
US21	Addresses school meal environment	0	Not mentioned
		1	Vague and/or suggested
		2	Specific strategy required (ensures adequate space/seating; supervision; a clean, pleasant environment; etc.) E.g., "Appropriate supervision shall be provided in the cafeteria, and rules for safe behavior consistently enforced"; "Students shall be provided a pleasant environment to eat lunch."
US22	<u>Nutrition information</u> for school meals (saturated fat, calories, etc.) is available	0	Not mentioned
		1	Vague and/or suggested E.g., "...will provide nutrition information to parents <u>upon request</u> ."
		2	Specific and required E.g., "...will share and publicize information about the nutritional content of meals with students and parents."

III. Nutrition Guidelines for Competitive & Other Foods Distributed at School

Code according to state law if no guidelines are mentioned or if less restrictive guidelines are used

NG23	<u>Federal Wellness</u> : Includes nutrition guidelines selected by the local education agency for ALL foods available on each school campus during the school day with the objective of promoting student health and reducing childhood obesity	0	No guidelines for competitive foods mentioned
		1	Mentions districts guidelines but does not define them; mentions plans to create guidelines; only mentions federal law regarding the National School Lunch Program or Foods of Minimal Nutritional Value; OR only mentions state guidelines (if the state has guidelines). E.g., "Nutritious meals served by the food services operation and other nutritious food choices served in district schools and district sponsored events will comply with district guidelines and state and federal law" ("district guidelines" not defined in policy).

(Continues on next page #)

III. Nutrition Guidelines for Competitive & Other Foods Distributed at School (continued)

NG23 cont'd		2	Indicates specific district guidelines, even if only in reference to Dietary Guidelines and even if you feel the guidelines are weak E.g., "All foods served during the school day shall meet district guidelines, which include...ensuring the provision of whole grains and fruits and vegetables."
Places food is served (NG24-NG28)			
NG24	Regulates <u>vending machines</u>		<p>Note: If policy regulates "all foods" or "competitive food," score according to the strength of that statement</p> <p>0 Not mentioned, and no mention of umbrella statement regulating "all foods" or "competitive foods"</p> <p>1 Vague, suggested, overridden by principal's discretion, or time-specific E.g., "Vending machines shall include items which are healthy"; "Vending machines shall be unplugged during lunch hour."</p> <p>2 Indicates regulation of ALL vending machine items or umbrella statement regulating "all foods" or "competitive foods"</p> <p>Automatic 2 because of Chapter 51</p>
NG25	Regulates <u>school stores</u>		<p>Note: If policy regulates "all foods" or "competitive food," score according to the strength of that statement</p> <p>0 Not mentioned, and no mention of umbrella statement regulating "all foods" or "all competitive foods"</p> <p>1 Vague, suggested, overridden by principal's discretion, or time-specific E.g., "...ensure some healthy options are sold at school stores."</p> <p>2 Indicates regulation of ALL school store items or umbrella statement regulating "all foods" or "competitive foods"</p> <p>Automatic 2 because of Chapter 51</p>
NG26	Regulates <u>food service a la carte</u>		<p>Note: If policy regulates "all foods" or "competitive food," score according to the strength of that statement</p> <p>0 Not mentioned, and no mention of umbrella statement regulating "all foods" or "all competitive foods"</p> <p>1 Vague, suggested, overridden by principal's discretion, or time-specific</p> <p>2 Indicates regulation of ALL a la carte items or umbrella statement regulating "all foods" or "competitive foods"</p> <p>Automatic 2 because of Chapter 51</p>
NG27	Regulates food at <u>class parties</u> and other school celebrations		<p>0 Not mentioned</p> <p>1 Vague, suggested, and/or overridden by principal's discretion E.g., "District encourages healthy snacks at parties"; "Celebrations involving food during the school day shall be at the discretion of the school principal"; "The school food environment (including fundraisers and celebrations) on balance and over time should be consistent with healthy food guidelines."</p> <p>2 Requires nutrition standards for regulating "food at parties"/food served at parties," OR policy specifies district nutrition standards will be followed at all times E.g., "Foods and beverages served at school celebrations must meet the District's Nutritional Standards." (Standards are defined)</p>
NG28	Regulates food <u>from home for the whole class</u>		<p>Note: If not mentioned, assign the same code as NG27</p> <p>0 Not mentioned</p> <p>1 Vague, suggested, overridden by principal's discretion, and/or time-specific E.g., "Classroom snacks shall <u>feature</u> healthy choices that meet the District's Nutrition Standards."</p> <p>2 Requires nutrition standards for "foods in the classroom"/food served in the classroom," OR policy specifies district nutrition standards will be followed at all times</p>

III. Nutrition Guidelines for Competitive & Other Foods Distributed at School (*continued*)

Times food is served (NG29-NG31)

Note:

- A common definition of "school day" is the period that begins with the arrival of the first child at school and ends after the last instructional period. If a school district defines "school day" in the policy, apply its definition.
- "All times" includes before, during, and after the school day but excludes fundraising off school grounds and evening and weekend events.
- "All times on school grounds" includes before, during and after school and evening and weekend events but excludes fundraising off school grounds.

NG29	Regulates food served before school	<p>Note: "All times" includes "before school". During the "school day" usually includes "before school" (check state law).</p> <p>0 No mention of nutrition standards for food sold/served before school, during the "school day," or "at all times"</p> <p>1 Vague, suggested, and/or overridden by principal's discretion</p> <p>2 Nutrition standards are specified and required for food served before school, OR policy specifies district nutrition standards will be followed "at all times"</p> <p>Automatic 2 because of Chapter 51</p>
NG30	Regulates food served after school	<p>Note: "All times" includes "after school." During the "school day" usually does <u>not</u> include "after school" (check state law).</p> <p>0 No mention of nutrition standards for food sold/served after school or "at all times"</p> <p>1 Vague, suggested, and/or overridden by principal's discretion</p> <p>2 Nutrition standards are specified and required for food served after school, OR policy specifies district nutrition standards will be followed "at all times"</p> <p>Automatic 2 because of Chapter 51</p>
NG31	<p>Regulates food <u>SERVED</u> or <u>SOLD</u> at <u>evening and community events on school grounds</u></p> <p>(e.g., concessions at athletic events, dances, or performances)</p> <p>Notes: anything on school grounds and open to the public is considered a community event; also if the event is "school sponsored" and takes place "in the school" it would be covered</p>	<p>Note: "All times on school grounds" includes evening and community events on school grounds, but "at all times" does NOT</p> <p>0 No mention of nutrition standards for food sold/served at evening/community events on school grounds or "at all times on school grounds"</p> <p>1 Vague, suggested, and/or overridden by principal's discretion E.g., "...will promote the availability of nutritional snacks at athletic events."</p> <p>2 Nutrition standards are specified and required for evening and community events, OR policy specifies district nutrition standards will be followed "at all times on school grounds" E.g., "Food or beverages sold or served on school grounds or for activities shall meet the District's nutrition standards" (standards are specified elsewhere in policy).</p> <p>2 if referencing Ch. 51 standards or stricter to apply to these events</p>
NG32	Regulates food sold for fundraising	<p>Note: Policy must specifically address "fundraising" for a score of a 1 or 2. Regulating food during "the school day," "at all times," or "at all times on school grounds" does not qualify.</p> <p>0 No mention of nutrition standards for food sold/served for fundraising</p> <p>1 Vague, suggested, time-specific and/or overridden by principal's discretion E.g., "...strongly encouraging the use of only non-food items to raise funds"; "...requiring administrative approval for all fundraisers".</p> <p>2 Nutrition standards specified and required for fundraising E.g., "Foods or beverages including snack foods that are made or purchased as part of the District's school or parent organization efforts to raise funds must also meet the District's nutrition standards" (standards are specified).</p> <p>Automatic 2 because of Chapter 51</p>

III. Nutrition Guidelines for Competitive & Other Foods Distributed at School *(continued)*

Nutrition guidelines for foods (NG33-37)

NG33	Guidelines address limiting <u>sugar</u> content of foods	0	Not mentioned. Default if specifies HHS/USDA <u>Dietary Guidelines for Americans</u> and no other guidelines are used.
		1	No limit specified and/or limit is suggested E.g., "Dry snacks sold at the K-8 level shall follow <i>District Nutrition Standards</i> , <u>minimizing</u> the content of ...sugar."
		2	Specific and required limit E.g., "K-12 school food service, school store, and school vending machines sale of individual snack items per package shall include no more than 35% sugar by weight."
NG34	Guidelines address limiting <u>fat</u> content of foods	0	Not mentioned
		1	No limit specified and/or limit is suggested. Default if specifies HHS/USDA <u>Dietary Guidelines for Americans</u> and no other guidelines are used. E.g., "All food and beverages available to students at school are recommended to be food items low in fat ..."
		2	Specific and required limit E.g., "K-12 school food service, school store, and school vending machine sale of individual snack items per package shall include no more than 35% of calories from fat and nine grams maximum per serving with the exception of nuts."
NG35	Guidelines address limiting <u>sodium</u> content of foods	0	Not mentioned
		1	No limit specified and/or limit is suggested. Default if specifies HHS/USDA <u>Dietary Guidelines for Americans</u> and no other guidelines are used. E.g., "Foods to avoid—consume only occasionally: High sodium foods (luncheon meats, cheeses, chips, salty popcorn, pickles)."
		2	Quantified and required limit E.g., "A snack food item sold individually shall contain no more than 240 mg of sodium per serving, and an individually sold entree shall contain no more than 600 mg of sodium per serving."
NG36	Guidelines address limiting <u>calorie</u> content per serving size of foods	0	Not mentioned. Default if specifies HHS/USDA <u>Dietary Guidelines for Americans</u> and no other guidelines are used.
		1	No limit specified and/or limit is suggested E.g., "Foods sold outside of the <i>National School Lunch Program</i> shall contain a <u>reasonable</u> number of calories per package."
		2	Quantified and required limit E.g., "Individually sold snack item shall not exceed 200 calories per package."
NG37	Guidelines address limiting <u>serving</u> size of foods	0	Not mentioned. Default if specifies HHS/USDA <u>Dietary Guidelines for Americans</u> and no other guidelines are used.
		1	No limit specified and/or limit is suggested E.g., "All food shall be sold in <u>appropriate</u> portion sizes."
		2	Quantified and required limit E.g., "Individually sold food shall not exceed one serving per package."
NG38	Guidelines address increasing whole grains, unprocessed foods, or fresh produce	0	Fruit juice, fruit roll-ups, etc.
		1	Offering of unprocessed, fresh fruits and vegetables is encouraged. Default if specifies HHS/USDA <u>Dietary Guidelines for Americans</u> and no other guidelines are used.
		2	Definitively offering whole grains, unprocessed foods, or fresh produce. E.g., "Half of the grains served will be whole grains"; "Only brown rice shall be served."
2= Farm to school program, school-based gardening, use of locally produced food			

III. Nutrition Guidelines for Competitive & Other Foods Distributed at School *(continued)*

NG39	Guidelines address limiting the use of <u>ingredients with questionable health effects</u> (e.g. artificial sweeteners, processed or artificial foods, trans fats, high fructose corn syrup (HFCS))	<table><tr><td>0</td><td>Not mentioned. Default if specifies HHS/USDA <u>Dietary Guidelines for Americans</u> and no other guidelines are used.</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>Discourages use of these ingredients E.g., "We will make every effort to limit sales of snacks with high fructose corn syrup."</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>Required and quantified limits or prohibition E.g., "Food served during the school day shall include no more than 10% of calories from saturated and trans fat and two grams maximum per serving."</td></tr></table>	0	Not mentioned. Default if specifies HHS/USDA <u>Dietary Guidelines for Americans</u> and no other guidelines are used.	1	Discourages use of these ingredients E.g., "We will make every effort to limit sales of snacks with high fructose corn syrup."	2	Required and quantified limits or prohibition E.g., "Food served during the school day shall include no more than 10% of calories from saturated and trans fat and two grams maximum per serving."
0	Not mentioned. Default if specifies HHS/USDA <u>Dietary Guidelines for Americans</u> and no other guidelines are used.							
1	Discourages use of these ingredients E.g., "We will make every effort to limit sales of snacks with high fructose corn syrup."							
2	Required and quantified limits or prohibition E.g., "Food served during the school day shall include no more than 10% of calories from saturated and trans fat and two grams maximum per serving."							
NG40	Addresses food not being used as a <u>reward</u> and/or withheld as a <u>punishment</u>	<table><tr><td>0</td><td>Not mentioned</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>Discourages or only allows healthy food as a reward E.g., "...strongly discourage the use of food/beverages as a reward or punishment"; "...will encourage non-food alternatives as student rewards"; "Only healthy foods will be used as reward."</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>Prohibits E.g., "No punitive or disciplinary action shall be taken that would deny a student lunch or snack time"; "Food rewards or incentives shall not be used in classrooms to encourage student achievement or desirable behavior."</td></tr></table>	0	Not mentioned	1	Discourages or only allows healthy food as a reward E.g., "...strongly discourage the use of food/beverages as a reward or punishment"; "...will encourage non-food alternatives as student rewards"; "Only healthy foods will be used as reward."	2	Prohibits E.g., "No punitive or disciplinary action shall be taken that would deny a student lunch or snack time"; "Food rewards or incentives shall not be used in classrooms to encourage student achievement or desirable behavior."
0	Not mentioned							
1	Discourages or only allows healthy food as a reward E.g., "...strongly discourage the use of food/beverages as a reward or punishment"; "...will encourage non-food alternatives as student rewards"; "Only healthy foods will be used as reward."							
2	Prohibits E.g., "No punitive or disciplinary action shall be taken that would deny a student lunch or snack time"; "Food rewards or incentives shall not be used in classrooms to encourage student achievement or desirable behavior."							
NG41	<u>Nutrition information</u> available for foods other than school meals	<table><tr><td>0</td><td>Not mentioned</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>Suggested</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>Required</td></tr></table>	0	Not mentioned	1	Suggested	2	Required
0	Not mentioned							
1	Suggested							
2	Required							
Nutrition guidelines for beverages (NG42-NG50)								
NG42	Guidelines address limiting <u>sugar</u> content of beverages	<table><tr><td>0</td><td>Not mentioned</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>Limit is suggested, not quantified, and/or time- or location-specific</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>Quantified and required limit E.g., "Only water and 100% juice will be allowed at school."</td></tr></table>	0	Not mentioned	1	Limit is suggested, not quantified, and/or time- or location-specific	2	Quantified and required limit E.g., "Only water and 100% juice will be allowed at school."
0	Not mentioned							
1	Limit is suggested, not quantified, and/or time- or location-specific							
2	Quantified and required limit E.g., "Only water and 100% juice will be allowed at school."							
NG43	Guidelines address limiting <u>fat</u> content of drinks (other than milk)	<table><tr><td>0</td><td>Not mentioned</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>Limit is suggested, not quantified, and/or time- or location-specific</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>Quantified and required limit E.g., "Only water and 100% juice will be allowed at school."</td></tr></table>	0	Not mentioned	1	Limit is suggested, not quantified, and/or time- or location-specific	2	Quantified and required limit E.g., "Only water and 100% juice will be allowed at school."
0	Not mentioned							
1	Limit is suggested, not quantified, and/or time- or location-specific							
2	Quantified and required limit E.g., "Only water and 100% juice will be allowed at school."							
NG44	Guidelines address limiting <u>calorie content</u> per serving size of beverages	<table><tr><td>0</td><td>Not mentioned</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>Limit is suggested, not quantified, and/or time- or location-specific</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>Quantified maximum number of calories permitted per beverage or serving size</td></tr></table>	0	Not mentioned	1	Limit is suggested, not quantified, and/or time- or location-specific	2	Quantified maximum number of calories permitted per beverage or serving size
0	Not mentioned							
1	Limit is suggested, not quantified, and/or time- or location-specific							
2	Quantified maximum number of calories permitted per beverage or serving size							
NG45	Guidelines address limiting <u>regular (sugar-sweetened) soda</u>	<table><tr><td>0</td><td>Not mentioned</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>Regular soda allowed during certain times or in certain locations</td></tr><tr><td>2</td><td>Soda is prohibited E.g., "Soda will not be available on school grounds"; "Only water, 100% juice, and milk will be available at school."</td></tr></table>	0	Not mentioned	1	Regular soda allowed during certain times or in certain locations	2	Soda is prohibited E.g., "Soda will not be available on school grounds"; "Only water, 100% juice, and milk will be available at school."
0	Not mentioned							
1	Regular soda allowed during certain times or in certain locations							
2	Soda is prohibited E.g., "Soda will not be available on school grounds"; "Only water, 100% juice, and milk will be available at school."							

III. Nutrition Guidelines for Competitive & Other Foods Distributed at School *(continued)*

NG46	Guidelines address limiting beverages other than soda <u>containing added caloric sweeteners</u> such as sweetened teas, juice drinks, energy drinks and sports drinks	0	Not mentioned
		1	Beverages with added caloric sweeteners allowed during certain times or in certain locations
		2	Other beverages with added caloric sweeteners prohibited at any time or location E.g., "Only milk, water, and 100% juice will be available at school."
NG47	Guidelines address limiting <u>sugar/calorie</u> content of <u>flavored milk</u>	0	Not mentioned
		1	Limit on sugar or calorie content is not specific or required, or high sugar/calorie flavored milk allowed at certain times or locations
		2	Quantified limit for sugar or calories E.g., "Flavored milk shall contain no more than 22 g of total sugars per 8-oz. portion."
NG48	Guidelines address limiting <u>fat</u> content of <u>milk</u>	0	Not mentioned
		1	Full-fat milk is prohibited, but 2%, "reduced-fat," or "less-fat milk" is allowed
		2	Only low-fat (1%) or non-fat milk is allowed (2% and full-fat are prohibited)
NG49	Guidelines provide <u>serving size</u> limits for beverages	0	Not mentioned
		1	Limit for drinks other than water is greater than 12 ounces or limit is suggested
		2	Limit for drinks other than water is 12 ounces or less
NG50	Guidelines limit caffeine content of beverages (with the exception of trace amounts of naturally occurring caffeine substances)	0	Not mentioned
		1	Limit is suggested, not quantified, and/or time- or location-specific
		2	Beverages with added caffeine prohibited, OR quantified limits specified E.g., "All beverages served shall be caffeine-free, with the exception of trace amounts of naturally occurring caffeine substances."
NG51	Guidelines address access to free <u>drinking water</u> is addressed	0	Not mentioned
		1	Availability of free water is encouraged, OR water is available only for sale
		2	Free water is always available E.g., "Students and staff will have access to free, safe, and fresh drinking water throughout the school day."

IV. Physical Education

See state law and code accordingly if no standards or less restrictive standards are used. Many states list National Association for Sport & Physical Education (NASPE) standards. Only code according to NASPE if districts actually require schools to follow NASPE standards.

PE52	Addresses PE curriculum for <u>each grade level</u>	0	Does not specify which students will be provided PE
		1	Unclear if each grade has a physical education curriculum, or a curriculum is identified but limited to only some grade levels E.g., "PE will be provided in K-8."
		2	Clear that district has a physical education curriculum for each grade. Describes a general curriculum for "K-12," "all levels," or "all students"

2= if they have all grades with Maine Learning Results

Default by Maine Law

12

IV. Physical Education (continued)

PE53	Addresses <u>time</u> per week of PE for elementary school students	0	Not mentioned
		1	Specifies number of times per week without duration; specifies total amount of PE, but it is less than 150 minutes/week; OR <u>suggests</u> that schools follow NASPE standards
		2	Specifies 150 minutes/week or more of PE; OR <u>requires</u> schools to follow NASPE standards
PE54	Addresses <u>time</u> per week of PE for middle school students	0	Not mentioned
		1	Specifies number of times per week without duration; specifies total amount of PE, but it is less than 225 minutes/week; OR <u>suggests</u> that schools follow NASPE standards
		2	Specifies 225 minutes/week or more of PE; OR <u>requires</u> schools to follow NASPE standards
PE55	Addresses <u>time per week of PE</u> for high school students	0	Not mentioned
		1	Specifies number of times per week without duration; specifies total amount of PE, but it is less than 225 minutes/week; OR <u>suggests</u> that schools follow NASPE standards
		2	Specifies 225 minutes/week or more of PE; OR <u>requires</u> schools to follow NASPE standards
PE56	PE promotes a <u>physically active lifestyle</u>	0	Not mentioned
		1	Suggests that PE classes promote a physically active lifestyle E.g., "PE programs should promote an active lifestyle." OR Suggests that PE programs focus on self-assessment
		2	Requires PE to teach lifetime activities E.g., "PE shall focus on personal fitness"; "Provide students K-12 physical education that teaches students the skills needed for lifelong physical fitness." OR Focuses on self-assessment through a "Fitnessgram" or "Activitygram."
PE57	Specifies <u>competency assessment</u> (e.g., knowledge, skills, practice)	0	Not mentioned
		1	Vague and/or suggested E.g., "...will promote rubrics that objectively evaluate and encourage active participation in physical education in all classes K-12."
		2	Assesses knowledge, skill, or practice E.g., "Students shall be able to demonstrate [physical education] competency through application of knowledge, skill development, and practice"; "Evaluation procedures will use classroom based assessment or other strategies."
2= References Maine Learning Results			
PE58	Addresses <u>PE quality</u>	0	Not mentioned
		1	Vague and/or suggested E.g., "A quality PE program will be provided to all students"
		2	Curriculum is aligned with academic standards or benchmarks, comprehensive in scope and sequence. Possible wording: "ongoing /sequential/systematic."

IV. Physical Education (continued)

		"Developmentally appropriate" does not qualify for 1 or 2	
PE59	PE program promotes <u>inclusive play</u>	0	Not mentioned. "Age appropriate" play does qualify for a 1 or 2.
		1	Vague and/or suggested
		2	Default if specifies NASPE standards. If specifies state standards, compare to NASPE. OR discourages bullying, restricts picking teams, promotes confidence building, encourages good sportsmanship, includes students who are not athletically gifted, and/or provides PE choices that match ability E.g., "The PE program shall meet the needs of all students, including those who are not athletically gifted, and actively teach cooperation, fair play, and responsible participation."
PE60	Addresses PE classes or credits	0	Not mentioned
		1	Suggested that PE classes or credits count toward graduation and/or GPA
		2	Required that PE classes or credits count toward graduation and/or GPA
PE61	Addresses <u>frequency of required PE</u> (each year and each day)	0	Not mentioned
		1	PE opportunities are described for students (K-12) or "all students," but it is unclear PE will be provided daily; OR PE is required each year for at least part of the year
		2	Clear that all students will get PE every day, each year
PE62	Addresses <u>teacher-student ratio</u> for PE	0	Not mentioned
		1	Vague and/or suggested
		2	Specific and required
PE63	Addresses <u>adequate equipment and facilities</u> for PE	0	Not mentioned
		1	Suggested or encouraged
		2	Ensures equipment and facilities are safe and adequate E.g., "The physical education program shall be provided adequate space and equipment and conform to all applicable safety standards."
PE64	Addresses amount of <u>moderate to vigorous activity</u> in PE	0	Not mentioned. Recess and other physical activity do not qualify.
		1	Suggested, duration not specified, and/or duration is less than 50% of class time E.g., "The PE program shall devote <u>as much class time as possible</u> to moderate and vigorous activity."
		2	At least 50% of class time is designated for moderate to vigorous activity E.g., "All physical education classes to include at least 50% of moderate to vigorous activity in all or most lessons."
PE65	Addresses <u>qualifications for PE instructors</u>	0	Not mentioned
		1	Credentials are vaguely referred to or suggested E.g., "PE shall be taught by an <u>appropriate staff member</u> ;" "When possible, PE will be taught by a licensed instructor."
		2	Requires PE to be taught by a licensed instructor. Default if NASPE standards specified. If specifies state standards, compare to NASPE. E.g., "PE will be taught by a licensed instructor."

IV. Physical Education (continued)

PE66	<u>Addresses professional development provided for PE staff</u>	0	Not mentioned
		1	Refers to general training, not physical education training; AND/OR refers to general staff E.g., "Provide teachers and other staff with adequate training in health and nutrition education."
		2	Required that PE staff will receive professional development E.g., "Ensures PE staff will receive professional development on a yearly basis."
PE67	<u>Addresses PE waiver requirements (e.g., Substituting PE requirement with other activities)</u>	0	Not mentioned, or waivers for PE are explicitly allowed
		1	PE waivers are discouraged, or waivers are limited to physical activities (e.g., team sports)
		2	Prohibits substituting PE for other physical activities
PE68	<u>Requires students to participate in an annual health assessment (e.g., fitness or BMI)</u>	0	Not mentioned
		1	Vague, suggested, and/or unclear how often E.g., "...shall introduce developmentally appropriate components of a health-related fitness assessment (Connecticut Physical Fitness Assessment)." OR Assessment is specific and required but a positive approach to communicating results is not mentioned
		2	Type of assessment is specified and required and a positive approach to communicating results is mentioned E.g., "Confidential health reports will be sent directly to parents and will include additional resources."

V. Physical Activity

PA69	<u>Federal Wellness:</u> Includes goals for physical activity that are designed to promote student wellness in a manner that the local education agency determines is appropriate	0	Policy clearly detracts from requirement
		1	Implied that policy detracts from requirement
		2	Default unless policy detracts from requirement
PA70	<u>Physical activity provided for every grade level</u>	0	Not mentioned
		1	Policy refers to "students," but it is not clear that each grade level will receive physical activity outside of PE E.g., "...provide adequate time for students to be engaged in physical activity, which includes physical education, recess, and co-curricular activities."
		2	Clear that each grade will receive physical activity outside of PE E.g., "Physical activity will be integrated across the curricula for all grades (K-12) and throughout the school day."
PA71	<u>Includes physical activity opportunities for school staff</u>	0	Not mentioned
		1	Suggested provision E.g., "...will promote periodic and ongoing programs to increase the activity choices for faculty and staff."
		2	Required provision

V. Physical Activity (continued)

PA72	Regular PA opportunities are provided throughout the day (NOT including recess)	<p>0 Not mentioned</p> <p>1 Vague and/or suggested E.g., "Classrooms shall incorporate, where possible, appropriate, short breaks that include physical movement."</p> <p>2 Required E.g., "Physical activity opportunities shall be offered daily before school, during school, or after school."</p>
PA73	Addresses PA through <u>Intramurals</u> or Interscholastic activities	<p>0 Not mentioned</p> <p>1 Vague and/or suggested provision E.g., "Intramural offerings <u>should</u> be maintained at present levels and steadily increased to accommodate elementary, middle and high school grades."</p> <p>2 Provision of Intramurals or Interscholastic activities is required</p>
PA74	Addresses <u>community use of school facilities</u> for PA outside of the school day	<p>0 Not mentioned</p> <p>1 Availability of school facilities for PA is suggested E.g., "The district should allow community based organizations to use facilities outside of school hours."</p> <p>2 Policy states effort to <u>promote</u> the use of facilities E.g., "The district is encouraged to promote the use of school facilities outside of school hours for physical activity programs offered by community based organizations."</p>
PA75	Addresses <u>safe active routes</u> to school	<p>0 Not mentioned</p> <p>1 Vague and/or suggested E.g., "The school district may consider programs such as promoting safe and walkable routes to school."</p> <p>2 Policy states effort to promote safe active routes to school (i.e., by seeking funding, working with local transit, organizing walking school bus, ensuring safe walking paths) E.g., "Each school is responsible for working with community groups to facilitate and promote walking and biking to school by students and staff using safe routes and safe practices."</p>
PA76	Addresses not using PA (extra or restricted) as <u>punishment</u>	<p>0 Not mentioned</p> <p>1 Discouraged E.g., "Students <u>should</u> not be pulled out of physical education for any other content area instruction or punishment."</p> <p>2 Prohibited E.g., "Staff members shall not deny participation in recess or other physical activity opportunities as a form of discipline or punishment unless the safety of students is in question."</p>
PA77	Addresses <u>recess frequency or amount</u> in <u>elementary</u> school	<p>0 Not mentioned</p> <p>1 Frequency or amount is vague and/or suggested E.g., "Supervised recess time should be provided to all students within each school day at all elementary schools."</p> <p>2 Specific and required E.g., "All elementary school students shall have daily supervised recess...."</p>

V. Physical Activity (continued)

PA78	Addresses recess <u>quality to promote physical activity</u>	0	Not mentioned
		1	Vague or weak language
		2	Strong, specific language encouraging physical activity and/or outdoor play, even if it refers to elementary students only E.g., "All elementary school students shall have daily recess, during which schools shall provide space, equipment and an environment conducive to safe and enjoyable activity."

VI. Communication and Promotion

CP79	Federal Wellness: Involve parents, students, and representatives of the school food authority, the school board, school administrators, and the public in the development of the school wellness policy	<p>Note: This should have happened in the past because it deals exclusively with policy DEVELOPMENT; however since language may be copied and pasted, score future orientation (i.e., "shall form a committee") the same. Record if the policy lists the individuals involved in policy development.</p>	
		0	No, neither policy nor supporting documentation specifies who was on policy development team
		1	Yes, policy (or supporting documentation) specifies who was on policy development team, but not all required groups were represented
		2	Yes, policy (or supporting documentation) specifies who was on policy development team and all required groups were represented
CP80	Includes <u>staff wellness</u> programs	0	Not mentioned
		1	Program suggested E.g., "...will <u>provide</u> periodic and ongoing programs to increase nutritional knowledge and activity for faculty and staff."
		2	Program required E.g., "Presentations on nutrition will be <u>provided</u> "; "Activity programs will be available for staff, and gym memberships will be subsidized."
CP81	Addresses consistency of <u>nutrition messages</u>	0	Not mentioned
		1	Vague and/or suggested E.g., "The entire school environment... shall be <u>aligned</u> with healthy school goals..." (Although "shall" is required, "aligned" is vague.) "...will <u>encourage</u> menu choices linked with the nutrition education curriculum."
		2	Specific and required E.g., "The school environment, including cafeteria and classroom, <u>shall provide clear and consistent messages</u> that reinforce healthy eating."
CP82	Encourages staff to <u>role model healthy behaviors</u>	0	Not mentioned
		1	Suggested that school will encourage staff to model healthy behavior E.g., "Each school in the district <u>should</u> encourage staff to model..."
		2	Required that school will encourage staff to model healthy behavior E.g., "Staff <u>will be</u> encouraged to model healthy eating and physical activity as a valuable part of daily life."
CP83	Specifies <u>who</u> in the district is responsible for wellness/health communication beyond required policy implementation reporting	0	Not mentioned
		1	Specifies who is responsible, and communication is suggested. OR "the district" is specified as being responsible for communication E.g., "Teachers and staff <u>can</u> post websites on nutrition topics."
		2	Specifies who is responsible, and communication is required. Acceptable: "Superintendent" or "designee." E.g., "Food services <u>will</u> provide families opportunities for input and monitoring of their children's food purchases at the K-8 level."

VI. Communication and Promotion (continued)

CP84	<p>Specifies District using <u>CDC Coordinated School Health Model</u> or other coordinated/comprehensive method.</p> <p>CSHP model consists of 8 interactive components: (1) health education, (2) family/community involvement, (3) health promotion for staff, (4) healthy school environment, (5) counseling, psychological and social services, (6) physical education, (7) health services, (8) nutrition services</p>	0	Not mentioned
		1	<p>Mentions that district is considering use or working toward use of a coordinated school health model</p> <p>E.g., "We will strive toward integrating nutrition into a coordinated school health approach."</p>
		2	<p>Includes language to institutionalize a coordinated school health model</p> <p>E.g., "Schools <u>will</u> link nutrition education activities with the coordinated school health program."</p>
CP85	<p>Addresses <u>methods</u> to solicit or encourage <u>input</u> from stakeholder groups (e.g. two-way sharing)</p>	0	Not mentioned
		1	<p>Specific methods suggested</p> <p>E.g., "...<u>should</u> encourage feedback from parents and community through stakeholder meetings."</p>
		2	<p>Required to solicit input from stakeholders, and specific methods are named</p> <p>E.g., "Students <u>will</u> be given the opportunity to provide input on local, cultural, and favorite ethnic foods"; "The school will consider student needs in planning for a healthy school nutrition environment. Students will be asked for input and feedback through the use of student surveys and attention will be given to their comments."; "Shall provide periodic food promotions to encourage taste testing of healthy new foods being introduced on the menu"; "The food service director will be available to speak with parents during open house."</p>
CP86	<p>Specifies <u>how</u> district will engage parents or community to meet district wellness goals</p> <p>(e.g., through website, email, parent conferences, events etc.)</p>	0	Not mentioned
		1	<p>Unclear if school will engage parents or community, and specific methods are named</p> <p>E.g., "Nutrition information <u>should</u> be provided to parents and staff through newsletters, publications, health fairs, and other activities..."</p>
		2	<p>Clear that the school will engage parents or community, and specific methods are listed. OK if it is not clear that each specific method will be used.</p> <p>E.g., "Nutrition education <u>will</u> be provided to parents. Nutrition education may be provided in the form of handouts, the school website, articles and information provided in district or school newsletters, presentations that focus on nutrition and healthy lifestyles, and through any other appropriate means available to reach parents."</p>
CP87	<p>Specifies <u>what</u> content/information district communicates to parents</p>	0	Not mentioned
		1	<p>It is suggested that schools communicate content/information to parents</p> <p>E.g., "Nutrition information <u>should</u> be provided to parents on but not limited to: Healthy snack ideas, healthy breakfast..."</p>
		2	<p>It is required for school to communicate content/information with parents and content is specific (wellness policy, lists of foods for healthy lunches or celebrations, opportunities for physical activity before and after school, etc.)</p> <p>E.g., "The District will provide parents with healthy snack ideas."</p>
CP88	<p>Specifies <u>marketing</u> to promote healthy choices</p>	0	Not mentioned
		1	<p>Vague and/or suggested</p> <p>E.g., "It is recommended that organizations operating concessions at school functions market healthy food choices at a lower profit margin to encourage student selection."</p>
		2	Specific (posters, pricing structures, etc.) and required

VI. Communication and Promotion (continued)

CP69	<u>Specifies restricting marketing of unhealthful choices</u>	0	Not mentioned
		1	Suggested and/or applicable in some areas or during certain times E.g., "Display and advertising of foods with minimal nutritional value is strongly discouraged on school grounds."
		2	Required (at all times implied) E.g., "Education materials shall be free of brands and illustrations of unhealthful foods"; "Soft drink logos are not allowed on school materials or on school property."
		Automatic 2 because of "An act to protect children's health on school grounds"	
CP90	<u>Establishes a health advisory committee or school health council that is ongoing beyond policy development</u>	0	Not mentioned
		1	Suggested and/or not clear that the committee will be ongoing
		2	Committee is required and clearly ongoing E.g., "The Nutrition and Physical Activity Advisory Council shall include (stakeholders) and shall meet a minimum of two times annually to monitor and evaluate the implementation of the policy."

VII. Evaluation

EB1	Federal Wellness: Establish a plan for measuring implementation of the local wellness policy, including designation of one or more persons within the local educational agency or at each school, as appropriate, charged with operational responsibility for ensuring that the school meets the local wellness policy	0	Not mentioned
		1	Describes a plan, and does not designate one or more persons charged with ensuring compliance Describes a plan and designates one or more persons charged with ensuring compliance E.g., "A district-wide Wellness Committee shall be established for the purpose of monitoring the implementation of the district's Wellness Policy and its nutrition and physical activity components through the Superintendent or his/her designee, as determined necessary"; "The Superintendent or designee shall ensure compliance with established district wide nutrition and physical activity policies. In each school, the building administrator or designee shall ensure compliance with those policies in his or her school."
		2	
EB2	Addresses a plan for <u>policy implementation</u> , including a person or group responsible (initial or ongoing)	0	Not mentioned
		1	Identifies having or developing a plan without strong language, or without 1 identifying a person or group responsible E.g., "The district will strive to implement the policy by..." Using strong language, identifies having or developing a plan for implementation and identifies a person or group responsible E.g., "The District shall prepare, adopt, and implement a comprehensive plan to encourage healthy eating and physical activity"; "The Superintendent or designee shall ensure compliance with established district wide nutrition and physical activity policies. In each school, the building administrator or designee shall ensure compliance with those policies in his or her school ..."
		2	
EB3	Addresses a plan for <u>policy evaluation</u> , including a person / group responsible for tracking outcomes	0	Not mentioned
		1	Some kind of pre-post assessment is implied E.g., "The district shall have a classroom based assessment for health and fitness."
		2	An evaluation plan is required, a person/group responsible for tracking evaluation is/are identified, AND specific outcomes to be measured are stated (i.e., health impact, fiscal impact, student learning, School Health Index) E.g., "The Advisory Council shall meet at least annually to review nutrition and physical activity policies, new research and evidence on health trends, and effective programs and program elements."

VII. Evaluation (continued)

E94	Addresses the audience and frequency of a report on compliance and/or evaluation	<p>0 Not mentioned</p> <p>1 Some kind of report on compliance or evaluation is implied</p> <p>2 Policy must meet all of the following criteria: -Reporting on compliance or evaluation is required - Specific items are stated (e.g., compliance with nutrition guidelines, listing of activities and programs conducted to promote nutrition and physical activity, recommendations for policy and/or program revisions, feedback received from stakeholders) -It is clear that a report will be made to a specific audience (e.g., board of education, administration, PTO/PTAs, the public) - Frequency of reporting is stated</p> <p>E.g., "The advisory council shall prepare a report annually for the Superintendent evaluating the implementation of the policy and regulations and include any recommended changes or revisions."</p>
E95	Identifies funding support for wellness activities or policy evaluation	<p>0 Not mentioned</p> <p>1 Vague</p> <p>2 Identifies a specific source</p>
E96	Identifies a plan for revising the policy	<p>0 Not mentioned</p> <p>1 Future orientation in making a decision to revise E.g., "...may meet to discuss revisions to policy;" "...may suggest changes."</p> <p>2 Discusses revision to policy in any way by any person or group E.g., "...will meet to discuss revisions to policy."</p>

APPENDIX E. SCORES BY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT

SAU	Nutrition Education		Standards for USDA Child Nutrition Program/Reimbursable School Meals		Nutrition Guidelines for Competitive and Other Foods Distributed at School		Physical Education	
	Comprehensiveness		Comprehensiveness		Comprehensiveness		Comprehensiveness	
	Score	Strength Score	Score	Strength Score	Score	Strength Score	Score	Strength Score
5 Alexander	0.78	High	0.85	High	0.72	High	0.59	Med
9 Alton	0.78	High	0.38	Med	0.31	Med	0.41	Med
14 Appleton	0.56	Med	0.46	Med	0.41	Med	0.53	Med
20 Auburn	0.33	Med	0.46	Med	0.41	Med	0.47	Med
21 Augusta	0.67	High	0.69	High	0.62	Med	0.35	Med
24 Baileyville	0.56	Med	0.46	Med	0.41	Med	0.53	Med
27 Bangor	0.33	Med	0.23	Low	0.45	Med	0.47	Med
28 Bar Harbor	0.44	Med	0.54	Low	0.86	High	0.29	Low
30 Bath	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.41	Med	0.53	Med
31 Beals	0.78	High	0.69	High	0.66	Med	0.59	Med
40 Biddeford	0.67	High	0.62	Med	0.59	Med	0.41	Med
44 Blue Hill	0.33	Med	0.08	Low	0.34	Med	0.29	Low
51 Bradley	0.78	High	0.38	Med	0.79	High	0.41	Med
53 Brewer	0.56	Med	0.23	Low	0.41	Med	0.35	Med
54 Bridgewater	0.56	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med	0.41	Med
57 Bristol	0.44	Med	0.08	Low	0.38	Med	0.24	Low
58 Brooklin	0.67	High	0.08	Low	0.45	Med	0.41	Med
60 Brooksville	0.44	Med	0.08	Low	0.34	Med	0.29	Low
63 Brunswick	0.44	Med	0.23	Low	0.34	Med	0.47	Med
65 Bucksport	0.89	High	0.46	Med	0.45	Med	0.29	Low
70 Calais	0.78	High	0.85	High	0.72	High	0.59	Med
75 Cape Elizabeth	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.41	Med	0.53	Med
77 Caribou	0.56	Med	0.46	Med	0.41	Med	0.53	Med
83 Castine	0.44	Med	0.08	Low	0.34	Med	0.29	Low
85 Caswell	0.22	Low	0.62	Med	0.79	High	0.71	High
89 Charlotte	0.22	Low	0.15	Low	0.55	Med	0.29	Low
90 Chelsea	0.56	Med	0.46	Med	0.41	Med	0.53	Med
94 China	0.56	Med	0.38	Med	0.45	Med	0.53	Med
106 Cranberry Isles	0.44	Med	0.54	Med	0.86	High	0.69	High
111 Cutler	0.56	Med	0.46	Med	0.41	Med	0.31	Low
116 Dayton	0.67	High	0.23	Low	0.48	Med	0.59	Med
128 Dresden	0.56	Med	0.62	Med	0.48	Med	0.31	Low
136 East Millinocket	0.56	Med	0.54	Med	0.41	Med	0.31	Low
137 Easton	0.56	Med	0.46	Med	0.41	Med	0.53	Med
138 Eastport	0.22	Low	0.15	Low	0.55	Med	0.29	Low
140 Edgcomb	0.56	Med	0.54	Med	0.66	Med	0.65	Med
144 Ellsworth	0.44	Med	0.23	Low	0.34	Med	0.35	Med
151 Falmouth	0.44	Med	0.08	Low	0.41	Med	0.29	Low
154 Fayette	0.56	Med	0.38	Med	0.41	Med	0.47	Med
160 Freetport	0.44	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med	0.41	Med
167 Georgetown	0.56	Med	0.46	Med	0.55	Med	0.41	Med
169 Glenburn	0.67	High	0.15	Low	0.48	Med	0.41	Med
171 Gorham	0.33	Med	0.15	Low	0.38	Med	0.47	Med
177 Greenbush	0.78	High	0.38	Med	0.79	High	0.41	Med
180 Greenville	0.44	Med	0.00	Low	0.31	Low	0.29	Low
187 Hancock	0.56	Med	0.46	Med	0.41	Med	0.53	Med
189 Harmony	0.56	Med	0.31	Low	0.34	Med	0.29	Low
197 Hemton	0.56	Med	0.46	Med	0.41	Med	0.47	Med

SAU	Physical Activity		Communication and Promotion		Evaluation		Total	
	Comprehensiveness Score	Strength Score	Comprehensiveness Score	Strength Score	Comprehensiveness Score	Strength Score	Comprehensiveness Score	Strength Score
5 Alexander	1.00	High	0.75	High	0.83	High	0.76	High
9 Alton	0.50	Med	0.58	Med	0.83	High	0.61	Med
14 Appleton	0.70	High	0.83	High	0.83	High	0.50	Med
20 Auburn	0.40	Med	0.67	High	0.83	High	0.48	Med
21 Augusta	0.70	High	0.83	High	0.83	High	0.64	Med
24 Baileyville	0.70	High	0.83	High	0.83	High	0.50	Med
27 Bangor	0.50	Med	0.50	Med	0.67	High	0.44	Med
28 Bar Harbor	0.50	Med	0.50	Med	0.67	High	0.58	Med
30 Bath	0.70	High	0.75	High	0.83	High	0.54	Med
31 Beals	0.70	High	0.92	High	0.83	High	0.71	High
40 Biddeford	0.70	High	0.75	High	0.50	Med	0.59	Med
44 Blue Hill	0.40	Med	0.42	Med	0.50	Med	0.32	Low
51 Bradley	0.50	Med	0.58	Med	0.83	High	0.61	Med
53 Brewer	0.60	Med	0.67	High	0.83	High	0.47	Med
54 Bridgewater	0.20	Low	0.25	Low	0.33	Med	0.34	Med
57 Bristol	0.00	Low	0.17	Low	0.50	Med	0.26	Low
58 Brooklyn	0.30	Low	0.25	Low	0.67	High	0.39	Med
60 Brunswick	0.40	Med	0.42	Med	0.67	High	0.34	Med
63 Bucksport	0.60	Med	0.50	Med	0.83	High	0.44	Med
65 Calais	0.70	High	0.75	High	0.83	High	0.52	Med
70 Calais	1.00	High	0.70	High	0.83	High	0.76	High
75 Cape Elizabeth	0.70	High	0.83	High	0.83	High	0.56	Med
77 Caribou	0.70	High	0.83	High	0.83	High	0.56	Med
83 Castine	0.40	Med	0.17	Low	0.17	Low	0.28	Low
85 Caswell	0.50	Med	0.25	Low	0.00	Low	0.55	Med
89 Charlotte	0.70	High	0.42	Med	0.50	Med	0.42	Med
90 Chelsea	0.70	High	0.83	High	0.83	High	0.56	Med
94 China	0.60	Med	0.50	Med	0.67	High	0.50	Med
106 Cranberry Isles	0.50	Med	0.50	Med	0.67	High	0.58	Med
111 Cutler	0.70	High	0.83	High	0.83	High	0.56	Med
116 Dayton	0.60	Med	0.67	High	0.33	Med	0.48	Med
128 Dresden	0.80	High	0.83	High	0.83	High	0.64	Med
136 East Millinocket	0.70	High	0.83	High	0.83	High	0.58	Med
137 Easton	0.70	High	0.83	High	0.83	High	0.56	Med
138 Eastport	0.70	High	0.42	Med	0.50	Med	0.42	Med
140 Edgecomb	0.70	High	0.33	Med	0.00	Low	0.55	Med
144 Ellsworth	0.70	High	0.58	Med	0.83	High	0.48	Med
151 Falmouth	0.50	Med	0.33	Med	0.50	Med	0.35	Med
154 Fayette	0.70	High	0.75	High	0.83	High	0.53	Med
160 Freeport	0.40	Med	0.42	Med	0.50	Med	0.39	Med
167 Georgetown	0.60	Med	0.75	High	0.67	High	0.55	Med
169 Glenburn	0.30	Low	0.67	High	0.67	High	0.46	Med
171 Gorham	0.30	Low	0.17	Low	0.33	Med	0.32	Low
177 Greenbush	0.50	Med	0.58	Med	0.83	High	0.61	Med
180 Greenville	0.30	Low	0.42	Med	0.67	High	0.31	Low
187 Harcock	0.70	High	0.83	High	0.83	High	0.56	Med
189 Harmony	0.60	Med	0.58	Med	0.83	High	0.44	Med
197 Hermon	0.60	Med	0.83	High	0.83	High	0.54	Med

SAU	Nutrition Education		Standards for USDA Child Nutrition Program/Reimbursable School Meals				Nutrition Guidelines for Competitive and Other Foods Distributed at School		Physical Education	
	Comprehensiveness		Comprehensiveness		Comprehensiveness		Comprehensiveness		Comprehensiveness	
	Score	Strength Score	Score	Strength Score	Score	Strength Score	Score	Strength Score	Score	Strength Score
204 Hope	0.56	0.44	0.46	0.15	0.45	0.31	0.53	Med	0.53	Med
214 Jay	0.44	Med	0.22	Low	0.24	Med	0.29	Low	0.24	Low
215 Jefferson	0.56	Med	0.46	0.15	0.41	Med	0.53	Med	0.53	Med
217 Jonesport	0.78	High	0.69	High	0.66	Med	0.59	Med	0.41	Med
223 Kittery	0.67	High	0.15	Low	0.48	Med	0.41	Med	0.29	Low
228 Lamorne	0.89	High	0.69	High	0.86	High	0.82	High	0.41	Med
233 Lewiston	0.56	Med	0.46	Med	0.41	Med	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
236 Limestone	0.56	Med	0.46	Med	0.41	Med	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
240 Lincolnville	0.56	Med	0.46	Med	0.41	Med	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
242 Lisbon	0.44	Med	0.15	Low	0.48	Med	0.47	Med	0.41	Med
247 Frenchboro	0.56	Med	0.54	Low	0.86	High	0.29	Low	0.18	Low
254 Machiasport	0.56	Med	0.46	Med	0.41	Med	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
260 Manchester	0.67	High	0.62	Med	0.41	Med	0.53	Med	0.41	Med
269 Mechanic Falls	0.56	Med	0.46	Med	0.41	Med	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
271 Medway	0.56	Med	0.54	Med	0.41	Med	0.59	Med	0.35	Med
276 Milford	0.78	High	0.38	Med	0.79	High	0.41	Med	0.24	Low
277 Milinoeket	0.56	Med	0.54	Med	0.41	Med	0.59	Med	0.35	Med
279 Minot	0.56	Med	0.46	Med	0.41	Med	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
281 Monmouth	0.56	Med	0.85	High	0.62	Med	0.71	High	0.53	Med
291 Mount Desert Island	0.44	Med	0.54	Med	0.86	High	0.29	Low	0.18	Low
292 Mount Vernon	0.67	High	0.62	Med	0.41	Med	0.53	Med	0.41	Med
305 New Sweden	0.78	High	0.08	Low	0.48	Med	0.41	Med	0.29	Low
307 Nobleboro	0.44	Med	0.08	Low	0.38	Med	0.24	Low	0.18	Low
320 Old Orchard Beach	0.67	High	0.23	Low	0.52	Med	0.41	Med	0.35	Med
321 Old Town	0.56	Med	0.46	Med	0.41	Med	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
324 Orono	0.56	Med	0.46	Med	0.41	Med	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
327 Otis	0.56	Med	0.46	Med	0.41	Med	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
332 Palermo	0.56	Med	0.46	Med	0.41	Med	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
339 Pembroke	0.22	Low	0.15	Low	0.55	Med	0.29	Low	0.24	Low
340 Penobscot	0.44	Med	0.08	Low	0.34	Med	0.29	Low	0.18	Low
342 Perry	0.22	Low	0.15	Low	0.55	Med	0.29	Low	0.24	Low
345 Phippsburg	0.56	Med	0.46	Med	0.55	Med	0.41	Med	0.29	Low
350 Poland	0.56	Med	0.46	Med	0.41	Med	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
353 Portland	0.89	High	0.54	Med	0.55	Med	0.47	Med	0.35	Med
357 Princeton	0.56	Med	0.46	Med	0.41	Med	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
363 Readfield	0.67	High	0.62	Med	0.41	Med	0.53	Med	0.41	Med
367 Robbinston	0.78	High	0.85	High	0.72	High	0.59	Med	0.35	Med
374 Saco	0.67	High	0.23	Low	0.48	Med	0.41	Med	0.29	Low
381 Sanford	0.78	High	0.15	Low	0.53	Med	0.53	Med	0.29	Low
383 Scarborough	0.78	High	0.54	Med	0.69	High	0.65	Med	0.35	Med
389 Sedgewick	0.67	High	0.08	Low	0.45	Med	0.41	Med	0.29	Low
392 Shirley	0.44	Med	0.00	Low	0.31	Low	0.29	Low	0.18	Low
398 Somerville	0.56	Med	0.46	Med	0.41	Med	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
401 S. Bristol	0.44	Med	0.08	Low	0.38	Med	0.24	Low	0.18	Low
402 Southport	0.56	Med	0.54	Med	0.66	Med	0.65	Med	0.59	Med
403 South Portland	0.56	Med	0.08	Low	0.41	Med	0.41	Med	0.29	Low
405 Southwest Harbor	0.44	Med	0.54	Med	0.86	High	0.29	Low	0.18	Low
420 Surry	0.56	Med	0.46	Med	0.41	Med	0.53	Med	0.35	Med

SAU		Physical Activity				Communication and Promotion				Evaluation				Total			
		Comprehensiveness		Strength		Comprehensiveness		Strength		Comprehensiveness		Strength		Comprehensiveness		Strength	
204	Hope	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
214	Jay	0.20	Low	0.20	Low	0.25	Low	0.17	Low	0.50	Med	0.33	Med	0.38	Med	0.26	Low
215	Jefferson	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
217	Jonesport	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.92	High	0.50	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.71	High	0.46	Med
223	Kittery	0.20	Low	0.20	Low	0.33	Med	0.17	Low	0.67	High	0.33	Med	0.41	Med	0.26	Low
228	Lamoine	0.70	High	0.20	Low	0.58	Med	0.33	Med	0.50	Med	0.50	Med	0.76	High	0.48	Med
233	Lewiston	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.32	Low
236	Limestone	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
240	Lincolnville	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
242	Lisbon	0.70	High	0.20	Low	0.75	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.52	Med	0.33	Med
247	Frenchboro	0.50	Med	0.10	Low	0.50	Med	0.42	Med	0.67	High	0.17	Low	0.58	Med	0.34	Med
254	Machiasport	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
260	Manchester	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.59	Med	0.33	Med
269	Mechanic Falls	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
271	Medway	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.58	Med	0.34	Med
276	Millford	0.50	Med	0.20	Low	0.58	Med	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.61	Med	0.40	Med
277	Millinocket	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.58	Med	0.34	Med
279	Minot	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
281	Monmouth	1.00	High	0.60	Med	0.58	Med	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.83	High	0.71	High	0.49	Med
291	Mount Desert Island	0.50	Med	0.10	Low	0.50	Med	0.42	Med	0.67	High	0.17	Low	0.58	Med	0.34	Med
292	Mount Vernon	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.59	Med	0.35	Med
305	New Sweden	0.20	Low	0.20	Low	0.25	Low	0.17	Low	0.50	Med	0.33	Med	0.26	Low	0.20	Low
307	Nobleboro	0.00	Low	0.00	Low	0.17	Low	0.08	Low	0.50	Med	0.33	Med	0.39	Med	0.27	Low
320	Old Orchard Beach	0.40	Med	0.20	Low	0.75	High	0.42	Med	0.50	Med	0.33	Med	0.49	Med	0.31	Low
321	Old Town	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
324	Orono	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.50	Med	0.50	Med	0.54	Med	0.33	Med
327	Otis	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
332	Palermo	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
339	Pembroke	0.70	High	0.50	Med	0.42	Med	0.25	Low	0.50	Med	0.33	Med	0.42	Med	0.29	Low
340	Penobscot	0.40	Med	0.10	Low	0.42	Med	0.17	Low	0.67	High	0.33	Med	0.34	Med	0.21	Low
342	Perry	0.70	High	0.50	Med	0.75	High	0.25	Low	0.50	Med	0.33	Med	0.42	Med	0.29	Low
345	Phlipsburg	0.60	Med	0.40	Med	0.42	High	0.67	High	0.67	High	0.67	High	0.55	Med	0.42	Med
350	Poland	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
353	Portland	0.70	High	0.50	Med	0.67	High	0.58	Med	0.83	High	0.67	High	0.61	Med	0.44	Med
357	Princeton	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
363	Readfield	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.59	Med	0.35	Med
367	Robbinston	1.00	High	0.70	High	0.75	High	0.33	Med	0.83	High	0.67	High	0.76	High	0.46	Med
374	Saco	0.60	Med	0.30	Low	0.67	High	0.50	Med	0.33	Med	0.17	Low	0.48	Med	0.31	Low
381	Sanford	0.70	High	0.10	Low	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.83	High	0.67	High	0.53	Med	0.31	Low
383	Scarborough	0.90	High	0.70	High	0.58	Med	0.58	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.69	High	0.49	Med
389	Sedgewick	0.30	Low	0.10	Low	0.25	Low	0.17	Low	0.67	High	0.33	Med	0.39	Med	0.25	Low
392	Shirley	0.30	Low	0.10	Low	0.42	Med	0.17	Low	0.67	High	0.33	Med	0.31	Low	0.19	Low
398	Somerville	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
401	S. Bristol	0.00	Low	0.00	Low	0.17	Low	0.08	Low	0.50	Med	0.33	Med	0.26	Low	0.20	Low
402	Southport	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.33	Med	0.17	Low	0.00	Low	0.00	Low	0.55	Med	0.38	Med
403	South Portland	0.20	Med	0.20	Low	0.67	High	0.42	Med	0.67	High	0.33	Med	0.44	Med	0.29	Low
405	Southwest Harbor	0.50	Med	0.10	Low	0.50	Med	0.42	Med	0.67	High	0.17	Low	0.58	Med	0.34	Med
420	Surry	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.75	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.55	Med	0.33	Med

SAU		Nutrition Education				Standards for USDA Child Nutrition Program/Reimbursable School Meals				Nutrition Guidelines for Competitive and Other Foods Distributed at School				Physical Education			
		Competitiveness		Strength		Competitiveness		Strength		Competitiveness		Strength		Competitiveness		Strength	
		Score	Med	Score	Low	Score	Med	Score	Low	Score	Med	Score	Low	Score	Med	Score	Low
430	Tremont	0.44	Med	0.22	Low	0.54	Med	0.08	Low	0.86	High	0.09	High	0.29	Low	0.18	Low
431	Trenton	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med	0.31	Low	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
439	Vassalboro	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.38	Med	0.15	Low	0.45	Med	0.38	Med	0.53	Med	0.41	Med
440	Veazie	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med	0.31	Low	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
448	Wales	0.44	Med	0.22	Low	0.31	Low	0.15	Low	0.41	Med	0.31	Low	0.29	Low	0.18	Low
456	Waterville	0.56	Med	0.33	Med	0.15	Low	0.08	Low	0.41	Med	0.34	Med	0.35	Med	0.24	Low
457	Wayne	0.67	High	0.44	Med	0.62	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med	0.34	Med	0.53	Med	0.41	Med
458	Sabatius	0.44	Med	0.22	Low	0.31	Low	0.15	Low	0.41	Med	0.31	Low	0.29	Low	0.18	Low
465	Westbrook	0.33	Med	0.22	Low	0.08	Low	0.08	Low	0.34	Med	0.31	Low	0.53	Med	0.18	Low
473	Whitefield	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med	0.31	Low	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
474	Whiting	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med	0.31	Low	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
478	Windham	0.67	High	0.44	Med	0.08	Low	0.08	Low	0.34	Med	0.31	Low	0.41	Med	0.35	Med
479	Windsor	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med	0.31	Low	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
481	Winslow	0.56	Med	0.56	Med	0.38	Med	0.15	Low	0.45	Med	0.38	Med	0.53	Med	0.41	Med
485	Winthrop	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med	0.31	Low	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
487	Woodland	0.78	High	0.56	Med	0.08	Low	0.08	Low	0.45	Med	0.31	Low	0.41	Med	0.29	Low
490	Woolwich	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.31	Low	0.55	Med	0.38	Med	0.41	Med	0.41	Med
491	Yarmouth	0.56	Med	0.33	Med	0.08	Low	0.08	Low	0.48	Med	0.34	Med	0.41	Med	0.35	Med
492	York	0.44	Med	0.11	Low	0.46	Med	0.23	Low	0.45	Med	0.34	Med	0.29	Low	0.24	Low
501	MSAD 01	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.15	Low	0.08	Low	0.41	Med	0.31	Low	0.41	Med	0.35	Med
503	MSAD 03	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med	0.31	Low	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
504	MSAD 04	0.33	Med	0.11	Low	0.23	Low	0.23	Low	0.48	Med	0.34	Med	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
505	MSAD 05	0.56	Med	0.33	Med	0.23	Low	0.08	Low	0.55	Med	0.34	Med	0.53	Med	0.41	Med
506	MSAD 06	0.33	Med	0.22	Low	0.00	Low	0.00	Low	0.31	Low	0.31	Low	0.29	Low	0.18	Low
508	MSAD 08	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med	0.31	Low	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
509	MSAD 09	0.67	High	0.33	Med	0.23	Low	0.08	Low	0.59	Med	0.34	Med	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
511	MSAD 11	0.33	Med	0.33	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.52	Med	0.34	Med	0.41	Med	0.29	Low
512	MSAD 12	0.44	Med	0.33	Med	0.15	Low	0.08	Low	0.34	Med	0.31	Low	0.29	Low	0.18	Low
513	MSAD 13	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med	0.31	Low	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
514	MSAD 14	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med	0.31	Low	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
515	MSAD 15	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.34	Med	0.31	Low	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
516	MSAD 16	0.67	High	0.56	Med	0.62	Med	0.31	Low	0.48	Med	0.34	Med	0.59	Med	0.29	Low
517	MSAD 17	0.33	Med	0.22	Low	0.08	Low	0.08	Low	0.34	Med	0.31	Low	0.18	Low	0.18	Low
519	MSAD 19	0.78	High	0.44	Med	0.15	Low	0.08	Low	0.34	Med	0.31	Low	0.41	Med	0.29	Low
520	MSAD 20	0.67	High	0.56	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.45	Med	0.34	Med	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
521	MSAD 21	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med	0.31	Low	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
522	MSAD 22	0.67	High	0.56	Med	0.38	Med	0.31	Low	0.48	Med	0.31	Low	0.47	Med	0.41	Med
523	MSAD 23	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med	0.31	Low	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
524	MSAD 24	0.89	High	0.67	High	0.85	High	0.77	High	0.83	High	0.34	Med	0.76	High	0.47	Med
525	MSAD 25	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.62	Med	0.15	Low	0.76	High	0.38	Med	0.65	Med	0.41	Med
526	MSAD 26	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med	0.31	Low	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
527	MSAD 27	0.78	High	0.56	Med	0.54	Med	0.46	Med	0.41	Med	0.38	Med	0.47	Med	0.35	Med
528	MSAD 28	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med	0.31	Low	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
529	MSAD 29	0.67	High	0.33	Med	0.08	Low	0.08	Low	0.34	Med	0.31	Low	0.35	Med	0.24	Low
531	MSAD 31	0.67	High	0.56	Med	0.62	Med	0.23	Low	0.45	Med	0.31	Low	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
532	MSAD 32	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med	0.31	Low	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
533	MSAD 33	0.78	High	0.67	High	0.54	Med	0.31	Low	0.86	High	0.69	High	0.65	Med	0.47	Med

SAU		Physical Activity				Communication and Promotion				Evaluation				Total			
		Comprehensiveness		Strength Score	Comprehensiveness		Strength Score	Comprehensiveness		Strength Score	Comprehensiveness		Strength Score				
		Score	Med		Score	Med		Score	Med		Score	Med					
430	Tremont	0.50	Med	0.10	Low	0.50	Med	0.42	Med	0.67	High	0.17	Low	0.58	Med	0.34	Med
431	Trenon	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
439	Vassalboro	0.60	Med	0.20	Low	0.50	Med	0.25	Low	0.67	High	0.50	Med	0.50	Med	0.33	Med
440	Veazie	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.50	Med	0.50	Med	0.54	Med	0.33	Med
448	Wales	0.50	Med	0.30	Low	0.50	Med	0.25	Low	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.43	Med	0.26	Low
456	Wareville	0.30	Low	0.20	Low	0.25	Low	0.17	Low	0.17	Low	0.00	Low	0.33	Med	0.23	Low
457	Wayne	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.59	Med	0.35	Med
458	Sabatius	0.50	Med	0.30	Low	0.50	Med	0.25	Low	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.43	Med	0.26	Low
465	Westbrook	0.60	Med	0.30	Low	0.50	Med	0.25	Low	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.38	Med	0.25	Low
473	Whitefield	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
474	Whiting	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
478	Windham	0.30	Low	0.30	Low	0.42	Med	0.33	Med	0.00	Low	0.00	Low	0.33	Med	0.28	Low
479	Windsor	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
481	Winslow	0.60	Med	0.20	Low	0.50	Med	0.25	Low	0.67	High	0.50	Med	0.50	Med	0.34	Med
485	Winthrop	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
487	Woodland	0.20	Low	0.20	Low	0.25	Low	0.17	Low	0.50	Med	0.33	Med	0.38	Med	0.27	Low
490	Woodwich	0.70	High	0.40	Med	0.75	High	0.67	High	0.67	High	0.67	High	0.56	Med	0.42	Med
491	Yarmouth	0.20	Low	0.20	Low	0.50	Med	0.33	Med	0.67	High	0.50	Med	0.41	Med	0.20	Low
492	York	0.20	Low	0.20	Low	0.33	Med	0.17	Low	0.33	Med	0.00	Low	0.38	Med	0.23	Low
501	MSAD 01	0.20	Low	0.20	Low	0.25	Low	0.08	Low	0.33	Med	0.33	Med	0.34	Med	0.26	Low
503	MSAD 03	0.30	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
504	MSAD 04	0.30	Low	0.20	Low	0.50	Med	0.33	Med	0.33	Med	0.17	Low	0.42	Med	0.28	Low
505	MSAD 05	0.50	Med	0.20	Low	0.58	Med	0.25	Low	0.50	Med	0.33	Med	0.50	Med	0.29	Low
506	MSAD 06	0.50	Med	0.20	Low	0.33	Med	0.08	Low	0.67	High	0.17	Low	0.31	Low	0.19	Low
508	MSAD 08	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
509	MSAD 09	0.60	Med	0.20	Low	0.75	High	0.58	Med	0.67	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
511	MSAD 11	0.60	Med	0.40	Med	0.42	Med	0.25	Low	0.33	Med	0.17	Low	0.46	Med	0.24	Low
512	MSAD 12	0.40	Med	0.20	Low	0.42	Med	0.33	Med	0.33	Med	0.17	Low	0.33	Med	0.24	Low
513	MSAD 13	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
514	MSAD 14	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
515	MSAD 15	0.40	Med	0.20	Low	0.67	High	0.33	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.49	Med	0.31	Low
516	MSAD 16	0.80	High	0.40	Med	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.64	Med	0.38	Med
517	MSAD 17	0.60	Med	0.20	Low	0.50	Med	0.33	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.38	Med	0.25	Low
519	MSAD 19	0.20	Low	0.10	Low	0.25	Low	0.08	Low	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.38	Med	0.25	Low
520	MSAD 20	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.33	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.58	Med	0.34	Med
521	MSAD 21	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.50	Med	0.50	Med	0.54	Med	0.33	Med
522	MSAD 22	0.70	High	0.60	Med	0.83	High	0.67	High	0.83	High	0.67	High	0.57	Med	0.45	Med
523	MSAD 23	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
524	MSAD 24	1.00	High	0.80	High	0.83	High	0.67	High	0.67	High	0.50	Med	0.83	High	0.55	Med
525	MSAD 25	0.60	Med	0.30	Low	0.50	Med	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.67	High	0.66	Med	0.35	Med
526	MSAD 26	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
527	MSAD 27	0.90	High	0.80	High	0.75	High	0.50	Med	0.50	Med	0.50	Med	0.57	Med	0.47	Med
528	MSAD 28	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.34	Med
529	MSAD 29	0.30	Low	0.10	Low	0.67	High	0.50	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.41	Med	0.28	Low
531	MSAD 31	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.60	Med	0.35	Med
532	MSAD 32	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
533	MSAD 33	0.80	High	0.40	Med	0.75	High	0.58	Med	0.83	High	0.67	High	0.75	High	0.55	Med

SAU	Nutrition Education		Standards for USDA Child Nutrition Program/ Reimbursable School Meals				Nutrition Guidelines for Competitive and Other Foods Distributed at School		Physical Education	
	Comprehensiveness		Comprehensiveness		Comprehensiveness		Comprehensiveness		Comprehensiveness	
	Score	Strength Score	Score	Strength Score	Score	Strength Score	Score	Strength Score	Score	Strength Score
534 MSAD 34	0.56	Med	0.33	Med	0.31	Low	0.15	Low	0.79	High
535 MSAD 35	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med
537 MSAD 37	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med
538 MSAD 38	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med
539 MSAD 39	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med
540 MSAD 40	0.67	High	0.44	Med	0.15	Low	0.08	Low	0.41	Med
541 MSAD 41	0.67	High	0.56	Med	0.54	Med	0.15	Low	0.45	Med
542 MSAD 42	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med
543 MSAD 43	0.78	High	0.67	High	0.85	High	0.46	Med	0.86	High
544 MSAD 44	0.78	High	0.56	Med	0.77	High	0.38	Med	0.86	High
545 MSAD 45	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med
547 MSAD 47	0.67	High	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.08	Low	0.52	Med
548 MSAD 48	0.89	High	0.44	Med	0.31	Low	0.23	Low	0.83	High
549 MSAD 49	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.45	Med
550 MSAD 50	0.67	High	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.23	Low	0.34	Med
551 MSAD 51	0.56	Med	0.33	Med	0.08	Low	0.08	Low	0.41	Med
552 MSAD 52	0.78	High	0.33	Med	0.31	Low	0.31	Low	0.59	Med
553 MSAD 53	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med
554 MSAD 54	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.34	Med
555 MSAD 55	0.67	High	0.56	Med	0.15	Low	0.08	Low	0.41	Med
556 MSAD 56	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.38	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med
557 MSAD 57	0.89	High	0.78	High	0.23	Low	0.15	Low	0.69	High
558 MSAD 58	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med
559 MSAD 59	0.56	Med	0.33	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.48	Med
560 MSAD 60	0.44	Med	0.33	Med	0.62	Med	0.23	Low	0.72	High
561 MSAD 61	0.67	High	0.44	Med	0.08	Low	0.08	Low	0.34	Med
562 MSAD 62	0.67	High	0.44	Med	0.38	Med	0.15	Low	0.48	Med
564 MSAD 64	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med
567 MSAD 67	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.62	Med	0.31	Low	0.45	Med
568 MSAD 68	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.38	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med
570 MSAD 70	0.33	Med	0.22	Low	0.08	Low	0.08	Low	0.38	Med
571 MSAD 71	0.78	High	0.44	Med	0.31	Low	0.15	Low	0.55	Med
572 MSAD 72	0.56	Med	0.33	Med	0.69	High	0.38	Med	0.52	Med
574 MSAD 74	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med
575 MSAD 75	0.44	Med	0.33	Med	0.31	Low	0.00	Low	0.72	High
576 MSAD 76	0.44	Med	0.22	Low	0.54	Med	0.08	Low	0.86	High
791 Indian Island	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med
903 Boothbay-Boothbay Hbr CSD	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.54	Med	0.23	Low	0.66	Med
907 Mount Desert CSD	0.44	Med	0.22	Low	0.54	Med	0.08	Low	0.86	High
909 Southern Aroostook CSD	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med
910 Maranacook	0.67	High	0.44	Med	0.62	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med
913 Deer Isle	0.67	High	0.44	Med	0.08	Low	0.08	Low	0.45	Med
914 Great Salt Bay	0.44	Med	0.33	Med	0.08	Low	0.08	Low	0.38	Med
917 Moosabec CSD	0.78	High	0.67	High	0.69	High	0.31	Low	0.66	Med
919 Five Town CSD	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med
961 Maine School of Science and Math	0.56	Med	0.44	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med
972 Gov. Baxter School	0.56	Med	0.33	Med	0.46	Med	0.15	Low	0.41	Med

SAU		Physical Activity				Communication and Promotion				Evaluation				Total			
		Comprehensiveness		Strength Score		Comprehensiveness		Strength Score		Comprehensiveness		Strength Score		Comprehensiveness		Strength Score	
		Score	Med	Score	Low	Score	Med	Score	Med	Score	Med	Score	High	Score	Med	Score	Med
534	MSAD 34	0.40	Med	0.30	Low	0.33	Med	0.33	Med	0.67	High	0.33	Med	0.54	Med	0.33	Med
535	MSAD 35	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.43	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
537	MSAD 37	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
538	MSAD 38	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
539	MSAD 39	0.60	Med	0.20	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.50	Med	0.30	Low
540	MSAD 40	0.20	Low	0.20	Low	0.25	Low	0.17	Low	0.83	High	0.33	Med	0.35	Med	0.26	Low
541	MSAD 41	0.80	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.60	Med	0.38	Med
542	MSAD 42	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
543	MSAD 43	0.80	High	0.30	Low	0.58	Med	0.50	Med	0.50	Med	0.33	Med	0.74	High	0.51	Med
544	MSAD 44	0.70	High	0.40	Med	0.83	High	0.58	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.76	High	0.46	Med
545	MSAD 45	0.90	High	0.50	Med	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.58	Med	0.45	Med
547	MSAD 47	0.40	Med	0.30	Low	0.58	Med	0.25	Low	0.67	High	0.50	Med	0.60	Med	0.32	Low
548	MSAD 48	0.40	Med	0.20	Low	0.50	Med	0.33	Med	0.67	High	0.67	High	0.60	Med	0.43	Med
549	MSAD 49	0.60	Med	0.30	Low	0.75	High	0.33	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.54	Med	0.30	Low
550	MSAD 50	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.50	Med	0.50	Med	0.50	Med	0.31	Low
551	MSAD 51	0.40	Med	0.20	Low	0.50	Med	0.33	Med	0.50	Med	0.50	Med	0.39	Med	0.27	Low
552	MSAD 52	0.50	Med	0.20	Low	0.58	Med	0.42	Med	0.33	Med	0.33	Med	0.53	Med	0.35	Med
553	MSAD 53	0.60	Med	0.20	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.55	Med	0.32	Low
554	MSAD 54	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.33	Med	0.83	High	0.33	Med	0.55	Med	0.31	Low
555	MSAD 55	0.60	Med	0.30	Low	0.50	Med	0.33	Med	0.50	Med	0.50	Med	0.41	Med	0.29	Low
556	MSAD 56	0.60	Med	0.10	Low	0.67	High	0.33	Med	0.67	High	0.50	Med	0.51	Med	0.29	Low
557	MSAD 57	0.80	High	0.30	Low	0.75	High	0.58	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.69	High	0.50	Med
558	MSAD 58	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
559	MSAD 59	0.70	High	0.10	Low	1.00	High	0.58	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.61	Med	0.34	Med
560	MSAD 60	0.70	High	0.40	Med	0.42	Med	0.42	Med	0.67	High	0.33	Med	0.58	Med	0.40	Med
561	MSAD 61	0.20	Low	0.20	Low	0.25	Low	0.25	Low	0.50	Med	0.33	Med	0.32	Low	0.27	Low
562	MSAD 62	0.70	High	0.40	Med	0.67	High	0.33	Med	0.83	High	0.33	Med	0.57	Med	0.31	Low
564	MSAD 64	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.92	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.57	Med	0.33	Med
567	MSAD 67	0.80	High	0.40	Med	0.92	High	0.50	Med	0.83	High	0.67	High	0.61	Med	0.40	Med
568	MSAD 68	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.55	Med	0.33	Med
570	MSAD 70	0.40	Med	0.30	Low	0.50	Med	0.25	Low	0.67	High	0.50	Med	0.34	Med	0.26	Low
571	MSAD 71	0.60	Med	0.40	Med	0.42	Med	0.25	Low	0.67	High	0.50	Med	0.53	Med	0.34	Med
572	MSAD 72	0.50	Med	0.20	Low	0.58	Med	0.33	Med	0.83	High	0.67	High	0.59	Med	0.35	Med
574	MSAD 74	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
575	MSAD 75	0.70	High	0.40	Med	0.75	High	0.58	Med	0.50	Med	0.50	Med	0.55	Med	0.32	Low
576	MSAD 76	0.50	Med	0.10	Low	0.50	Med	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.17	Low	0.58	Med	0.34	Med
791	Indian Island	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
903	Boothbay-Boothbay Hbr CSD	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.33	Med	0.17	Low	0.00	Low	0.00	Low	0.55	Med	0.38	Med
907	Mount Desert CSD	0.50	Med	0.10	Low	0.50	Med	0.42	Med	0.67	High	0.17	Low	0.58	Med	0.34	Med
909	Southern Arrostook CSD	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
910	Maranacook	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.59	Med	0.35	Med
913	Deer Isle	0.30	Low	0.10	Low	0.25	Low	0.17	Low	0.67	High	0.33	Med	0.39	Med	0.25	Low
914	Great Salt Bay	0.00	Low	0.00	Low	0.17	Low	0.08	Low	0.50	Med	0.33	Med	0.26	Low	0.20	Low
917	Mooseabec CSD	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.92	High	0.50	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.71	High	0.46	Med
919	Five Town CSD	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.34	Med
961	Maine School of Science and Math	0.70	High	0.30	Low	0.83	High	0.42	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.56	Med	0.33	Med
972	Gov. Baxter School	0.60	Med	0.30	Low	0.67	High	0.33	Med	0.83	High	0.50	Med	0.52	Med	0.30	Low