The Physical Educator Vol. 75 • pp. 282–301 • 2018
https://doi.org/10.18666/TPE-2018-V75-I2-7988

PHYSICAL ACTIVITY

The Status of Physical Activity Opportunities in Idaho Schools

Catherine P. Berei, Grace Goc Karp, Katie Kauffman

Abstract

Recent literature indicates that low percentages of Idaho adolescents report being physically active on a daily basis. Research examines school PA, however, little focuses on Comprehensive School Physical Activity Programs (CSPAPs) from the perspectives of physical educators. This study explored Idaho physical educators' perceptions and implementation of CSPAPs. Physical educators (n = 268) were invited to complete an online survey; 108 surveys were completed (40% response rate). Close-ended responses were analyzed with descriptive statistics, and open-ended responses were analyzed into coherent categories. Teachers reported that they provided quality physical education, PA opportunities before and after school, opportunities during school, and family and community events and that they have staff involved in PA. Teachers provided PA opportunities for all levels of ability and to promote overall wellness. A majority of respondents indicated specific challenges to implementing a CSPAP at their schools: time allotted in job descriptions, outside commitments, compensation, resources, facilities, and equipment. Few teachers reported having CSPAP professional development, but many expressed interest in the opportunity. Most teachers felt supported by stakeholders and felt CSPAP is important, but few implemented all CSPAP components due to perceptions of challenges. Research should examine professional

Catherine P. Berei is an assistant professor, Physical Education Teacher Education, Exercise Science Department, Southern Connecticut State University. Grace Goc Karp is a professor, Physical Education Teacher Education, Department of Movement Sciences, University of Idaho. Katie Kauffman is a health and physical education teacher, Robert Stuart Middle School, Twin Falls School District. Please send author correspondence to bereic1@southernct.edu

development opportunities and strategies that can increase Idaho PA opportunities.

A Comprehensive School Physical Activity Program (CSPAP) is a multicomponent approach by which school districts and schools use all opportunities for students to be physically active, meet the nationally recommended 60 min/day of moderate to vigorous physical activity (MVPA), and develop the knowledge, skills, and confidence to be physically active for a lifetime (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], n.d.-a, 2013). According to data obtained from a national survey completed by a representative sample of the U.S. population, only about 25% of children aged 6 to 15 years met the 60 min/day recommendation (Troiano et al., 2008). Similarly, in Idaho only 29.6% of adolescents reported being physically active for a total of at least 60 min/day on each of the 7 days prior to completing a self-report survey, and only 21.4% of Idaho adolescents attended daily physical education (PE) classes in an average week (CDC, 2016). In attempts to increase adolescent physical activity (PA), the CSPAP national framework (CDC, n.d.-b) promotes PA opportunities for adolescents through school settings in a variety of ways including quality PE classes and before, during, and after school programs that incorporate PA. It also encourages school staff, communities, and families to be involved in PA opportunities in a variety of ways (CDC, n.d.-a, 2013).

Quality PE (QPE) is at the heart of CSPAPs (CDC, 2013; Rink, Hall, & Williams, 2010), and the purpose of QPE is to "provide the opportunity for students to learn knowledge and skills needed to establish and maintain physically active lifestyles throughout childhood and adolescence and into adulthood" (CDC, 2013, p. 12). PE classes play an integral part in adolescent PA participation levels (Le Masurier & Corbin, 2006). Idaho mandates PE in Grades 1 to 8, but not at the high school level. QPE is important, but it alone may not be able to help adolescents achieve the 60 min/day MVPA recommendation, because there is no specified amount of QPE time per week in Grades 1 to 8 specified in the Idaho standards (Society of Health and Physical Educators [SHAPE America], 2016). In addition, PE is provided as an elective at the high school level, but students are not required to take it (SHAPE America, 2016). According SHAPE America (2016), daily recess or classroom PA breaks are not required

in Idaho elementary schools, nor is there any PA time requirement at any of the school levels. Thus, providing opportunities for PA before, during, and after school in Idaho becomes essential for adolescents to achieve national PA recommendations. SHAPE America (2016) recommends that "physical education teachers should coordinate the physical activity initiatives that are integrated throughout the school day" (p. 15) in attempts to help adolescents achieve 60 min/day of PA. If physical educators are being called upon to lead PA initiatives and efforts as leaders in the fields of health and PE, it only makes sense that they are aware of and understand the ins and outs of CSPAPs and the implementation process.

In recent years, a growing body of literature examining the facilitators and barriers to incorporating PA in a variety of ways in school settings has emerged. Centeio, Erwin, and Castelli (2014) indicated that successful CSPAP implementation hinges on (a) action plan, (b) supportive administration, and (c) passion and dedication for the health of students. Many teachers are afraid to try classroom-based PA, perceiving a loss of control, which they equate to chaos. McMullen, Kulinna, and Cothran (2014) found that in regard to choosing PA to include in their classroom, teachers considered degree of chaos, space constraints, time to get back on task, connection to academic content, ease of implementation, and enjoyment. Teachers indicated a lack of time, for planning and for implementation, to incorporate PA throughout the school day as a challenge (Lasky, Moore, & Sutherland, 2001; Patton, 2012).

To promote health and PA, the socioecological model (McLeroy, Bibeau, Steckler, & Glanz, 1988) describes how patterned behavior can be determined by five levels of individual and environmental factors including intrapersonal factors, interpersonal processes and primary groups, institutional factors, community factors, and public policy. At the intrapersonal, or individual, level, behavior is influenced by individual factors such as the beliefs, attitudes, knowledge, self-concept, and skills of the individual. At the second level, interpersonal process and primary groups, behavior is influenced by social factors such as family and networks of work and friend groups. Institutional factors with operating rules and regulations, at the third level, have the potential to influence behaviors. Community factors are described as "the relationships among organizations,

institutions, and informal networks" (McLeroy et al., 1988, p. 355) and influence behavior at the fourth level. At the fifth level, public policy at local, state, and national levels has the potential to influence behavior (McLeroy et al., 1988). The purpose of this model is to "focus attention on the environmental causes of behavior and to identify environmental interventions" (McLeroy et al., 1988, p. 366); in this case, the behavior refers to physical educators' implementation of PA opportunities specifically using the CSPAP model and their attempt to identify individual and environmental factors that influence this behavior.

Although several reports examine national and state school PA and PE (i.e., 2016 *Shape of the Nation* report, 2014 *State Indicator Report on Physcial Activity*, *2008 Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans*, the National Physical Activity Plan, and *Guidelines for School and Community Programs to Promote Lifelong Physical Activity Among Young People*), few of the reports focus on the implementation of CSPAPs from the perspectives of physical educators in Idaho; therefore, the purpose of this study was to gain an understanding of Idaho physical educators' perceptions, understanding, and implementation of CSPAPs within their schools. Specific research questions included the following: (a) What are the types of PA opportunities, as guided by the CSPAP model, provided by pre-K–12 Idaho PE teachers? (b) What role do physical educators take in providing CSPAP? Why, and what support do they get? (c) What is the knowledge of the Comprehensive School Physical Activity Program (CSPAP)? (d) What are physical educators' perceptions of barriers for CSPAP implementation?

Method

Participants

Participant e-mail contact information was obtained from the Society of Health and Physical Educators Idaho (SHAPE Idaho) database, and all participants were PE and/or health teachers. Participant criteria included teaching PE in a pre-K–12 setting; therefore, any individual who did not meet this criterion was removed from the list and not contacted to participate in this study. The university's institutional review board approved the study, and consent was obtained from each participant before they participated in the study.

Data Collection

The main source of data included an electronic survey through the Qualtrics survey program. Participants were contacted via e-mail obtained from the state organization SHAPE Idaho, and the e-mail contained a link to the CSPAP survey. Two hundred sixty-eight physical educators in Idaho were contacted to complete the survey, and 110 surveys were opened. Two of the participants did not agree to participate in the study, and 108 participants agreed and completed the survey (40% response rate). A second e-mail requesting participants complete the survey was sent 10 days after the initial e-mail, and one last e-mail reminder requesting completion of the survey was sent 4 weeks following the initial e-mail. No identifying information was associated with the data obtained during collection unless the participant willingly included identifying information within the survey.

The CSPAP survey was self-designed and was intended to assess physical educators' perceptions, understanding, and implementation of a CSPAP within their school setting. An initial draft of the survey was created and included 28 questions that were multiple-choice, short answer, or Likert scale responses. Next, the researchers piloted the draft survey with six PE teachers, representative of each school level, to identify content and face validity agreement in relation to ease and appropriateness of questions and subsequent responses. Through this process, a suggestion from the teachers resulted in one change being made to the draft survey; this change included adding a multiple-choice option relating to no knowledge/never heard of the CSPAP model to the question about understanding of the CSPAP model. The final survey included 28 questions that were multiple-choice, short answer, or Likert scale responses. Eighteen multiple-choice questions examined physical educators' understanding of the CSPAP model, CSPAP components implemented in school settings, PA resources utilized within the school setting, shared facility agreements for PA, PE and PA professional development, professional development directly related to CSPAPs, and the extent to which physical educators felt they provided MVPA 50% of the PE class time. Five Likert scale questions captured the opinions of the physical educators related to the degree of support they felt from various stakeholders to enhance PA opportunities in their

school, the extent to which they felt implementing various CSPAP components was a part of their job description, the type of role they felt they played in providing PA opportunities within each CSPAP component, the extent to which they felt various challenges when implementing PA outside of PE classes, and the amount of CSPAP participation by various populations within their school settings. With QPE as the foundation of CSPAPs (CDC, 2013; Rink et al., 2010) and physical educators being asked to lead CSPAP efforts (SHAPE America, 2016), it is essential to understand the perceptions of physical educators regarding their role as physical educators and CSPAP leaders. In addition, it is well-documented that support for a facilitator of CSPAPs in school settings is critical (Berei, 2015; Centeio, Erwin, & Castelli, 2014; Doolittle & Rukavina, 2014); therefore, examining the perception of support that physical educators receive within their school settings is important. Four of the survey questions asked for open-ended responses related to why physical educators provide PA opportunities or training to others outside of PE; minutes of PE provided for students per week; additional thoughts, comments, or concerns related to CSPAP; and the college/university from which participants obtained their teaching certification (demographic question). Last, questions about participant demographics such as age, gender, teaching experience, level and recentness of education, level of PE taught (i.e., K–5, 6–8, 9–12), PE department size, and status of state and national organization membership were included.

Data Analysis

The CSPAP survey included questions that were quantitative and qualitative in nature. All survey data was downloaded from Qualtrics to a word document so that it could be easily analyzed.

CSPAP survey questions that were qualitative (open-ended, short answer) were organized into coherent categories and analyzed. Trustworthiness of the data was established through (a) triangulation using multiple investigators (two) and (b) a peer debriefer. The peer debriefer checked the work of other researchers throughout the data analysis process and reviewed the raw data and findings for data credibility (Merriam, 2009).

Results

The purpose of this study was to gain an understanding of Idaho physical educators' perceptions, understanding, and implementation of CSPAPs within their schools. Participant ages ranged from 26 to 30 (9%), 31 to 35 (20%), 36 to 40 (15%), 41 to 45 (16%), 46 to 50 (10%), 51 to 55 (16%), and 56 to 60 (14%). Males accounted for 38% and females accounted for 62% of the survey respondents. Participants taught at a variety of levels: 33% elementary, 31% middle school, 18% high school, 10% K–12, 2% preschool, and 4% a combination of levels. Years of teaching experience also varied; 7% taught 1 to 2 years, 10% taught 3 to 6 years, 18% taught 7 to 9 years, 10% taught 10 to 12 years, 10% taught 13 to 15 years, 7% taught 16 to 18 years, and 37% taught 19 or more years. PE department sizes revealed 92% of the schools had four or less teachers, 5% had five to six teachers, and 2% had 10 teachers. The majority (70%) of the participants received their teaching degree at an institution within the state of Idaho. Level of education included 59% with a bachelor's degree and 41% with a master's degree. Last, 59% of the teachers are members of the state organization SHAPE Idaho, and 30% are members of the national organization SHAPE America.

CSPAP survey results indicated physical educators' perceptions, understanding, and implementation of CSPAPs within school settings in the state of Idaho. Survey results were grouped into several overall categories including CSPAP familiarity and interest, CSPAP opportunities provided, physical educator perceptions of their role and support for PA programs, and barriers to CSPAP implementation.

CSPAP Familiarity and Interest

Although the original CSPAP model was introduced in 2008 (National Association for Sport and Physical Education, 2008) and is currently promoted as a national framework (CDC, n.d.-b), respondents felt they were very familiar with CSPAPs and implemented all parts of the model systematically (3%); were familiar with the CSPAP model and implemented some components (16%); had heard of CSPAP, but were unfamiliar with what the model looked like or the components within the model (48%); had heard of CSPAP, but felt as though they did not implement any of the five components (4%); or had never heard of the CSPAP model (27%).

Although PE and/or PA professional development was provided for 63% of the physical educators, only 10% had received professional development or training directly related to leading or implementing CSPAPs. Despite limited access to knowledge about CSPAPs, 72% were interested in an online professional development course related to CSPAPs.

CSPAP Opportunities Provided

In general, the survey participants expressed that PA opportunities in all five CSPAP components were implemented within their school settings. Ninety-five percent of physical educators felt they provided QPE most to all of the time, as indicated by providing MVPA 50% or more of the class time. Time (minutes per week) of PE in pre-K–12 settings varied greatly from 20 to 310 min. Some (29%) physical educators reported 41 to 60 min/week of QPE, and others reported 81 to 100 min (12%), 181 to 200 min (8%), 221 to 240 min (14%), and 241 to 260 min (8%). PA opportunities before and/or after school were provided for children and adolescents by 33% of schools, as reported by physical educators. Thirty-eight percent identified that multiple opportunities for PA were provided during the school day (organized recess, PA breaks in classrooms). The most commonly used PA resources included Fuel Up to Play 60, Five for Life, Fitness for Life, and SPARK. Physical educators reported using shared facility agreements for general PA use with sports programs (95%), community entities (65%), and nonprofit organizations (49%). The least implemented components were staff involvement in PA (e.g., trained to integrate activity in the classroom, support recess PA, staff wellness; 26%) and family and community PA events and other physical activities connected to the school (27%).

Overall, physical educators provided a variety of reasons for why they were implementing CSPAP activities. First, teachers wanted to enhance PA, skill, and fitness. One participant wrote, "I have implemented family fitness nights at each of the schools I teach at. This is a great opportunity for students to come in and practice what we work on every single day in PE class." Another reason was to increase community health and wellness knowledge. This was explained through open-ended responses such as "to help students stay healthy" and

> I believe that creating a healthier community of adults will result in setting up success for my young students and create a better economy and healthier place to live. The connections between movement and sound nutrition to better physical, mental, and spiritual health are undeniable. If not I, then who will educate my neighbors?

Next, participants wanted to utilize PA for the physical and social opportunities it provides for the faculty and staff within their school environment. One participant explained, "I enjoy helping the staff get to know one another on another level while getting an intense workout." Additional reasons for providing PA opportunities included a desire to involve parents and enjoyment in working with students; one participant wrote, "To increase student and parent activity for wellness."

Physical Educator Perceptions of Their Role and Support for CSPAPs

One component of this study was to gain an understanding of CSPAP implementation related to the role physical educators felt they took in providing PA opportunities using the CSPAP model and what support they felt they received from various stakeholders.

Perceptions of CSPAP leader roles. Respondents viewed their role to provide QPE (MVPA 50% of class time; $M = 4.87$) as important to very important. PA programs before and after school ($M = 3.68$) were viewed as moderately important to important. This idea was supported by one participant's response: "[After school PA opportunities give] the students an activity to participate in, plus be active. It prevents many students from going home and sitting around or causing trouble." Respondents felt it was moderately important to train staff to provide organized recess ($M = 3.04$), train classroom teachers to integrate PA into the classroom ($M = 3.66$), implement wellness activities for staff ($M = 3.84$), and provide family and community PA events and activities that are connected to the school ($M = 3.71$; see Table 1). In support of the CSPAP component of family and community PA events and activities, one participant described how these events provide an "opportunity for [students'] parents to get involved in the process of developing a physically active lifestyle for themselves and their child." In an open-ended response, one participant

described, "It is an expectation that I coach"; therefore, providing PA opportunities before and after school may already be a component of the physical educator role.

Despite what survey respondents felt regarding the importance of providing various PA opportunities, there was a mix of actual self-reported involvement (either supporting others in implementing or implementing themselves) in implementing various CSPAP components (see Table 2). The majority (88%) of physical educators reported they implement QPE themselves and 8% reported they support others in implementing QPE. Respondents reported implementing the following PA opportunities themselves: before and after school programs (33%), multiple opportunities for PA during school (19%), staff involvement in PA (14%), and family and community PA events and activities connected to the school (20%).

Support for CSPAPs. In school settings, support to implement or enhance PA opportunities can come from a variety of stakeholders including other PE teachers within a PE department, building administration, students, school district administration, classroom teachers within the school, parents, and community stakeholders. In terms of the degree of support from each of these stakeholders, physical educators in Idaho (see Table 3) felt often supported by other PE teachers in their department ($M = 4.21$), building administration ($M = 3.99$), and students ($M = 3.90$). Physical educators felt sometimes supported by school district administration ($M = 3.38$), classroom teachers within the school ($M = 3.32$), parents ($M = 3.43$), and community stakeholders ($M = 3.06$).

Barriers to CSPAP Implementation

Physical educators reported on the extent (never, occasionally, fairly often, very often, or always) to which they experienced various barriers to implementing PA programs outside of PE within their school settings. The time allotted in job descriptions for CSPAP implementation was fairly often, very often, or always challenging (81%), and outside commitments were fairly often or always challenging (80%) for the respondents. Physical educators reported equipment (56%), facilities (59%), and resources (65%) were fairly often, very often, or always a challenge when attempting to implement PA opportunities, and compensation was perceived to be fairly often, very often, or always a challenge for 75% of the participants.

Table 1
Percentages of Idaho SHAPE Members Who Perceive Specific CSPAP Components Should Be Included in Their Job Descriptions

CSPAP component	Not important % (*n*)	Of little importance % (*n*)	Moderately important % (*n*)	Important % (*n*)	Very important % (*n*)	*M*
Quality physical education (MVPA 50% of class time) (*n* = 91)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	13 (12)	87 (79)	4.87
PA programs before and after school (*n* = 91)	5 (5)	9 (8)	26 (24)	31 (28)	29 (26)	3.68
Training staff to provide organized recess (*n* = 90)	17 (15)	23 (21)	20 (18)	19 (17)	21 (19)	3.04
Training classroom teachers to integrate PA into the classroom (*n* = 91)	4 (4)	10 (9)	29 (26)	30 (27)	28 (25)	3.66
Implement wellness activities for staff (*n* = 91)	4 (4)	4 (4)	28 (25)	31 (28)	33 (30)	3.84
Family and community PA events and activities connected to the school (*n* = 91)	3 (3)	10 (9)	30 (27)	26 (24)	31 (28)	3.71

Note. MVPA = moderate to vigorous physical activity; PA = physical activity.

Table 2
Percentages of Idaho SHAPE Members Who Perceive They Should Implement Specific CSPAP Components in Their Physical Education Programs (n = 91)

CSPAP component	I am not involved % (*n*)	I support others in implementing % (*n*)	I implement myself % (*n*)
Quality physical education (MVPA 50% of class time)	4 (4)	8 (7)	88 (80)
PA programs before and after school	30 (27)	37 (34)	33 (30)
Multiple opportunities for PA during school (organized recess, PA breaks in classroom)	35 (32)	46 (42)	19 (17)
Staff involvement in PA (trained to integrate PA in classroom, support recess PA, staff wellness)	39 (35)	47 (43)	14 (13)
Family and community PA events and activities connected to the school	40 (36)	41 (37)	20 (18)

Note. MVPA = moderate to vigorous physical activity; PA = physical activity.

Table 3
Percentages of Idaho SHAPE Members Who Perceive Support From Various Stakeholders to Enhance Physical Activity Opportunities in Their Schools

Stakeholders	Not supported % (*n*)	Rarely supported % (*n*)	Sometimes supported % (*n*)	Often supported % (*n*)	Fully supported % (*n*)	*M*
Other physical education teachers in the department (*n* = 86)	2 (2)	6 (5)	13 (11)	27 (23)	52 (45)	4.21
Building administration (*n* = 91)	2 (2)	7 (6)	22 (20)	28 (26)	41 (37)	3.99
Students (*n* = 90)	1 (1)	5 (5)	21 (19)	47 (42)	26 (23)	3.90
School district administration (*n* = 91)	8 (7)	11 (10)	35 (32)	27 (25)	19 (17)	3.38
Classroom teachers within the school (*n* = 91)	3 (3)	14 (13)	42 (38)	29 (26)	12 (11)	3.32
Parents (*n* = 90)	1 (1)	16 (14)	32 (29)	41 (37)	10 (9)	3.43
Community stakeholders (*n* = 88)	6 (5)	22 (19)	43 (38)	20 (18)	9 (8)	3.06

Last, support from classroom teachers and school administration were fairly, very, or always challenging for 44% and 37% of the physical educators, respectively.

Discussion

Although most survey respondents viewed some sort of involvement with CSPAP components as an important part of their role as a physical educator in a school setting, only one quarter to one third implemented CSPAP components outside of the QPE component. In addition, some felt that implementing CSPAP components other than QPE was not a part of their job in school and community settings. For the prevalence of CSPAPs and the number of Idaho adolescents who meet the recommended 60 min/day of MVPA (CDC, n.d.-a, 2013) to increase, the importance of PA opportunities outside of QPE will need to be established and physical educators will need help to utilize strategies to overcome the challenges they experience. Insufficient equipment and resources were challenges for just over half of physical educators in Idaho. Similar to the shared use agreements already utilized by some physical educators in Idaho, equipment and resources could be shared, which would help them overcome this challenge. Physical educators should take advantage of grant and funding opportunities that could provide funding to expand access to PA equipment and resources in gymnasiums and classrooms.

It is promising that some physical educators in Idaho felt some sort of positive support from various stakeholders including other physical educators, building and school district administration, and students within their school and community settings. This support (Berei, 2015; Centeio, Erwin, & Castelli, 2014; Doolittle & Rukavina, 2014) has the potential to lay the groundwork and ultimately lead to effective and successful CSPAP implementation. Survey participants expressed that they felt little to some support from classroom teachers, a barrier to implementing PA during the school day (organized recess, PA breaks in classroom, integrating PA into lessons). For Idaho adolescents to achieve daily PA recommendations, effective CSPAPs will require classroom teacher buy-in. Emerging literature (Berei, 2015; Carson, Pulling, Wolak, Castelli, & Beighle, 2014; Castelli, Carson, & Kulinna, 2014; Centeio, Erwin, & Castelli, 2014; Doolittle & Rukavina, 2014; Jones et al., 2014; Kulinna, Brusseau, Cothran,

& Tudor-Locke, 2012; Lasky et al., 2001; McMullen, Kulinna, & Cothran, 2014) supports the need to develop these collaborations to implement effective CSPAPs, as physical educators themselves cannot implement CSPAPs alone. Physical educators indicated time was a barrier when attempting to implement all CSPAP components by themselves; this was evident from the responses in that the majority of the survey participants expressed "time alloted within their job description" as a challenge to CSPAP involvement. Nearly half of physical educators support others in providing multiple opportunities for PA during school, staff involvement in PA, and family and community PA events and activities connected to the school, thus highlighting their positive perception of the need for collaboration (Berei, 2015; Carson et al., 2014; Castelli et al., 2014; Centeio, Erwin, & Castelli 2014; Doolittle & Rukavina, 2014; Jones et al., 2014; Kulinna et al., 2012; Lasky et al., 2001; McMullen et al., 2014) for effective CSPAP implementation.

The socioecological model (McLeroy et al., 1988) can be utilized in an examination of CSPAP perceptions and implementation behaviors of some physical educators in Idaho. At the lowest level, intrapersonal, there was little knowledge related to the CSPAP model, indicating a need for dissemination of CSPAP knowledge to increase awareness and understanding of the model. Overall, this may have limited the ability of the respondents to use the CSPAP model to implement PA opportunities. Next, support and collaboration are essential for effective CSPAP implementation and are factors at the interpersonal level. These factors both helped and hindered CSPAP implementation in that when support and collaboration were present, they enhanced CSPAP implementation, yet, when absent, were viewed by survey respondents as barriers to CSPAP implementation. For these physical educators, institutional factors played a role in the implementation of CSPAPs in that they found time allotted within their job descriptions as a barrier. In a school setting, these institutional factors may be affected by the rules and regulations within the school, and assistance for physical educators to overcome this barrier could include time during the school day to implement PA opportunities outside of structured PE classes, more time during the school day for recess and other PA opportunities, or time to educate and train other school staff to implement PA oppor-

tunities. According to the survey participants, community factors and relationships with organizations outside of the school enhanced PA opportunities through shared facility agreements that provided a place for students, staff, families, and community members to be physically active. Discussion and information around the outer level, public policy, by survey respondents was not directly addressed in the survey, nor did it appear in any of the open-ended answers. This is not surprising, because results at the underlying levels, such as the lack of CSPAP knowledge at the intrapersonal level, indicate it would not be appropriate to expect the discussion of information related to PA policy; without knowledge of CSPAP model, it can be assumed there would be no discussion of public policy around the CSPAP model or PA policy in school settings.

This particular research is a first step to learning more about CSPAP knowledge and implementation in Idaho. Although there was a satisfactory response rate to the electronic survey, this study has several limitations. More data need to be collected for researchers to gain a better understanding of what types of PA opportunities Idaho physical educators are providing to help children reach the recommended 60 min/day of PA. A more in-depth survey and interviews with physical educators could help researchers to better explore the complex school environments in which physical educators are providing PA opportunities, as well as identify what can help teachers implement CSPAP components effectively and successfully. Because only 59% of survey respondents reported membership within the SHAPE Idaho organization, researchers should use alternate and additional information databases to gather contact information and reach a more broad population of physical educators across the state. It will also be important for researchers to reach the physical educators who are not involved in state professional organizations, to learn not only their current knowledge and understanding of CSPAPs, but also how to help design and implement professional development opportunities that are effective for them in their school and community environments.

In conclusion, providing opportunities for CSPAP professional development is desired and warranted. Professional development about the CSPAP model itself, as well as implementation for physical educators, classroom teachers, and administrators is lacking in

Idaho; however, the level of interest in online professional development courses related to CSPAP is a positive indication for Idaho. Positive receptivity toward the notion that it is important that physical educators fulfill PA leadership roles in school settings is critical to CSPAP implementation (Berei, 2015; Bulger & Housner, 2009; Carson, 2012; Centeio, Castelli, Carson, & Beighle, 2014; Deslatte & Carson, 2014; SHAPE America, 2016). Now that CSPAPs are being promoted as the national framework for PA and PE in school settings (CDC, n.d.-b), it will be essential that this information is included in learning opportunities for physical educators. Although the majority of the survey respondents were interested in learning more about CSPAPs through professional development opportunities, 59% reported being a member of SHAPE Idaho and 30% reported being a member of SHAPE America. Encouraging more physical educators in Idaho to be involved in their state (SHAPE Idaho) and national (SHAPE America) organizations is one way to enhance professional development opportunities. Both organizations offer multiple opportunities to learn about CSPAPs through conferences, workshops, webinars, podcasts, mini-conferences, clinics, academic credit course offerings, and continuing education credits (SHAPE America, n.d.; SHAPE Idaho, n.d.). A second professional development opportunity could be through online university courses specifically related to designing and implementing CSPAPs. From these opportunities, hopefully communities of CSPAP learning can be developed to provide additional support. Research should examine effective professional development opportunities and strategies to address CSPAP with all stakeholders.

References

Berei, C. P. (2015). *Describing and understanding factors related to implementing comprehensive school physical activity programs by physical educators* (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from ProQuest. (3728945)

Bulger, S. M., & Housner, L. D. (2009). Relocating from easy street: Strategies for moving physical education forward. *Quest, 61,* 442–469. https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2009.10483625

Carson, R. (2012). Certification and duties of a director of physical activity. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 83*(6), 16–19, 29. https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2012.10598790

Carson, R. L., Pulling, A. C., Wolak, M., Castelli, D. M., & Beighle, A. (2014). Facilitators and inhibitors of the director of physical activity program and comprehensive school physical activity program implementation [Abstract]. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 85*(Suppl. 1), A-56. https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2014.930647

Castelli, D. M., Carson, R. L., & Kulinna, P. H. (2014). Special issue: Comprehensive school physical activity programs. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 33,* 435–439. https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2014-0193

Centeio, E. E., Castelli, D. M., Carson, R. L., & Beighle, A. (2014). Implementing CSPAP into the school setting: Professional development outcomes [Abstract]. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 85*(Suppl. 1), A-156.

Centeio, E. E., Erwin, H., & Castelli, D. M. (2014). Comprehensive school physical activity programs: Characteristics of trained teachers. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 33*, 492–510. https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2014-0066

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (n.d.-a). Comprehensive school physical activity program (CSPAP). Retrieved January 22, 2015, from https://www.cdc.gov/healthyschools/physicalactivity/cspap.htm

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (n.d.-b). *National framework for physical activity and physical education.* Retrieved January 22, 2015, from https://www.cdc.gov/healthyschools/physicalactivity/pdf/National_Framework_Physical_Activity_and_Physical_Education_Resources_Support_CSPAP_508_tagged.pdf

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2013). *Comprehensive school physical activity programs: A guide for schools*. Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/healthyschools/physicalactivity/pdf/13_242620-A_CSPAP_SchoolPhysActivityPrograms_Final_508_12192013.pdf

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2016). *Youth risk behavior surveillance survey—United States, 2015.* Retrieved from http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/data/yrbs/pdf/2015/ss6506_updated.pdf

Deslatte, K., & Carson, R. L. (2014). Identifying the common characteristics of comprehensive school physical activity programs in Louisiana. *Physical Educator, 71,* 610–634.

Doolittle, S. A., & Rukavina, P. B. (2014). Case study of an institutionalized urban comprehensive school physical activity program. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 33*, 528–557. https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2014-0073

Dwyer, J. J., Allison, K. R., Barrera, M., Hansen, B., Goldenberg, E., & Boutilier, M. A. (2003). Teachers' perspectives on barriers to implementing physical activity curriculum guidelines for school children in Toronto. *Canadian Journal of Public Health, 94*, 448–452.

Jones, E. M., Taliaferro, A. R., Elliott, E. M., Bulger, S. M., Kristjansson, A. L., Neal, W., & Allar, I. (2014). Feasibility study of Comprehensive School Physical Activity Programs in Appalachian communities: The McDowell CHOICES project. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 31,* 467–491. https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2014-0065

Kulinna, P. H., Brusseau, T., Cothran, D., & Tudor-Locke, C. (2012). Changing school physical activity: An examination of individual school designed programs. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 31,* 113–130. https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.31.2.113

Lasky, S., Moore, S., & Sutherland, S. (2001). Teachers' experience of mandated reform: Too much pressure and too little support. *Research in Ontario Secondary Schools: A Series of Brief Reports, 6*(3). Retrieved from http://legacy.oise.utoronto.ca/research/field-centres/TVC/RossReports/vol6no3.htm

Le Masurier, G., & Corbin, B. (2006). Top 10 reasons for quality physical education. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 77*(6), 44–53. https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2006.10597894

McLeroy, K. R., Bibeau, D., Steckler, A., & Glanz, K. (1988). An ecological perspective on health promotion programs. *Health Education Quarterly, 15*, 351–377. https://doi.org/10.1177/109019818801500401

McMullen, J., Kulinna, P., & Cothran, D. (2014). Physical activity opportunities during the school day: Classroom teachers' perceptions of using activity breaks in the classroom. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education, 33*, 511–527. https://doi.org/10.1123/jtpe.2014-0062

Merriam, S. B. (2009). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (2nd ed.). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

National Association for Sport and Physical Education. (2008). *Comprehensive School Physical Activity Programs* [Position statement]. Reston, VA: Amercian Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance.

Patton, I. (2012). Teachers' perspectives of the daily physical activity program in Ontario. *Physical and Health Education Journal, 78*(1), 14–21.

Rink, J., Hall, T., & Williams, L. (2010). *Schoolwide physical activity: A comprehensive guide to designing and conducting programs.* Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Society of Health and Physical Educators. (n.d.). Professional development. Retrieved from http://www.shapeamerica.org/prodev/index.cfm

Society of Health and Physical Educators. (2016). *Shape of the nation: Status of physical education in the USA*. Retrieved from http://www.shapeamerica.org/advocacy/son/2016/upload/Shape-of-the-Nation-2016_web.pdf

Society of Health and Physical Educators Idaho. (n.d.). Programs & services. Retrieved from http://shapeidaho.org/programs-services/

Troiano, R. P., Berrigan, D., Dodd, K. W., Masse, L. C., Tilert, T., & McDowell, M. (2008). Physical activity in the United States measured by accelerometer. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise, 40*, 181–188. https://doi.org/10.1249/mss.0b013e31815a51b3