STATE LAWS IMPACTING COMMUNITY USE OF SCHOOLS PROPERTY: EVALUATION APPROACHES AND IMPLICATIONS FOR RESEARCH AND POLICY IMPLEMENTATION

The legal information and assistance provided in this presentation does not constitute legal advice or legal representation.
Objectives

- Discuss two different policy research approaches evaluating state laws on community use of school property.
- Learn the strengths and weaknesses of each approach in the context of research and practice goals.
- Promote discussion of how these approaches may be used together to promote research and implementation of effective joint use agreement policy.
Speakers

- Moderator: Mary Marrow, staff attorney with the Public Health Law Center

- Carter Headrick, Director of State and Local Obesity Policy for the Voices for Healthy Kids Project of the American Heart Association

- Scott Kelly, staff attorney with the Public Health Law Center at William Mitchell College of Law

- Natasha Frost, J.D. staff attorney at the Public Health Law Center

- Frank M. Perna EdD, PhD, National Cancer Institute (NCI)

- Stefanie Winston, legislative analyst at the MayaTech Corporation
Our Changing World

64% of U.S. middle and high schools allow sodas and other sugar-laden drinks to be sold on campus.

49% allow junk food advertising at school.

51% stock vending machines with chips, cookies, cakes and other unhealthy snacks.

Only 21% of youth ages 6-19 eat the recommended five or more servings of fruits and vegetables each day.

Nearly 40% of children’s diets come from added sugars and unhealthy fats.

Consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages (SSBs) has increased 500% in the past 50 years.

SSBs are now the single largest category of caloric intake in children, surpassing milk a decade ago.
A Collaborative Response

Influencing public policy through advocacy is an essential strategy to reducing childhood obesity.
## Policy Priorities

### Smart School Foods
- Improve the nutritional quality of snack foods and beverages in schools.

### Healthy Drinks
- Increase accessibility, availability, and affordability of healthy beverages by increasing access to water in school and community environments.
- Increase costs of sugar sweetened beverages through the passage of excise taxes.

### Food Access
- Increase access to affordable foods in Corner Stores & Grocery Stores

*Population Approaches to Improve Diet, Physical Activity, and Smoking Habits. A Scientific Statement from the American Heart Association*
Policy Priorities

**Marketing Matters**
- Develop guidelines for serving more nutritious foods in restaurants.
- Improve point-of-purchase design in retail environments.
- Replace unhealthy food promotion & marketing in schools with healthy food promotion & marketing.

**Active Places**
- Pass and implement Shared Use legislation which clarifies liability laws so schools can open playgrounds and gyms to the community.
- Support policies which fund Safe Routes to School programs and ensure federal dollars are effectively used.
- Promote “Complete Streets” initiatives that integrate bike and pedestrian paths into road-planning and construction.

**Active Kids Out of School**
- Establish mandatory physical activity standards in before and after school programs.
- Increase access to playground equipment within communities.
### American Heart Association

#### Planning and Stakeholder Development
- **(Defining the Problem)**
  - Issue becomes AHA priority
  - AHA strategic planning begins
  - Stakeholders convened
  - Public policy barriers identified

#### Policy Analysis
- **(Identifying Solutions)**
  - Policy analysis is completed
  - Policy chosen by State Advisory Committee as a priority
  - Legislation is drafted

#### Legislative Campaign Implementation
- **Campaign planning begins**
- **Campaign implementation**
- **Legislation passes**

#### Regulatory Campaign Implementation
- **Regulatory advocacy planning begins**
- **Campaign implementation**
- **Regulations promulgated**

#### Policy Implementation
- **Program implementation monitored**
- **Evaluation conducted**
- **Evaluation results reported**

#### Evaluation

### Table

- **An issue is identified as an Association-wide priority where policy and systems change is needed to advance the priority.**
  - Advocacy staff convene cross-functional internal teams to develop strategic plans to address policy.
  - Stakeholders’ group of internal and external experts/partners may be convened as well for input and guidance.
- **Public policy opportunities and barriers are identified and legislative and regulatory options are explored.**
- **Policy analysis is led by state advocacy staff and could include analysis of the following:**
  - Current statutory and regulatory law.
  - Political and economic feasibility of solution.
  - Potential public policy solutions that could address the problem.
  - Policy solution chosen and identified as a state advocacy priority by State Advisory Committee.
  - Decision is made to pursue legislative or regulatory route.
  - Decision is made on outcome measures for subsequent evaluation.
- **Either through this proactive process or in reaction to legislation that is introduced, state advocacy staff take the lead developing strategic campaign plans to advance public policy.**
  - Utilizing a cross-functional team for both planning and implementation, advocacy staff work closely with internal and external partners to monitor the regulatory advocacy process.
  - Advocacy staff take the lead on lobbying tactics as well as providing expert advice and guidance.
- **If regulatory action is needed, state advocacy staff develop strategic regulatory campaign plans to advance our regulatory priorities.**
  - Once legislation and/or regulation is passed, advocacy staff monitor and influence the development of the program so that it is aligned with AHA guidelines and policies.
  - Advocacy staff take the lead on development of evaluation plan related to agreed upon outcome measures.
  - Evaluation may be completed using internal or external resources and partners.
  - Outcomes are evaluated and reported.
The School Environment

“environments that contribute to the livability, sustainability, and public health of neighborhoods and communities.”

(EPA, 2011)
Community Use

Keep Calm
And
Come to the Open Gym

YOUTH LOCKin
Don't Miss Out On The Fun
Community Neglect
Liability
Fear
Fear
Elements

- Duty of care;
- Failed in Duty; and
- That failure caused harm that could have been reasonably expected to occur
Duty of Care

- Willful
- Wanton
- Gross Negligence
- Negligence
- Strict liability
- Reasonable Person Standard
Use Agreements
Documentation
Purpose

Why?
Appropriateness
Training
Supervision
Risk Management
Duration
Evaluation
Know the Policy Landscape

- Grassroots and partner input
- Based in Science
- Develop Model Policy
- Decide on Bottom Lines
- 50 State Scan
  - Set the baseline
  - Track Progress
  - Measure Against Bottom Lines
Know the Legal Landscape

- Use of School Property by Public
- Shared Use Agreements
- Governmental Immunity
- Recreational User Statute
- Limits on Recovery
- Insurance Requirements
- Court cases
- Other statutes
Picking the search terms

Key words

- gross negligence, inherent risk
- attractive nuisance, safe premises
- school, public access
- Playground, recreation, sport
- joint use, shared use, joint power
- joint use, shared use, joint power
Going beyond key words

Education Code

NPLAN 50 state review
Memo components

- Use of School Property for Public Purposes Statute
- Recreational Use Statute
- Sovereign/governmental immunity
- Other Cases relating to Recreation
- Other issues affecting liability and recreation
- Other issues affecting liability protections in other contexts
- Jury Verdicts and Settlements
Baseline: Schools are protected from liability up to the level of gross negligence when allowing community recreational use of indoor and outdoor school property during non-school hours.
North Carolina

Strong protection: sovereign immunity
North Carolina

Notwithstanding the provisions of G.S. 115C-263 and 115C-264, local boards of education may adopt rules and regulations under which they may enter into agreements permitting non-school groups to use school real and personal property, except for school buses, for other than school purposes so long as such use is consistent with the proper preservation and care of the public school property. No liability shall attach to any board of education, individually or collectively, for personal injury suffered by reason of the use of such school property pursuant to such agreements. N.C. Gen. Stat. Ann. § 115C-524 (West)
North Carolina

Attendee at middle school basketball game brought action against county school board, seeking to recover damages for injuries allegedly sustained in fall on bleachers. The Court of Appeals, held that: 1 school board's entering into a general trust fund agreement did not waive governmental immunity; 2 school board's operating basketball game and charging admission did not constitute a proprietary function as would waive governmental immunity; 3 statute requiring school board to keep school buildings in good repair and proper condition did not create private cause of action for individuals. Willett v. Chatham County Bd. of Educ., 176 N.C. App. 268, 625 S.E.2d 900 (2006)
Arizona

- Recreational Use Statute
- Governmental Immunity
- A.R.S. § 15-1105 Lease of school property; civic center school fund; reversion to school plant fund; definitions
ELIMINATING BARRIERS FOR COMMUNITY RECREATIONAL USE OF SCHOOL PROPERTY: POLICY GUIDANCE ON LIABILITY AND SHARED USE

What happens when a state is not in the baseline?
Policy Guidance on Community Use

- Findings of Fact
- Statement of Purpose
- Definitions
- Liability Provisions
- Other innovative components
Success story: Mississippi

- Specifically authorizes school district-level shared use policy
- Limits liability
- Encourages shared use agreements
- Authorizes government funds for shared use agreements
- Requires state-level shared use toolkit
- Requires Department of Education website
- Requires school districts to address community use
Lessons learned

- Importance of TA
- Need state-specific resources
- Unintended consequences
- Open access versus agreements
- Terminology
- Multilevel approach
- Need for resources
State-specific resource development

- Wisconsin toolkit
- Minnesota toolkit
- Other state-specific resources

Using Recreational Agreements in Wisconsin Schools

Recreational agreements are becoming a popular strategy that community and school partners can use to increase access to opportunities for physical activity. Wisconsin's two law center has identified the purpose and structure of "recreational agreements" that school districts enter in connection with school or community use of school grounds for recreational activities. The Wisconsin Association of School Boards, Wisconsin School Law Center, and Synthesis Wisconsin Solutions have developed two sample agreements for this purpose. These agreements have been used to provide clarity on the use of school grounds for recreational activities.

Making the Case for Community Recreational Use of School Property

Shared use of school property, facilities and equipment has been explored as a strategy to increase physical activity opportunities for local communities. This can provide access to spaces that are currently underutilized by the community.

Does access to recreational facilities increase physical activity?

- It is suggested that people with access to recreational facilities are more likely to be physically active.
- Research indicates that children who have access to school recreational facilities are more likely to be physically active.
- Evidence suggests that access to school recreational facilities in underserved communities increases the likelihood that community members will be physically active.
Questions?

www.publichealthlawcenter.org

Natasha Frost, Staff Attorney
Natasha.frost@wmitchell.edu
651-290-6454

Scott Kelly, Staff Attorney
Scott.kelly@wmitchell.edu
651-695-7611

Mary Marrow, Staff Attorney
Mary.marrow@wmitchell.edu
651-290-7605
What's next?

Promoting Physical Activity Through the Shared Use of School Recreational Spaces: A Policy Statement From the American Heart Association

Most Americans are not sufficiently physically active, even though regular physical activity improves health and reduces the risk of many chronic diseases. Those living in rural, non-White, and lower-income communities often have insufficient access to places to be active, which can contribute to their lower level of physical activity.

The shared use of school recreational facilities can provide safe and affordable places for communities. Studies suggest that challenges to shared use include additional cost, liability protection, communication among constituents interested in sharing space, and decision-making about scheduling and space allocation.

This American Heart Association policy statement has provided recommendations for federal, state, and local decision-makers to support and expand opportunities for physical activity in communities through the shared use of school spaces. (Am J Public Health. Published online ahead of print October 17, 2013:e146. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2013.301481)
TABLE 1—Policy Recommendations to Promote and Facilitate Shared Use That Address Shared Use Challenges

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Policy Recommendation to Promote and Facilitate Shared Use</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>School Design</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Liability</th>
<th>Decision-Making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Encourage or require school districts to provide community recreational use of school property.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require school board policy to address shared use.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarify or provide liability protection for schools when recreational use of the property is allowed.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authorize school districts to enter into shared use agreements, and set specific requirements for what is included in the agreements.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require proof of insurance for groups using school property.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support full and dedicated funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorporate community recreational use of school property as a Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan priority.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide incentives for shared use in school construction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outline joint powers concepts and opportunities.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require the creation of state-level toolkits and local dissemination plans to local communities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission studies through state workgroups to assess barriers and determine solutions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Joint Use Agreement in the Classification of Laws Associated with School Students (C.L.A.S.S.) Evaluation Tools and Database

Frank Perna, EdD, PhD.
National Cancer Institute

Stefanie Winston, JD, MPH
The MayaTech Corporation

Active Living Research Conference
San Diego, CA, March 9, 2014

The findings and conclusions in this presentation are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views on the National Cancer Institute.
C.L.A.S.S. Syllabus

• Lesson 1: What is C.L.A.S.S. & what makes it unique as an approach?
• Lesson 2: What is the C.L.A.S.S. Joint Use Agreement Scale?
• Lesson 3: Let’s go to C.L.A.S.S. (demonstration)
• Q & A
Lesson 1: What is C.L.A.S.S.S.?

Classification of Laws Associated with School Students

- Classification system of codified state laws
- Includes two coding systems:
  - Physical Education-Related State Policy Classification System (PERSPCS)
  - School Nutrition Environment State Policy Classification System (SNESPCS)
- All 50 states and Washington DC
- Grade levels: Elementary, Middle and High School
- Years 2003 – 2012, coded biennially after 2008
How was C.L.A.S.S. Developed?

Conceptual framework guided by:
- Expert panel including scientists and senior policy analysts (NCI, CDC, and scientific consultants)
- Socio-ecologic model
- Policies expected to have an impact on school environment and social norms that may affect children’s behaviors (Masse, et al., 2007).

Topics based on consensus recommendations from:
- Expert panel
- Review of published literature
- Key documents and web reports
- Government recommendations and guidelines (e.g., NASPE, IOM, CDC healthy School Guidelines)
Classification System Based On:

- National Standards & Recommendations
  (NASPE, CDC, IOM, FDA, USDA, ACSM, IOM)

Measure the extensiveness of school PE and Nutrition state codified laws

State codified laws since, 2003 - 2012:

- Compiled and independently coded
- Updated annually through 2008 and biannually thereafter
- Additional policy areas added for 2012

Måsse, et al., 2007; Måsse, et al., 2007
What makes C.L.A.S.S. Unique?

- Assigns specific scores (allowing ranking and comparisons)
- Enacted state-level law only: state statutory law and adopted regulations
- Grade level distinction
- Systematic coding
## CLASS Compares to Other Systems?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CLASS&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>CDC: Nutrition and Physical Activity Database&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Fas/Fat: How Obesity Threatens America’s Future 2010&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>National Conference of State Legislatures&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Rudd Center for Food Policy and Obesity&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Obesity Legislation Database&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE and PA</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade-level distinction</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses Empirical Scores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allows comparison across years</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enacted legislation and regulations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>1</sup> CLASS: Comprehensive Assessment of Community Strategies for Health Equity

<sup>2</sup> CDC: Nutrition and Physical Activity Database

<sup>3</sup> Fas/Fat: How Obesity Threatens America’s Future 2010

<sup>4</sup> National Conference of State Legislatures

<sup>5</sup> Rudd Center for Food Policy and Obesity

<sup>6</sup> Obesity Legislation Database
Lesson 2: What is the C.L.A.S.S. Joint Use Agreement Scale?

- Conceptual framework guided by:
  - Review of published literature
  - Expert panel including scientists and senior policy analysts (NCI, CDC, MayaTech, Change Lab Solutions and Extramural Community)

- Scoring Criteria from consensus recommendations
  - MayaTech created search-string & initial codified law search
  - Expert panel provided feedback on iterations coding criteria
  - Scoring criteria and decision rules established
  - Pilot testing of 5 states
  - Scoring criteria and decision rules revised
  - All 50 states and District of Columbia scored
    - Percent inter-rater agreement > 90%, kappa > .95
## Joint Use Agreement Scoring Key and Variable Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Description: The Joint Use Requirement score reflects the degree to which state law allows for joint use agreements between a school and a community partner with the aim of increasing access to school physical activity facilities as suggested in the CDC School Health Guidelines at the ES grade level.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4     | State requires a formal written agreement between schools and communities or organizations that allows access to school's recreational facilities outside of school hours and contains 3 of the following 4 criteria:  
  -- Contains provision regarding liability  
  -- Contains provision regarding fees for use  
  -- Contains provision regarding insurance coverage  
  -- Contains provisions regarding operations and management of the facility |
| 3     | State requires a formal written agreement between schools and communities or organizations that allows access to school's recreational facilities outside of school hours without reference to liability, fees, insurance or operations and management. |
| 2     | State requires schools to allow communities or organizations access to schools' recreational facilities outside of school hours, without a specific requirement for written agreements between the parties, or provisions regarding liability, fees, insurance, or operations and management. |
| 1     | State recommends informal cooperation between schools and communities or organizations that allow access to school's recreational facilities outside of school hours and references one or more of the following 4 criteria:  
  -- Contains provision regarding liability  
  -- Contains provision regarding fees for use  
  -- Contains provision regarding insurance coverage  
  -- Contains provisions regarding operations and management of the facility |
| 0     | No requirement or recommendation for a joint use agreement. |
| Decision Rules | 1) Exclude laws that only discuss funding of joint use facilities  
2) Laws must specify recreational activities, not just opening up the facilities for civic duties or educational opportunities.  
3) Definitions:  
   a. Formal Agreement: joint use agreement, or when the school must have a written agreement concerning access to schools’ recreational facilities.  
   b. Informal Agreement: when the state authorizes or requires schools to allow access to recreational facilities but does not specify that an agreement is required.  
   c. Communities or Organizations: includes other schools, parks, for-profit or non-profit organizations; essentially any group that enters into an agreement with a elementary/middle/high school is included.  
4) A fee, or lack thereof (i.e. allowing the property to be used for free) counts as one of the elements.  
5) Exclude laws that only discuss liability and not joint-use/access issues.  
6) If grades are not specified in the joint use variable, then we will assume that the provision applies to all grades.  
7) Provisions that address joint use but do not specify recreational use are not included. |
Physical Education / Joint Use Agreement Requirement / Arizona / 2012

The Joint Use Requirement score reflects the degree to which state law allows for joint use agreements between a school and a community partner with the aim of increasing access to school physical activity facilities as suggested in the CDC School Health Guidelines.

The median national score is the ‘middle’ score, with half the states with scores over the median and the other half with scores below the median.

The information provided in this map is based on data collected and coded by the MayaTech Corporation through a contract with the National Cancer Institute and reflects the codified law of each state as of December 31 of the specified year. CLASS scores reflect the effective date of the law, not the law creation date.
Implementation of the Joint Use Scale

- Arizona
  - Coded as a “1” for ES, MS, and HS
  - Citations:
  - Decision NOT to Code:
    - ARIZ. REV. STAT. § 33-1551
• Key Findings:
  ➢ Agreement on analysis of the lease of school property statute.
  ➢ A.H.A. included recreational use statute, while C.L.A.S.S.S. did not.
  ➢ C.L.A.S.S.S. did not use case law, or non-statutory laws.
Physical Education / Joint Use Agreement Requirement / North Carolina / 2012

The Joint Use Requirement score reflects the degree to which state law allows for joint use agreements between a school and a community partner with the aim of increasing access to school physical activity facilities as suggested in the CDC School Health Guidelines.

The median national score is the 'middle' score, with half the states with scores over the median and the other half with scores below the median.

The information provided in this map is based on data collected and coded by the MayaTech Corporation through a contract with the National Cancer Institute and reflects the codified law of each state as of December 31 of the specified year. CLASS scores reflect the effective date of the law, not the law creation date.
North Carolina:

- Coded as “1” for ES, MS, and HS
- Citations:
  - N.C. GEN. STAT. §§ 115C-12, 115C-524
- Decision NOT to Code:
  - 15A N.C. ADMIN. CODE § 12k.01.09
• Key Findings:
  ➢ C.L.A.S.S. analyzed laws that specifically applied to schools.
  ➢ A.H.A. looked at the broader joint use environment.
  ➢ C.L.A.S.S. only analyzed statutes and regulations.
Primary Limitations of C.L.A.S.S. Approach to JUA Policy Scoring

- Conceptually, JUA should promote activity levels, but empirical evidence sparse

- Proximally, unknown if state laws favorable to the creation of JUA actually facilitate their occurrence

- C.L.A.S.S. only analyzed statutes and regulations related to joint use agreement
Let’s Go To C.L.A.S.S.

Classification of Laws Associated with School Students

http://class.cancer.gov/index.aspx
The Classification of Laws Associated with School Students (C.L.A.S.S.) website uses two policy classification systems to score state-level codified laws for physical education (PE) and nutrition in schools. The scoring criteria for these systems are based on current public health research and national recommendations and standards for PE and nutrition in schools.

Use C.L.A.S.S. data to:
- Compare codified state laws in nutrition and physical education to national standards.
- Assess differences in codified state laws in nutrition and physical education across states over time.

What's New?
- The 2012 C.L.A.S.S. physical education and nutrition data are now available for download and also through the C.L.A.S.S. Data Maps and State Profiles tools.
- New policy areas added: Moderate-vigorous physical activity in PE, Joint-use agreement for physical activity, PE proficiency, Potable water, Farm-to-school program.
- The first C.L.A.S.S. BRIEF documenting the positive association between strong state law and physical education in US schools, is now available!
- Visit the C.L.A.S.S. State Profiles! This new web tool creates state-specific profiles for all policy areas in physical education and nutrition.
Physical Education / High School / Joint Use Agreement Requirement / 2012

The Joint Use Requirement score reflects the degree to which state law allows for joint use agreements between a school and a community partner with the aim of increasing access to school physical activity facilities as suggested in the CDC School Health Guidelines at the HS grade level.

For full CLASS Scoring Key and Variable information visit: http://class.cancer.gov/download.aspx

Classification of Laws Associated with School Students (C.L.A.S.S.)
http://class.cancer.gov

The information provided in this map is based on data collected and coded by the MayaTech Corporation through a contract with the National Cancer Institute and reflects the codified law of each state as of December 31 of the specified year. CLASS scores reflect the effective date of the law, not the law creation date.
Change in C.L.A.S.S. Rating: Joint Use Agreement

- No Law: 40% (2003), 30% (2012)
- Joint Use Recommend: 50% (2003), 60% (2012)
- Joint Use Require (No Agreement): 10% (2003), 30% (2012)
- Joint Use Require (Agreement): 10% (2003), 10% (2012)
- Require Joint Use (Specific Provisions): 5% (2003), 0% (2012)

P < .05
Physical Education / Joint Use Agreement Requirement / California / 2012

The Joint Use Requirement score reflects the degree to which state law allows for joint use agreements between a school and a community partner with the aim of increasing access to school physical activity facilities as suggested in the CDC School Health Guidelines.

This chart shows a state's codified law in relation to the Centers for Disease Control & Prevention (CDC) recommendations for Joint Use Agreement Requirements at each grade level. The median score for the nation is also shown.

CLASS Scoring Key and Variable Information

Physical Education / PE Time Requirements / California / 2012

The Physical Education (PE) Time Requirements score reflects the degree to which state law addresses the amount of PE instruction with respect to the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE) recommended standard.

The median national score is the 'middle' score, with half the states with scores over the median and the other half with scores below the median.

The information provided in this map is based on data collected and coded by the MayTech Corporation through a contract with the National Cancer Institute and reflects the codified law of each state as of December 31 of the specified year. CLASS scores reflect the effective date of the law, not law creation date.

Physical Education / Curriculum Standards / California / 2012

The Physical Education (PE) Curriculum Standards score reflects the degree to which state law addresses the PE curriculum requirements with respect to the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE) recommended standard.

Law requires recommended standard. Law requires standard for areas

Required for some areas

Required, but only by framework reference

Only recommend curriculum standard

No requirement

National median
C.L.A.S.S. Actions Examples

C.L.A.S.S. Actions

Want to see C.L.A.S.S. in action? These are examples of how C.L.A.S.S. data can be used to analyze school physical education (PE) and nutrition policies.

C.L.A.S.S. Publications

Publications of C.L.A.S.S. data. Please click on the title to link to that paper or abstract.


Download C.L.A.S.S. Data

School Nutrition Environment State Policy Classification System (SNESPCS)

SNESPCS data are currently available from 2003–2012. After 2008, policies are coded every two years.

The SNESPCS 2003 single-year data set and codebook were based on nutrition standards published by the U.S. Dietary Guidelines for Americans and other federal recommendations. In 2008, the SNESPCS data was revised to include recommendations from the Institute of Medicine report, "Nutrition Standards for Foods in Schools: Leading the Way toward Healthier Youth." As a result, the SNESPCS criteria and coding for current combined data set have changed since the initial publication. Future SNESPCS data sets will be updated according to the most recent nutrition standards that affect the school nutrition environment. The competitive foods, reimbursable school meal, and nutrition education policies are classified according to grade level requirements at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. Grade-level classifications were not made for the remaining topics. C.L.A.S.S. scores reflect the law into effect in the specified year, not law creation date. The citation for source laws coded are available in the SNESPCS Law Citation file. C.L.A.S.S. data are occasionally updated due to changes in policy or coding. If you have any questions or would like to know if there are updates to the C.L.A.S.S. data, please contact nclclass@mail.nih.gov.

Data files available for download:
- SNESPCS 2003-2012 Data File (xls)
- SNESPCS 2003-2012 Data File (sav)
- SNESPCS 2003-2012 Citation File (xls)

Data File Code Book (pdf)
- SNESPCS Scoring Key and Variable Information (pdf)

Physical Education-Related State Policy Classification System (PERSPCS)

PERSPCS data are currently available from 2003–2012. After 2008, policies are coded every two years. With the exception of recess time, policies for each topic are classified according to grade-level requirements at the elementary, middle, and high school levels. A series of dichotomous tracking variables that might potentially enhance or inhibit implementation or impact the individual policy provisions are also coded for the time, requirement, staffing, and assessment-related variables. C.L.A.S.S. scores reflect the law into effect in the specified year, not law creation date. The citation for source laws coded are available in the PERSPCS Law Citation file. C.L.A.S.S. data are occasionally updated due to changes in policy or coding. If you have any questions or would like to know if there are updates to the C.L.A.S.S. data, please contact nclclass@mail.nih.gov.

Data files available for download:
- PERSPCS 2003-2012 Data File (xls)
- PERSPCS 2003-2012 Data File (sav)
- PERSPCS 2003-2012 Citation File (xls)

Data File Code Book (pdf)
- PERSPCS Scoring Key and Variable Information (pdf)
THANK YOU!

For more information

Frank Perna, PhD  pernafm@mail.nih.gov
Stefanie Winston, JD,MPH  SWinston@mayatech.com
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