

**Carol M. White Physical Education Program**  
CFDA #84.215F

Information and Application Procedures for Fiscal Year 2010  
OMB No. 1894-0006 Expiration Date: 09/30/2011

**Application Deadline: July 19, 2010**

---



**U.S. Department of Education**  
Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

### Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools

Dear Colleague:

Thank you for your interest in applying for a grant under the Carol M. White Physical Education Program (PEP). This program, authorized by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) of 2001, is intended to assist local educational agencies and community-based organizations to initiate, expand, or enhance physical education programs to help students meet their state standards for physical education. Furthermore, we encourage applicants to develop and implement effective programs and partnerships that promote lifelong physical activity practices and healthy eating habits.

The FY 2010 PEP program represents a departure from past years and seeks to align the program with current knowledge, research, and best practices. Applicants will be required to design projects that address their specific needs and align with existing related initiatives in the field. Efforts that may be supported through PEP include: providing professional development and training for staff, incorporating evidence-based physical education and nutrition education curricula, and providing cognitive, social, cooperative skill-building activities.

The U.S. Department of Education recognizes the vital role a healthy lifestyle plays in the lives of our nation's students. As a result, we are pleased to present this opportunity for applicants to strengthen and enhance programs that support a broader, strategic vision for encouraging healthy physical education and nutrition habits.

We look forward to receiving your application for support under the Carol M. White Physical Education Program.

Sincerely,

/s/

Kevin Jennings  
Assistant Deputy Secretary

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

<b>I. PEP GRANT FAST FACTS.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>II. APPLICATION SUBMISSION PROCEDURES.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>III. PROGRAM INFORMATION.....</b>	<b>9</b>
Introduction	
General Information	
The Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA)	
Resources	
Priorities and Application Requirements	
Selection Criteria	
Frequently Asked Questions	
<b>IV. LEGAL AND REGULATORY DOCUMENTS.....</b>	<b>55</b>
Notice of Final Priorities (NFP)	
Notice Inviting Applications (NIA)	
Authorizing Legislation	
<b>V. GENERAL APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS AND INFORMATION.....</b>	<b>129</b>
Preparing the Application	
Organizing the Application	
Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs (Executive Order 12372)	
General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) Section 427	
<b>VI. APPLICATION CHECKLIST AND TIPS FOR APPLICANTS.....</b>	<b>136</b>
<b>VII. APPENDECIES AND FORMS.....</b>	<b>140</b>
Screening Form	
Program Specific Assurances	
Program Specific Assurances for Competitive Preference #1 –Collection of Body mass Index (BMI) Measurement	
Sample LEA Partnership Agreement Form	
Sample CBO Partnership Agreement Form	

---

---

## I. PEP GRANT FAST FACTS:

---

**Eligible Applicants:** Local educational agencies (LEAs) and Community Based Organizations (CBOs) that do not have an active grant under this program (CFDA 84.215F).

**Purpose:** The purpose of the Carol M. White Physical Education Program (PEP) grant is to assist LEAs and CBOs to initiate, expand, or enhance physical education programs that help students in kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> grade meet their state standards for physical education.

**Absolute Priority:** The absolute priority for this program requires that an applicant propose a program that will address its State's physical education standards and develop, expand, or improve its physical education program for students kindergarten through grade 12 by undertaking instruction in healthy eating habits and good nutrition and at least one of the authorized physical fitness activities.

**Competitive Preference Priority #1:** We will give competitive preference priority to applicants that agree to implement aggregate BMI data collection, and use it as part of a comprehensive assessment of health and fitness for the purposes of monitoring the weight status of their student population across time.

**Competitive Preference Priority #2:** We will give competitive preference priority to an applicant that includes in its application an agreement that details the participation of required partners.

**Application Deadline Date:** July 19, 2010

**Application Submission:** Applications must be submitted electronically via e-Application.

**Project Period:** Up to 36 months

**Estimated Available Funds:** \$39,000,000

**Average Award Range:** \$100,000 - \$750,000 per year

**Estimated Average Size of Awards:** \$427,000

**Estimated Number of Awards:** 93

**Competition Manager:** Carlette Huntley  
Email address: Carlette.Huntley@ed.gov  
Telephone: (202) 245-7871

**NOTE: PLEASE READ THIS INFORMATION AND PROCEDURES DOCUMENT IN INTS ENTIRETY BEFORE COMPLETING YOUR APPLICATION.**

## **II. APPLICATION SUBMISSION PROCEDURES:**

---

### **Application Transmittal Instructions**

The competition deadline for the Carol M. White Physical Education grant program is **July 19, 2010**. If you want to apply for a grant and be considered for funding, you must meet the deadline requirements.

Applications for grants under this grant competition must be submitted electronically using the Electronic Grant Application System (e-Application) accessible through the Department's e-Grants System. You **may not** submit your application by e-mail or facsimile.

### **Applications Submitted Electronically**

Applications must be submitted electronically using e-Application, accessible through the Department's e-Grants portal page at: <http://e-Grants.ed.gov> by 4:30:00 p.m. (Washington, DC time) on the application deadline date.

For more information on using e-Application, please refer to the Notice Inviting Applications for this competition published in the Federal Register; the e-Application Submission Procedures and Tips document found in this application package; and/or visit <http://e-Grants.ed.gov>.

You may access the application for the Carol M. White Physical Education grant program at: <http://e-Grants.ed.gov> or <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/whitephised/applicant.html>

### **e-Application Submission Procedures and Tips for Applicants**

#### **U.S. Department of Education**

e-Application Website: <http://e-grants.ed.gov>

#### **IMPORTANT – PLEASE READ FIRST**

**To facilitate your use of e-Application, this document includes important application preparation and submission procedures you need to be aware of to ensure your application is received in a timely manner and accepted by the Department of Education. Please read and follow these step-by-step directions to create and submit your application.**

#### **ATTENTION**

Applicants using the Department of Education's e-Application system will need to register first to access an application package. Forms in an application package are completed on-line and narratives are uploaded while logged into the system. Therefore, allow sufficient time to complete your application before the closing date. If you have not used e-Application in the past, you may want to walk through the Demo available on the e-Application homepage. If you encounter difficulties, you may also contact the e-Grants help desk on 1-888-336-8930. The following are steps you should follow to successfully complete an application with e-Application.

**Step 1 – Determine if your program is accepting electronic applications.** *The Federal*

*Register* notice of each program will indicate whether the program is accepting e-Application as part of the Department's e-Application program. Here is a link to the Department's *Federal Register* notices: <http://www.ed.gov/news/fedregister/announce/index.html>. Additional information on the Department of Education's grant programs can be found at <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocfo/grants/grants.html>.

**Step 2 – Register in e-Application to access the application package.** If you are a new user, you will need to register to use e-Application. From the e-Grants Portal Page <http://e-grants.ed.gov/>, click on the continue button and click the register button on the right side of the next page. Select the e-Application module and click the next button. Please provide the requested information. Your e-Grants password will be sent to the e-mail address you provide. Once you receive the e-mail, enter your username and password and click the login button.

If you already have a username and password for e-Grants, use them to login. If you have access to more than one e-Grants module, you will be directed to select which module you wish to enter. Keep in mind that this username and password will be used for all e-Grants modules. In order to update your registration for additional e-Grants modules, click the appropriate tab on the top of the screen and provide the requested information.

**Note the following browser compatibility problems.** The site is viewed best in Internet Explorer 5. We currently support IE 5, Netscape 6.2, Firefox 2.2 (along with later versions of IE, Netscape and Firefox). Please make sure that you have **Cookies** and **JavaScript** enabled in your browser.

**Step 3 - Add Application Package to your Start Page.** From your Start Page, click on the "Add" button to see the list of application packages. Click on a specific package link on the List of Application Packages to apply. The package will now appear on your Start Page. From this point forward, you will access your unique application from your Start Page (not the Packages Page).

**Step 4 - Begin the Application.** Click on the underlined Application Package Title on your Start Page. This brings you to a page where you will see all of the application's forms and narratives listed as underlined links.

**Step 5 - Fill out Forms.** Enter a form by clicking on the underlined form title in order to enter data. Remember to click the "Save" button at the bottom of the form and check the "Form Completed" box for each form as you complete it.

**Step 6 - Upload File(s) for Narrative Responses.** Click on an underlined narrative form title for the e-Application. Enter the title of the document, and click on the "Browse" button to locate your file. Remember to click the "Save" button after you upload the document and check the "Form Completed" box when you finish uploading your file(s). Please note for file uploads, we accept .doc, .rtf, and .pdf files only. If you are using Word 2007, please save your document in a lower version of Word before uploading into e-Application.

**Step 7 - Verify Information/Print Application.** Verify your information is complete and correct on all required forms and narratives. You have the option to print each form at any time by clicking on the print/view icon next to the appropriate form. After submission of the forms and narratives, you have the option to print a complete e-Application package in PDF by clicking on the "Request Complete Package in PDF" on the e-Application PR/Award page. A second

window will open informing you that your request has been received and that you will be notified via e-mail once it is available. This process can take anywhere from a few minutes to a few hours. Once you receive the e-mail, click on the link in the text of the message and enter your username and password in the new window. This will open the PDF file from which you can view/print the entire package. In addition, a blank complete package in PDF will be accessible from the package page in e-Application.

**Step 8 - Submit your Application.** Only authorized individuals for your organization can submit an application. Please check with your Authorizing Representative or sponsored research office before submission. Click on the "Ready to submit" button at the bottom of your application. Enter and verify the Authorizing Representative information. Click the "Submit" button. You will receive an e-mail to confirm that your application was received, and it will include a unique application number. Please print and keep this e-mail for your records. [Reminder: applications must be submitted before 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, DC time, on the deadline date for applications. e-Application will not accept your application if you try to submit it after 4:30:00 p.m. on the deadline date.]

**Step 9 - Fax the signed SF 424 Cover Page (or Program Specific Cover Page).** Write your unique application number (received in step 8) on the upper right corner of your printed SF 424 Cover Page (or Program Specific Cover Page), **sign and fax it within 3 business days of submitting your e-Application** to (202) 485-0041 or (202) 245-7166.

**NOTE:** For more detailed information on submitting an e-Application, please see the User Guide. In addition, please try practicing with our e-Application Demo site by clicking on the Demo button found on the upper left corner of the e-Application Home Page. Both the User Guide and Demo can be found at <http://e-grants.ed.gov>.

### **Other Submission Tips**

- 1) **SUBMIT EARLY - We strongly recommend that you do not wait until the last day to submit your application.** The time it takes to upload the narratives for your application will vary depending on a number of factors including the size of the files and the speed of your Internet connection. If you try to submit your application after 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, DC time on the deadline date, the e-Application system will not accept it.
- 2) **If electronic submission is optional and you have problems that you are unable to resolve before the deadline date and time for electronic applications, please follow the transmittal instructions for hard copy applications in the *Federal Register* notice and get a hard copy application postmarked by midnight on the deadline date.**

**If electronic submission is required, you must submit an electronic application before 4:30:00 p.m., unless you follow the procedures in the *Federal Register* notice and qualify for one of the exceptions to the electronic submission requirement and submit, no later than two weeks before the application deadline date, a written statement to the Department that you qualify for one of these exceptions. (See the *Federal Register* notice for detailed instructions.)**

- 3) **Dial-Up Internet Connections** - When using a dial-up connection to upload and submit your application, it can take significantly longer than when you are connected to the Internet with a high-speed connection, e.g. cable modem/DSL/T1. While times will vary depending upon the size of your application, it can take a few minutes to a few hours to complete your grant submission using a dial-up connection. If you do not have access to a high-speed connection and electronic submission is required, you may want to consider following the instructions in the *Federal Register* notice to obtain an exception to the electronic submission requirement no later than two weeks before the application deadline date. (See the *Federal Register* notice for detailed instructions.)

### **Additional Tips – Attaching Files**

Please note the following tips related to attaching files to your application:

1. Ensure that you only attach the Department of Education approved file types detailed in the *Federal Register* application notice (.doc, .pdf or .rtf). If using Word 2007, save your file to an earlier version of Word before uploading. Also, do not upload any password-protected files to your application.
2. When attaching files, applicants should limit the size of their file names. Lengthy file names could result in difficulties with opening and processing your application. We recommend you keep your file names to less than 25 characters. In addition, applicants should avoid including special characters in their file names (for example, %, \*, /, etc.) Both of these conditions (lengthy file names and/or special characters included in the file names) could result in difficulties opening and processing a submitted application.
3. Applicants should limit the size of their file attachments. Documents submitted that contain graphics and/or scanned material often greatly increase the size of the file attachments and can result in difficulties opening the files. Please note that each file attachment in e-Application has a file size limitation, which is anywhere from 2 to 8 MB, and the limitation will be indicated on the individual screen when you upload a file. For reference, however, the average discretionary grant application package totals 1 to 2 MB. Therefore, you may want to check the size of your attachments before uploading them into e-Application.

### III. PROGRAM INFORMATION:

---

#### Introduction

Over the last decade, health and education professionals, as well as States and communities, have been increasingly concerned about changing health and behavior patterns related to physical activity, nutrition, and weight status. While a healthy lifestyle can help prevent a host of serious health outcomes, including heart disease and diabetes, data show that a large percentage of youth are sedentary and neither active enough nor have a healthy diet. Only about 17 percent of high school students meet the current recommendations for physical activity.<sup>1</sup> In a recent study, about one-quarter of high school students reported that they used a computer or played computer or video games more than three hours a day and about 33 percent of high school students reported watching television three or more hours per day on an average school day. Only 77 percent of high school students did not eat five or more fruits or vegetables each day in the previous week.<sup>2</sup> These behaviors have contributed to a rise in overweight and obese youth, with recent studies indicating that 17 percent of 6-11 year-olds and 17.6 percent of 12-19 year-olds are considered obese. Furthermore, 33 percent of 6-11 year olds and 34 percent of 12-19 year olds are overweight;<sup>3</sup> these rates have roughly doubled since 1980.<sup>4</sup>

First Lady Michelle Obama has challenged the nation to solve the challenge of childhood obesity within a generation. Mrs. Obama's *Let's Move!* Initiative, launched in February, 2010, has sought to combine public and private efforts to address this considerable challenge. The Department of Education is proud to be a part of this initiative and has worked closely with our partners from across the Federal government and those in the field to develop a national strategy based on the best available science aimed at solving the childhood obesity crisis. As part of this initiative, a Federal Childhood Obesity Task Force was charged with creating an action plan for all sectors of society, aligned with the four pillars of *Let's Move!*: empowering parents, improving access to healthy foods, improving foods in schools, and increasing physical activity. The report details a coordinated strategy, identifies key benchmarks, and outlines an action plan to end the problem of childhood obesity within a generation.

In this report, schools are identified as a key setting for influencing youth through educational programs, as well as complementary policies and practices. The report recommends that schools provide a comprehensive physical activity program for students. Physical education is widely considered to be the cornerstone of a comprehensive school-based physical activity program. Physical education should:

- meet the needs of all students;

---

<sup>1</sup> Department of Health and Human Services. Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion. 2008 Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans. Washington, DC, 2008. The 2008 Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans recommends 60 minutes of physical activity per day for children and adolescents, which should include moderate to vigorous aerobic activity, as well as age-appropriate muscle and bone strengthening activities.

<sup>2</sup> Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Youth Risk Behavior Survey, 2009. Accessed online at [www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth](http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth). The question on physical activity asks about doing any kind of physical activity that increased their heart rate and made them breathe hard some of the time for a total of at least 60 minutes per day on five or more of the seven days before the survey. The question on nutritional intake asks students to report if the student ate fruits and vegetables (100 percent fruit juices, fruit, green salad, potatoes [excluding French fries, fried potatoes, or potato chips], carrots, or other vegetables) five or more times per day during the seven days before the survey.

<sup>3</sup> "Overweight" is defined as at or above the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile and "obese" is defined as at or above the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile on BMI-for-age growth charts.

<sup>4</sup> Ogden C, Carroll M, Flegal K. High body mass index for age among US children and adolescents, 2003-2006. *JAMA*. 2008;299(20): 2410-2405.

- be an enjoyable experience for all students;
- keep students active for most of PE class time;
- teach self-management as well as movement skills; and
- emphasize knowledge and skills for a lifetime of physical activity.<sup>5</sup>

Classes should be taught by highly-qualified teachers and students should be active for at least 50% of class time. In addition, a comprehensive school-based physical activity program should include opportunities for students to be active throughout the day, including before, during, and after school.

A comprehensive physical activity program should be complemented by nutrition instruction and a healthy nutrition environment, as well as multiple opportunities and settings that promote and practice physical activity and healthy eating.<sup>6</sup> Although the primary focus of PEP remains on developing high-quality physical education programs and an environment supportive of physical activity, a PEP project that incorporates both high-quality physical education and nutrition instruction strategies offers the best opportunity for students to acquire the information and skills necessary to help them understand the complementary relationship between physical education and nutrition, and understand the role that physical activity and nutrition can play in improving and maintaining their health.

Community settings also play a critical role in teaching students about physical activity, fitness, and healthy choices, and providing opportunities to practice making healthy choices throughout the school day. Students spend a significant portion of time outside of school, and a consistent community approach that reinforces and supports lessons and messages that are taught and learned in schools is critically important. For example, Community Based Organizations (CBO), particularly those CBOs that provide before-or after-school or summer programs, can play an important role in supplementing the skills and concepts that students learn in school. We have found that CBOs that have received PEP grants function optimally when they work collaboratively with one or more schools in the area served by the project. The more broadly a community adopts approaches that promote wellness, the more those social norms are conducive to healthy choices and behaviors.

In FY 2010, ED has enacted new priorities, requirements, and definitions to update the program to forge a new direction to strengthen and enhance PEP and to support a broader, strategic vision for encouraging the development of lifelong healthy habits, and improving nutrition and physical education programming and policies in schools and communities to prevent and decrease childhood obesity. PEP's new direction would apply lessons learned and best practices based on research and program evaluation that were not available during PEP's earlier years. With this new direction, we seek to provide funding to districts and community-based organizations in communities that plan to implement comprehensive, integrated physical activity and nutrition programs and policies that are reinforced in and by the community. By promoting sequential, research-based physical education and instruction in healthy eating and implementing policies to encourage physical activity and healthy eating and help students meet their state standards, we expect PEP projects to result in students developing important skills,

---

<sup>5</sup> National Association for Sport and Physical Education.(2004). *Moving into the future: national standards for physical education* (2 ed).Reston, V.A.: National Association for Sport and Physical Education; Kahn, E.B., Ramsey, L.T., Brownson, R.C., et al.(2002).The effectiveness of interventions to increase physical activity: a systematic review. *American Journal of Preventative Medicine*, 22(Supplement 4), 73-107.

<sup>6</sup> Institute of Medicine. *Preventing Childhood Obesity: Health in the Balance*. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2005.

knowledge, and behaviors that will help students develop healthy habits that will carry into adulthood.

## **General Information**

**Overview** --The Carol M. White Physical Education Program (PEP) provides grants to local educational agencies and community-based organizations to initiate, expand, or enhance physical education programs for students in kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> grade to help students meet their state standards for physical education.

**Eligibility** -- Eligible applicants are local educational agencies (LEAs), including charter schools that are considered LEAs under state law, and community-based organizations (CBOs), including faith-based organizations. Current, active grantees are not eligible to apply.

**Authority**-- The authority for this program is found in 20 U.S.C. 7261.

**Applicable Regulations**-- (a) The Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) in 34 CFR parts 74, 75, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 97, 98, and 99; the regulations in 34 CFR part 299. (b) The notice of final eligibility requirements for the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools discretionary grant programs published in the Federal Register on December 4, 2006 (71 FR 70369). (c) The notice of final priorities, requirements, and definitions published elsewhere in this issue of the Federal Register.

Note: The regulations in 34 CFR part 79 apply to all applicants except federally recognized Indian tribes.

Note: The regulations in 34 CFR part 86 apply to institutions of higher education only.

**Official Documents Notice** -- The official documents governing this competition are the Notice Inviting Applications and the Notice for Final Priorities published in the Federal Register on June 18, 2010. These notices are also available electronically at:

[www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister](http://www.ed.gov/legislation/FedRegister) and [www.gpoaccess.gov/nara/index.html](http://www.gpoaccess.gov/nara/index.html).

**Note to Applicants**-- This is a complete application package for the Carol M. White Physical Education Program. Together with the statute authorizing the program and the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) governing the program, this package contains all of the information, application forms, and instructions needed to apply for this grant.

**Project Period**-- Projects may be funded for up to 36 months (three budget periods of 12 months each). Continuation awards are contingent upon the annual demonstration of substantial progress toward meeting project goals and objectives, and the availability of future funds. Applicants should include a separate budget for each year of requested funds.

**Estimated Range of Awards**-- Under this grant competition, approximately 93 awards will be made, ranging from \$100,000-\$750,000 per project year.

**Application Due Date**-- Applications must be submitted electronically through the Department of Education's e-Grants portal and must be submitted before 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, DC time, on the deadline date for applications. E-application will not accept your application if you try to submit it after 4:30:00 on the deadline date.

*Applications may not be emailed or faxed.*

*Note: Under very extraordinary circumstances, the Department may change the closing date for a competition. When this occurs, we announce such a change in a notice published in the Federal Register. Waivers for individual applications failing to meet the deadline will not be granted, except in the circumstances described in the section under electronic submission of applications.*

**Unique Applications** -- Information submitted in response to the scoring criteria should be specific to the applicant's district or community and should not be identical or substantially similar to other applications. Identical or substantially similar applications are not responsive to the scoring criteria.

**Grantee Meetings**-- All applicants must budget for attendance at the following meetings during the project period for:

- One person at a new grantee meeting, lasting two days.
- Two people at the annual OSDFS National Conference, lasting three days.

These meetings will usually be held in Washington, DC. Grant funds may be used to pay for all costs associated with attendance at these meetings including transportation, hotel, and per diem.

**National Evaluation**-- Recipients of the FY 2010 PEP grant will be required to participate in a national evaluation study, per the regulations in section 75.591 of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR). Participation in the evaluation includes collecting baseline data of GPRA performance measures during the Fall of 2010 at the start of the PEP program.

The applicant must provide documentation of its commitment to participate in the U.S. Department of Education's evaluation. An LEA applicant must include a letter from the research office or research board approving its participation in the evaluation (if approval is needed), and both types of eligible applicants (LEAs and CBOs) must include a letter from the Authorized Representative agreeing to participate in the evaluation.

Full details of the scope and framework of the national evaluation are emerging, and we will share these details with grant programs that are required or requested to participate in this national evaluation after awards are made.

To help facilitate this evaluation effort, applicants are requested to provide baseline data for the required performance measures under the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) in their application, to the extent practicable (see page 17 of this application for additional information on GPRA measures).

**Reports**-- Each grantee is required to submit an annual and/or final report to demonstrate progress toward GPRA measures and project objectives. For multiple-year projects, these reports are also evaluated to determine whether substantial progress has been made to justify a continuation award.

Both an annual report(s) and final report are required for multi-year funded projects. For projects funded for one year, only a final report is required.

**Contracting for Goods and Services--** Generally, all procurement transactions by grantees made with Carol M. White Physical Education Program (PEP) grant funds must be conducted in a manner providing full and open competition, consistent with the standards in Section 80.36 (for SEAs and LEAs) and Sections 74.40-74.48 (for CBOs and IHEs) of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR). This section requires that grantees use their own procurement procedures (which reflect State and local laws and regulations) to select contractors, provided that those procedures meet certain standards described in EDGAR.

Because grantees must use appropriate procurement procedures to select contractors, generally applicants should not include information in their grant applications about specific contractors that will be used to provide services or goods for the proposed project if a grant is awarded. These requirements are not applicable in the event that the goods or services being procured are available only from a single source.

If a vendor assists an applicant in preparing an application for a grant, and subsequently is interested in providing contract services if the applicant receives a grant award, a close examination of all activities is warranted to ensure that the vendor did not act as an agent of the grantee, that the vendor does not have an organizational conflict of interest in the procurement, and that the requirements for full and open competition have not been violated.

The requirements regarding full and open competition could be violated even if a vendor's participation in the application process was limited. For example, a vendor that provides specifications that are then included in a grant application could have a competitive advantage over other vendors. Applicants for funding should carefully consider the requirements concerning competition contained in EDGAR as they interact with vendors during the application process, and if they are awarded a grant under the program. EDGAR is available online at: [www.ed.gov/policy/fund/reg/edgarReg/edgar.html](http://www.ed.gov/policy/fund/reg/edgarReg/edgar.html)

**Technical Assistance--** The Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools will host two webinars and three technical assistance conference calls designed to assist applicants who might have questions related to the application process and procedure for this grant program. The webinar and conference calls dates will be as follows:

- **June 21, 2010** (Webinar) --information specific to SHI, HECAT/PECAT, and BMI
- **June 22, 2010** (Webinar) --information specific to SHI
- **June 29, 2010** (AM Conference Call) –general information on program and application submission
- **June 29, 2010** (PM Conference Call) general information on program and application submission
- **July 7, 2010** (Conference Call) general information on program and application submission

Applicants should reference our website at: [www.ed.gov/programs/whitephised/applicant.html](http://www.ed.gov/programs/whitephised/applicant.html). for specific information related to the webinars and conference calls.

**Budget --** Applicants requesting funds must submit a [single] ED Standard Form 524 and a detailed budget for each of the three, 12-month budget periods to be eligible for funding each year. The ED Standard Form 524 should represent the total funds needed to support the proposed project for each of the 12-month budget periods.

**E-mail Addresses** --As part of our review of your application, we may need to contact you with questions for clarification. Please be sure your application contains valid e-mail addresses for the Project Director and Authorized Representative.

**Project Director Time Commitment** -- Applicants are requested to provide the percent of the Project Director's time that will be dedicated to the grant project if funded. For example, if the Project Director works 40 hours per week and spends 20 hours per working on grant activities, then the time commitment for the Project Director would be 50%. We suggest that applicants include this information in the budget narrative or that they add this information to the Project Director line on the Department of Education Supplement to the SF 424.

**Review of Applications and Notification of Awards** -- The review of applications and notification of award for this grant competition requires approximately six to eight weeks. We expect to notify the successful applicant by September 30, 2010. Unsuccessful applicants will be notified within 60 days of the award start date.

**Definitions**--For the purposes of this competition, the following definitions apply:

(A) The term **local educational agency** (LEA) is defined as:

- 1) A public board of education or other public authority legally constituted within a State for either administrative control or direction of, or to perform a service function for, public elementary or secondary schools in a city, county, township, school district, or other political subdivision of a State, or for such combination of school districts or counties as are recognized in a State as an administrative agency for its public elementary or secondary school.
- 2) The term includes any other public institution or agency having administrative control and direction of a public elementary or secondary school.
- 3) The term includes an elementary or secondary school funded by the Bureau of Indian Affairs but only to the extent that such inclusion makes such school eligible for programs for which specific eligibility is not provided to such school in another provision of law and such school does not have a student population that is smaller than the student population of the local educational agency receiving assistance under this chapter with the smallest student population, except that such school shall not be subject to the jurisdiction of any State educational agency other than the Bureau of Indian Affairs.
- 4) The term includes educational service agencies and consortia of those agencies.
- 5) The term includes the State educational agency in a State in which the State is the sole educational agency for all public schools.

(B) The term **community-based organization** (CBO) is defined as a private or public nonprofit organization of demonstrated effectiveness that:

- 1) is representative of a community or significant segments of a community; and
- 2) provides educational or related services to individuals in the community.

(C) The term **nonprofit** is applied to an agency, organization, or institution means that it is owned and operated by one or more corporations or associations, whose net earnings do not benefit, and cannot lawfully benefit, any private shareholder or entity.

(D) The term **local public health entity** is defined as an administrative or service unit of local or State government concerned with health and carrying some responsibility for the health of a jurisdiction smaller than the State (except for Rhode Island and Hawaii, because these States' health departments operate on behalf of local public health and have no sub-State unit). The definition applies to the State health department or the State public health entity in the event that the local public health entity does not govern health and nutrition issues for the local area.

(E) The term **local government** is defined as a county, municipality, city, town, township, local public authority (including any public and Indian housing agency under the United States Housing Act of 1937) school district, special district, intrastate district, council of governments (whether or not incorporated as a nonprofit corporation under state law), any other regional or interstate government entity, or any agency or instrumentality of a local government.

(F) The term **head of local government** is defined means the party responsible for the civic functioning of the county, city, town, or municipality or an appropriate designee. This includes, but is not limited to, the mayor, city manager, or county executive.

(G) The term **organization supporting nutrition or healthy eating** is defined as a local public or private non-profit school, local public health entity, health-related professional organization, or local business that has demonstrated interest and efforts in promoting student health or nutrition. This term would include, but not be limited to LEAs (particularly an LEA's school food or child nutrition director), grocery stores, supermarkets, restaurants, corner stores, farmers' markets, farms, other private businesses, hospitals, institutions of higher education, Cooperative Extension Service and 4H Clubs, and community gardening organizations, when such entities have demonstrated a clear intent to promote student health and nutrition or have made tangible efforts to do so. This definition would not include representatives from trade associations or representatives from any organization representing any producers or marketers of food or beverage product(s).

### **Other Terms**

(H) The term **physical activity** is defined as any bodily movement produced by the contraction of skeletal muscle that increases energy expenditure above a basal level. For more information about the guidelines, please visit the Department of Health and Human Services' Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans, which can be accessed at: <http://www.health.gov/paguidelines/default.aspx>.

(I) The term **physical education** is defined as the curricular offered in K-12 schools that provides students with instruction on physical activity, health-related fitness, physical competence, and cognitive understanding about physical activity for all students so that they can adopt healthy and physically active lifestyles. For information about the differences between physical activity and physical education, please see <http://aahperd.org/naspe/publications/teachingTools/PAvsPE.cfm>.

(J) The term **physical fitness** is defined as the ability to carry our tasks with vigor and alertness, without undue fatigue, and with ample energy to enjoy leisure-time pursuits and respond to emergencies. Physical fitness includes a number of components consisting of cardio-respiratory endurance (aerobic power), skeletal muscle endurance, skeletal muscle strength, skeletal muscle power, flexibility, balance, speed of movement, reaction time, and body composition. For more information about the guidelines, please visit the Department of Health and Human Services' Physical Activity Guidelines for Americans, which can be accessed at: <http://www.health.gov/paguidelines/default.aspx>.

**Program Contact**

Carlette Huntley, Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools; (phone) 202-245-7871, (email) [Carlette.Huntley@ed.gov](mailto:Carlette.Huntley@ed.gov), U.S. Department of Education, 550 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW., Potomac Center Plaza, Room 10071, Washington, DC 20202.

**Paperwork Burden Statement**

According to the paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for the information collection is OMB No. 1894-0006. The time required to complete the information collection is estimate to average 25 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather and maintain the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC 20202-4651. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools, U.S. Department of Education, 550 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW, Potomac Plaza Center, Room 10071, Washington, DC 20202-6450.

## **The Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA)**

The Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA) is a statute that requires all Federal agencies to manage their activities with attention to outcomes. Each agency must clearly state what it intends to accomplish, identify the resources required, and periodically report its progress to Congress. In so doing, it is expected that GPRA will contribute to improvements in accountability for the expenditures of public funds, improve Congressional decision-making through more objective information on the effectiveness of Federal programs, and promote a government focus on results, service delivery, and customer satisfaction.

The Secretary has established the following performance and efficiency measures for collecting data to use in assessing the effectiveness of PEP:

### **Performance:**

**Measure One: The percentage of students who engage in 60 minutes of daily physical activity.** Grantees must use pedometers for students in grades K-12 and an additional 3-Day Physical Activity Recall (3DPAR) instrument to collect data on students in grades 5-12.

**Measure Two: The percentage of students who achieve age-appropriate cardiovascular fitness levels.** Grantees are required to use the 20-meter shuttle run to assess cardiovascular fitness in middle and high school students.

**Measure Three: The percentage of students served by the grant who consumed fruit two or more times per day and vegetables three or more times per day.** Programs serving high school students are required to use the nutrition-related questions from the Youth Risk Behavior Survey to determine the number of students who meet these goals.

### **Efficiency:**

**The cost (based on the amount of the grant award) per student who achieves the level of physical activity required to meet the physical activity measures above (number of students who engage in 60 minutes of daily physical activity).**

**Note: Grantees will not be required to provide data for this measure.** Instead, we will use data provided for the physical activity measure above, as well as the grant expenditure amounts (for both grant funds and matching funds), to calculate this measure.

These measures constitute the Department's indicators of success for this program. Consequently, applicants for a grant under this program are advised to give careful consideration to these measures in formulating the approach and design of their proposed project. Grantees are required to collect and report data on the performance measure identified above to the Department. The Secretary may also publish data collected from grantees' performance reports to illustrate progress toward program objectives.

Grantees will also be required to participate in any national evaluation of PEP that the Secretary may require. To facilitate this effort, all applicants are asked to provide baseline data of these GPRA performance measures in their application to the extent practicable.

## **Resources**

The resources below are intended to assist applicants in meeting the priorities and requirements of the PEP program. These resources are not meant to be exhaustive but are intended to provide guidance to applicants. If you have additional questions, please refer first to the Frequently Asked Questions section of this application package; most questions are addressed there. If you are unable to find your question or your question is not sufficiently addressed, please contact Carlette Huntley, whose contact information can be found on page 16.

*(Absolute Priority)*

### **State Standards for Physical Education**

To be considered for a PEP grant under this competition, **your proposal must describe a plan to help students meet state standards for physical education.** You should clearly identify the specific standard(s) to which you are aligning your program. You must use your own state's standards. (For example: *We will be addressing state standard 1 for elementary school students: Movement, which states that students will be able to...*)

If your state does not have physical education standards, you may select another state's standards with which to align your program and, accordingly, identify which standards your project will address. (For example: *Our state, ABC, does not have state PE standards. Because our population is similar to that of our neighboring state, XYZ, we have chosen to use their state PE standards. Specifically, our project will focus on state standard 1, Movement, which states that students will...*)

You may not substitute national standards.

Most states and territories have established minimum physical education requirements. In recent years, several states have begun to reevaluate their standards to ensure that they are designed to address major components of a high quality physical education program. In developing their own standards, states have looked to national and other existing state standards for guidance. Below is a link to a website that may provide your State's standards. Please note, this is not a U.S. Department of Education website and we cannot ensure its accuracy. Also, all states may not be represented on this website. Please contact your State Educational Agency if you have additional questions about your PE state standards or would like to affirm their accuracy.

Standards for most states are available at [www.pelinks4u.org/links/statestandards.htm](http://www.pelinks4u.org/links/statestandards.htm).

*(Invitational Priority)*

### **Healthier US Challenge, USDA**

The Healthier US School Challenge (HUSSC) was established to recognize schools that are creating healthier school environments through their promotion of good nutrition and physical activity. Four levels of superior performance are awarded: Bronze, Silver, Gold, and Gold of Distinction ( <http://www.fns.usda.gov/tn/HealthierUS/index.html>).

*(Competitive Preference 1)*

### **Body Mass Index (BMI) Data Collection**

Information regarding BMI for schools may be attained online via the CDC website. This website offers general information regarding BMI as it relates to children and teens ([http://www.cdc.gov/healthyweight/assessing/bmi/childrens\\_bmi/about\\_childrens\\_bmi.html](http://www.cdc.gov/healthyweight/assessing/bmi/childrens_bmi/about_childrens_bmi.html) ) as well as tools to use for younger children ([http://www.cdc.gov/healthyweight/assessing/bmi/childrens\\_bmi/tool\\_for\\_schools.html](http://www.cdc.gov/healthyweight/assessing/bmi/childrens_bmi/tool_for_schools.html) ).

*(Requirement 1-- School and Community Needs Assessments)*

### **School Health Index (SHI)**

The SHI is a self-assessment tool developed by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) to help schools identify gaps in policies and programs designed to enhance and promote student health. Based on the CDC's eight-component Coordinated School Health Program Model, the SHI highlights the importance of involving all eight components, which can have a powerful impact on student health behaviors.

In FY 2010, PEP applicants are required to undertake Modules 1-4 of the SHI self-assessment tool as part of their applications and to develop project goals and plans that address the identified needs. Modules 1-4 are School Health and Safety Policies and Environment, Health Education, Physical Activity and Other Physical Activity Programs, and Nutrition Services. LEA applicants must use the SHI self-assessment to develop a School Health Improvement Plan focused on improving these issues, and design an initiative that addresses their identified gaps and weaknesses. Applicants must include their Overall Score Card for the questions answered in Modules 1-4 in their application, and correlate their School Health Improvement Plan to their project design. Grantees must also complete the same modules of the SHI at the end of the project period and submit the Overall Score Card from the second assessment in their final reports to demonstrate SHI completion and program improvement as a result of PEP funding.

If a CBO applicant (unless the CBO is a school) is in a partner agreement with an LEA or school, it must collaborate with its partner or partners to complete Modules 1-4 of the SHI.

The SHI is available for no cost and undertaking all eight modules of the assessment process can be completed in as little as six hours. The SHI is available online in an interactive and customizable format as well as a paper format. More information on the SHI can be found at [www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth](http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth) .

If the CBO has not identified a school or LEA partner, the CBO is not required to do Modules 1-4 of the SHI but must use an alternative needs assessment tool to assess the nutrition and physical activity environment in the community for children. CBO applicants are required to include their overall findings from the community needs assessment and correlate their findings with their project design. Grantees will be required to complete the same needs assessment at the end of their project and submit their findings in their final reports to demonstrate the completion of the assessment and program involvement as a result of PEP funding.

### **Other Community Needs Assessments**

Several entities, including state and local health departments, offer community-level needs assessments that CBOs might consider to assess their community's gaps and weaknesses and to design a program accordingly. For example, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention recently released the Community Health Assessment And Group Evaluation (CHANGE) tool. This tool and corresponding action plan can be used to:

- Gain a picture of the policy, systems, and environmental change strategies currently in place throughout the community;
- Develop a community action plan for improving policies, systems, and the environment to facilitate and support healthy lifestyles; and
- Assist with prioritizing community needs and allocating available resources.

Although the features above are specific to the CHANGE tool, its characteristics describe basic features that any community assessment should have in addition to:

- Assessing the community's legal and policy landscape;
- Considering the potential for enforcement and incentive mechanisms available to ensure that efforts will be adopted and sustained over time; and
- Is a validated instrument.

More information on the CHANGE tool can be found at <http://www.cdc.gov/healthycommunitiesprogram/tools/change.htm>. Two additional assessment tools that applicants may consider are:

- The YMCA's Community Healthy Living Index, which also has improvement planning tools (<http://www.ymca.net/communityhealthylivingindex/>); and
- The Alliance for a Healthier Generations Healthy Schools Inventory, which assesses school environments across eight content areas and includes prioritization and action planning tools ([www.healthiergeneration.org/schools](http://www.healthiergeneration.org/schools)). Applicants would also need to consider how this tool is associated with community efforts.

*(Requirement 2 -- Nutrition-and Physical Activity-Related Policies)*

This requirement only requires that grantees address policies relevant to their settings and needs. Applicants must describe their current policy framework and the process they plan to use to review, develop, implement, and monitor policies. The purpose of this requirement is to ensure that PEP grantees carefully consider the role of policy development and implementation in creating comprehensive PEP projects, and that they commit to making policy changes that support improvements in the areas of physical activity and nutrition during the project period of the PEP grant. Policy changes are also likely key to institutionalizing and sustaining progress made during a PEP project.

We believe that examining the policy framework in which projects are implemented will help grantees identify needed changes that can remove impediments to, or provide incentives for, enhanced physical education or improved nutrition outcomes. We do not expect grantees to address policies that are outside their authorized mission or scope. Also, we do not specify which particular policies that must be developed, reviewed, and potentially revised, but rather applicants should identify the nutrition- and physical activity-related policies to be developed, updated, or enhanced by grantees during the PEP grant.

More information on a range of school- and community-level policy interventions is widely available. These policies have been correlated with the adoption of comprehensive programs. Examples of policies that might enhance the applicant's program include, but are not limited to:

- Staffing policies that enable a physical educator to coordinate, plan, and direct the comprehensive program related to all physical activity efforts in the school, including those related to policy;

- Integrating physical activity in to the classroom to foster learning and increase children's physical activity;
- Removing barriers to enable children to walk or bike to school or in the community;
- Encouraging time for recess;
- Developing and implementing joint-use agreements for use of facilities or equipment between schools and communities or community groups;
- Providing supervision of play areas during out of school time for the target audience;
- Altering bus schedules to facilitate after-school program participation;
- Establishing time requirements for PE;
- Requiring certification and professional development for PE teachers;
- Setting class size limits; and
- Reviewing the use of waivers that allow student to opt out of PE class.

Policies that might encourage students to eat more healthy foods in and out of school might include, but are not limited to:

- Limiting the type of "competitive foods" sold at school (foods or beverages sold at school separately from school meal programs);
- Food placement and pricing in cafeterias;
- Vending machines and food sold as fundraisers;
- Developing partnerships with farms or farmers' markets;
- Adopting the recent Institute of Medicine recommendations for school meals that include fruits, vegetables, whole grains, and low-fat dairy products; and
- Creating school or community gardens.

For more information on policy interventions, including ideas on how to develop, enhance, build support for, and implement policies, please see:

- The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's Division of School Health: [www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth](http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth)
- The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation's Childhood Obesity Program: <http://www.rwjf.org/childhoodobesity/index.jsp>
- The Alliance for a Healthier Generation: <http://www.healthiergeneration.org/>
- The National Policy and Legal Analysis Network to Prevent Childhood Obesity: <http://www.nplanonline.org/>
- Action for Healthy Kids: [www.actionforhealthykids.org](http://www.actionforhealthykids.org)
- National Center for Safe Routes to Schools: <http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/>
- National Association of State Boards of Education's School Obesity Policy Report: <http://www.nasbe.org/index.php/pub-archive/nasbe-pr/983-nasbe-releases-school-obesity-policy-report>.

This list is not exhaustive and does not represent all possible policies or available resources!

*(Requirement 3--Local Wellness Policies)*

Public Law 108-265 determined that each local educational agency participating in a program authorized by the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq) or the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 (42 U.S.C. 1771 et seq) shall establish a local school wellness policy by School Year 2006.

For more information regarding local wellness policies, you may visit:  
<http://www.fns.usda.gov/tn/Healthy/wellnesspolicy.html>.

Action for Healthy Kids' Wellness Policy Tool may also be useful:  
<http://www.actionforhealthykids.org/school-programs/our-programs/wellness-policy-tool/>.

*(Requirement 4 --Related Federal, State, and Local Initiatives)*

### Team Nutrition

Team Nutrition is an initiative of the USDA Food and Nutrition Service to support the Child Nutrition Programs through training and technical assistance for foodservice, nutrition education for children and their caregivers, and school and community support for healthy eating and physical activity. For more information, please see: <http://teamnutrition.usda.gov/>.

### **Coordinated School Health Program**

The CDC's Coordinated School Health Program is a framework that integrates the basic, minimum components necessary for promoting the health and safety of students in schools. There are eight components of the Coordinated School Health Program: (1) Health Education; (2) Physical Education; (3) Health Services; (4) Nutrition Services; (5) Counseling and Physiological Services; (6) Healthy School Environments; (7) Health Promotion for Staff; and (8) Family and Community Involvement.

In FY 2010, PEP grantees are required to align their projects with their Coordinated School Health Program, if this is being implemented in their school or district. For more information on Coordinated School Health, please see: <http://www.cdc.gov/healthyouth>.

### **Communities Putting Prevention to Work—Communities Initiative**

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services has provided funds to local public health department to create community-level interventions to address obesity trends in both children and adults. This initiative funded under the American Recovery and reinvestment Act focused on developing and promoting partnerships, programmatic support, community mentoring, and evaluation to achieve the following prevention outcomes: (1) Increased levels of physical activity; (2) improved nutrition; (3) decreased overweight/obesity prevalence; (4) decreased smoking prevalence and decreasing teen smoking initiation; and (5) decreased exposure to second-hand smoke.

Because of the complementary nature of the goals of PEP and the Communities Putting Prevention to Work (CPPW) grants, communities that receive both grants must coordinate both efforts to avoid duplication and redundancy and to ensure that efforts are complimentary.

More information on CPPW, including a list of communities that have received a CPPW grant award, can be found at: [www.cdc.gov/chronicdisease/recovery/community.htm](http://www.cdc.gov/chronicdisease/recovery/community.htm).

### **Other Initiatives**

Grantees are also required to coordinate with other complementary initiatives, including but not limited to the following:

- Alliance for a Healthier Generation: <http://www.healthiergeneration.org>;
- Farm-to-School: <http://www.farmtoschool.org>;

- YMCA's Pioneering Healthier Communities: <http://www.ymca.net/activateamerica/>; and
- Action for Healthy Kids State or local teams: <http://www.actionforhealthykids.org>.

*(Requirement 5 --Physical Education and Nutrition Instruction Curricula)*

### **Physical Education Curriculum Analysis Tool (PECAT)**

The PECAT assists school districts conduct clear and comprehensive analyses of written physical education curricula. While it is based on national Standard, it may be customized to include local standards. For more information related to the PECAT, applicants should visit: <http://www.cdc.gov/healthyouth/pecat/>.

### **Health Education Curriculum Analysis Tool (HECAT)**

The HECAT is a tool designed to assist agencies conduct a clear, complete, and consistent analysis of health education curricula based on the National Health Education Standards and CDC's Characteristics of Effective Health Education Curricula. The HECAT can be customized to meet local community needs and conform to the curriculum requirements of the state or school district. Additional information on the HECAT may be found at: <http://www.cdc.gov/healthyouth/HECAT/index.htm>.

Applicants must use the PECAT and HECAT if they are proposing to change, enhance, or update curriculum for PE or nutrition instruction. Applicants can undertake the HECAT and PECAT as part of the application process to determine their best course of action. Alternatively, applicants may describe how and when they plan to undertake the PECAT and HECAT as a part of their project.

*(Requirement 9 --Performance Measures and Data Collection Methodology)*

### **Pedometers**

Although grantees are required to use pedometers to assess the percentage of students who are active for 60 minutes every day, grantees may select the specific pedometer to best meet the needs of their target population. In considering which pedometers to purchase, grantees should consider pedometers that:

- Provide a minimum of accumulated steps as the data output;
- Show step data that are either: a) aggregated since the last manual reset of the pedometer; or b) automatically aggregated daily by the pedometer;
- Have scientific research that indicates it is a reliable and valid measurement tool. Ideal measurement error is +/- 3% for steps taken;
- Have available straps that secure the pedometer to the waistband or belt loop; and
- Have can be easily sealed or closed with a plastic band that does not allow students to open it (if desired and applicable).

### **Nutrition Assessment for Elementary and Middle School Students**

We are not requiring that grantees use specific measurement tools for elementary and middle school students to assess their nutritional intake. We opted to not require a specific tool because we are not aware of any available tools that are free and publicly accessible, would provide valid and reliable data for elementary and middle school students, and that are not associated with commercial products or curriculum, which the Department is prohibited from endorsing. Below are factors that applicants may consider when selecting appropriate data collection tool to assess on the percentage of elementary and middle school students who

consumed fruit two or more times per day and vegetables three or more times per day.

Assessment instruments should:

- Estimate 'usual intake' (some sort of food frequency questionnaire is better than a single 24 hour recall for this);
- Be a tool that students can fill out themselves in the classroom (i.e. not an instrument that requires trained interviewers like a 24 hr recall);
- Be fairly easy to score/code (not a diet record);
- Be most like a "food frequency" questionnaire, screening tool, or checklist;
- Be available in multiple languages especially English and Spanish;
- Be written using age-appropriate language;
- Include graphics to help describe foods;
- Have a reference period that is reasonable for children or adolescents to remember (either "what did you eat yesterday", or "what did you eat within the last week" for older children and adolescents); and
- Be considered a valid and reliable instrument for the population with same demographics as the study population.

## Priorities and Application Requirements

**Absolute Priority:** Under an absolute priority, we consider only applications that meet the priority (34 CFR 75.105(c)(3)). The absolute priorities for this program require that an applicant propose a program that will address its State's physical education standards and develop, expand, or improve its physical education program for students kindergarten through grade 12 by undertaking the following activities:

- (1) instruction in healthy eating habits and good nutrition and
- (2) physical fitness activities that must include at least one of the following:
  - (a) fitness education and assessment to help students understand, improve, or maintain their physical well-being;
  - (b) instruction in a variety of motor skills and physical activities designed to enhance the physical, mental, and social or emotional development of every student;
  - (c) development of, and instruction in, cognitive concepts about motor skills and physical fitness that support a lifelong healthy lifestyle;
  - (d) opportunities to develop positive social and cooperative skills through physical activity participation; or
  - (e) opportunities for professional development for teachers of physical education to stay abreast of the latest research, issues, and trends in the field of physical education.

***Note: Applicants that fail to meet this priority will be considered ineligible and not considered for funding.***

**Competitive Priority:** Under a competitive preference priority, we give competitive preference to an application by (1) awarding additional points, (34 CFR 75.105(c)(2)(i)) to an application that meets one or both of the priorities. There are two competitive priorities for this program. They are as follows:

### Competitive Preference Priority #1 -- Collection of Body Mass Index Measurement. (2 additional points)

We will give competitive preference priority to applicants that agree to implement aggregate BMI data collection, and use it as part of a comprehensive assessment of health and fitness for the purposes of monitoring the weight status of their student population across time. Applicants electing to address this priority are required to include a signed a Program-Specific Assurance committing them to:

- (1) Use the CDC's BMI-for-age growth charts to interpret BMI results ([www.cdc.gov/growthcharts](http://www.cdc.gov/growthcharts));
- (2) Create a plan to develop and implement a protocol to include parents in the development of their BMI assessment and data collection policies, including a mechanism to allow parents to provide feedback on the policy. Applicants should detail the proposed method for measuring BMI; who would perform the BMI assessment (i.e., staff members trained to obtain accurate and reliable height and weight measurements); the frequency of reporting; the planned equipment to be used; methods for calculating the planned sampling frame (if the applicant would use sampling); the policies used to ensure student privacy during measurement; how the data would be secured to protect student confidentiality; who would have access to the data; how long the data will be kept; and what will happen to the data after that time. Applicants that intend to inform parents of their student's weight status must include plans for notifying parents of that

status, and must include their plan for ensuring that resources are available for safe and effective follow-up with trained medical care providers;

(3) Create a plan to notify parents of the BMI assessment and to allow parents to opt out of the BMI assessment and reasonable notification of their choice to opt out. Unless the BMI assessment is permitted or required by State law, LEA applicants would be required to detail their policies for providing reasonable notice of the adoption or continued use of such policies directly to the parents of the students enrolled in the LEA's schools served by the agency. At a minimum, the LEA would have to provide such notice at least annually, at the beginning of the school year and within a reasonable period of time after any substantive change in such policies, pursuant to the Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment, 20 U.S.C. Section 1232h(c)(2)(A); and

(4) De-identify the student information (such as by removing the student's name and any identifying information from the record and assigning a record code), aggregate the BMI data to the school or district level, and make the aggregate data publicly available and easily accessible to the public annually. Applicants need to describe their plan for the level of reporting they plan to use, depending on the size of the population, such as at the district level or the school level. Applicants should also be required to detail in their application their plan for how these data will be used in coordination with other required data for the program, such as fitness, physical activity, and nutritional intake measures, and how the combination of these measures will be used to improve physical education programming and policy.

*Note: On June 18, 1991, 17 Federal Departments and Agencies, including the Department of Education, adopted a common set of regulations known as the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects or "Common Rule." See 34 CFR Part 97. Applicants that engage in BMI data collection may be subject to the U.S. Department of Education's Protection of Human Subjects regulations if the data are used in research funded by the Federal government or for any future research conducted by an institution that has adopted the Federal policy for all research of that institution. The regulations define research as "a systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge. Activities which meet this definition constitute research for purposes of this policy, whether or not they are conducted or supported under a program which is considered research for other purposes. For example, some demonstration and service programs may include research activities." 34 CFR 97.102(d). Information on Human Subjects requirements is found at: <http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocfo/humansub.html>.*

**Note: Applications that do not provide a Program-Specific Assurance signed by an Authorized Representative committing the applicant to completing all four of the tasks above during their project period will not be eligible for competitive preference points.**

**Competitive Preference Priority #2-- Partnerships Between Applicants and Supporting Community Entities (3 additional points)**

We will give competitive preference priority to an applicant that includes in its application an agreement that details the participation of required partners. For an LEA applicant, required partners include:

- (A) the LEA;
- (B) at least one CBO;
- (C) a local public health entity, as defined in this notice;

- (D) the LEA's food service or child nutrition director; and
- (E) the head of the local government, as defined in this notice.

For a CBO applicant, the required partners include:

- (A) the CBO;
- (B) a local public health entity, as defined in this notice;
- (C) a local organization supporting nutrition or healthy eating, as defined in this notice;
- (D) the head of the local government, as defined in this notice; and
- (E) the LEA from which the largest number of students expected to participate in the CBO's project attend.

If the CBO applicant is a school, such as a parochial or other private school, the applicant needs to describe its school as part of the partnership agreement but is not required to provide an additional signature from a different LEA or school. A CBO applicant that is a school and serves its own population of students is required also to include another community CBO as part of its partnership and include the head of that CBO as a signatory on the partnership agreement. Applicants electing to address this priority are required to include a description of:

- (1) each partner's roles and responsibilities in the project;
- (2) if and how each partner will contribute to the project, including any contribution to the local match;
- (3) an assurance that the application was developed after timely and meaningful consultation between the required parties, as defined in this notice; and
- (4) a commitment to work together to reach the desired goals and outcomes of the project. The partner agreement would be required to be signed by the Authorized Representative of each of the required partners and by other partners as available and appropriate.

Please note that although partnerships with other parties are required to meet this priority, the eligible applicant will retain the administrative and fiscal control of the project.

***Note: Applications that do not provide a clear description partnership that addresses all four of the elements above will not be eligible for competitive preference points.***

### **Application Requirements:**

#### **Matching Requirement**

Federal grant funds may be used to pay for no more than 90 percent of total cost of the project in the first year and no more than 75 percent of the total cost of the project in each subsequent year. Therefore, applicants should determine the total cost of the program prior to requesting federal funds. For example, if the total cost of your program in year one is \$100,000; you may request grant funds in the amount of \$90,000 (90% of total cost). You would then be required to supply the additional \$10,000 as a match. If the total cost of your program in each subsequent year is \$100,000; you may request grant funds in the amount of \$75,000 (75% of the total cost) and would be then be required to supply the additional \$25,000 as a match.

In an effort to assist you in calculating your required matching cost, we have provided the following formulas:

- **Year One Formula:**

Requested Grant Amount X .10 (matching %)

---

.90 (Federal share %)

= Your Required Match

■ Subsequent Years Formula:

Requested Grant Amount X .25 (matching %)

---

.75 (Federal share %)

= Your Required Match

For additional information on the matching requirement, please see the “Frequently Asked Questions” section.

Administrative Cost Limitation

Administrative costs charged to the grant may not exceed five percent of the grant award in any fiscal year.

Aligning Project Goals with Identified Needs Using the School Health Index

Applicants are required to complete the physical activity and nutrition questions in Modules 1-4 of the CDC’s School Health Index(SHI)self-assessment tool or *use an alternative needs assessment tool to develop project goals and plans that address the identified needs*. For more information on the CDC’s SHI please refer to page 20 of this application. If a CBO applicant (unless the CBO is a school) is in a partner agreement with an LEA or school, the CBO is required to collaborate with its partner or partners to complete modules 1-4 of the SHI. Alternatively, if the CBO has not identified a school or LEA partner, the CBO is required to use an alternative needs assessment tool to assess the nutrition and physical activity environment in the community for children. Grantees will be required to complete the same needs assessment at the end of their project and submit their findings in their final reports to demonstrate the completion of the assessment and program involvement as a result of PEP funding.

Nutrition- and Physical Activity-Related Policies

Grantees are required to develop, update, or enhance physical activity policies and food- and nutrition-related policies that promote healthy eating and physical activity throughout students’ everyday lives, as part of their PEP projects. Applicants are required to sign a Program-Specific Assurance that commits them to developing, updating, or enhancing these policies during the project period. Applicants that do not submit such a Program-Specific Assurance signed by the applicant’s Authorized Representative will be ineligible for this competition. Applicants should describe in their application their current policy framework, areas of focus, and the planned process for policy development, implementation, review, and monitoring. Grantees will be required to detail at the end of their project period in their final reports the physical activity and nutrition policies selected and how the policies improved through the course of the project.

Linkage with Local Wellness Policies

Applicants participating in a program authorized by the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act or the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 must describe in their applications their school

district's established local wellness policy and how the proposed PEP project will align with and support, complement, and enhance the implementation of the applicant's local wellness policy. An LEA's local wellness policy should address all requirements in the Child Nutrition Act of 2004. A CBO applicant must describe in their applications how their proposed projects will enhance or support the intent of the local wellness policies of their LEA partner(s), if they are working in a partnership.

Applicants are required to sign a Program-Specific Assurance that commits them to align their PEP project with the district's Local Wellness Policy, if applicable. **Applicants that do not submit a Program Specific Assurance signed by the applicant's Authorized Representative will be ineligible for the competition.** If neither the applicant nor any member of its partnership participates in the school lunch program authorized by the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act or the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, it would not necessarily have a local wellness policy and, thus, will not be required to meet this requirement or adopt a local wellness policy. However, we encourage such applicants to develop and adopt a local wellness policy, consistent with the provisions in the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act or the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 in conjunction with its PEP project.

#### Linkages with Federal, State, and Local Initiatives

If an applicant is implementing the CDC's Coordinated School Health program, it is required to coordinate project activities with that initiative and describe in its application how the proposed PEP project will be coordinated and integrated with the program. If an applicant receives funding under the USDA's Team Nutrition initiative (Team Nutrition Training Grants), the applicant must describe in its application how the proposed PEP project supports the efforts of this initiative.

A PEP project in a community that receives a grant under the Recovery Act Communities Putting Prevention to Work—Community Initiative must agree to coordinate its PEP project efforts with those under the Recovery Act Communities Putting Prevention to Work-Community Initiative.

Applicants and PEP-funded projects must complement, rather than duplicate, existing, ongoing or new efforts whose goals and objectives are to promote physical activity and healthy eating or help students meet their State standards for physical education.

Applicants are required to sign a Program-Specific Assurance that commits them to align their PEP project with the Coordinated School Health program, Team Nutrition Training Grant, Recovery Act Communities Putting Prevention to Work- Community Initiative, or any other similar Federal, State, or local initiatives. **Applicants that do not submit a Program Specific Assurance signed by the applicant's Authorized Representative will be ineligible for the competition.**

#### Updates to Physical Education and Nutrition Instruction Curricula

Applicants that plan to use grant-related funds, including Federal and non-Federal matching funds, to create, update, or enhance their physical education or nutrition education curricula are required to use the Physical Education Curriculum Analysis Tool (PECAT) and submit their overall PECAT scorecard, and the curriculum improvement plan from PECAT. Applicants that plan to use grant-related funds, including Federal and non-Federal matching funds to create, update, or enhance their nutrition instruction in health education are required to complete the healthy eating module of the Health Education Curriculum Analysis Tool (HECAT). Applicants must use the curriculum improvement plan from the PECAT to identify curricular changes to be

addressed during the funding period. Applicants must also describe how the HECAT assessment would be used to guide nutrition instruction curricular changes. If an applicant is not proposing to use grant-related funds for physical education or nutrition instruction curricula, it will not need to use these tools. For more information on HECAT and PECAT, please see page 24 of the application.

#### Equipment Purchases

Purchases of equipment with PEP funds or related to grant activities (including equipment purchased with funds offered to meet the program's matching requirement) must be aligned with the curricular components of the applicant's physical education and nutrition program. Applicants must commit to aligning the students' use of the equipment with PEP elements applicable to their projects, identified in priority 1, and any applicable curricula by signing a Program Specific Assurance. ***Applicants that do not submit a Program Specific Assurance signed by the applicant's Authorized Representative will be ineligible for the competition.***

#### Increasing Transparency and Accountability

Grantees must create or use existing reporting mechanisms to provide information on students' progress, in the aggregate, on the key program indicators, as described in this notice and required under the Government Performance and Results Act, as well as on any unique project-level measures proposed in the application. Grantees that are educational agencies or institutions are subject to applicable Federal, State, and local privacy provisions, including the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act -- a law that generally prohibits the non-consensual disclosure of personally identifiable information in a student's education record. All grantees must comply with applicable Federal, State, and local privacy provisions. The aggregate-level information should be easily accessible by the public, such as posted on the grantee's or a partner's Web site. Applicants are required to describe in their application the planned method for reporting. Applicants must commit to reporting information to the public, including parents of students under 18 years old, by signing a Program Specific Assurance. ***Applicants that do not submit a Program Specific Assurance signed by the applicant's Authorized Representative will be ineligible for the competition.***

#### Participation in a National Evaluation

The applicant must provide documentation of its commitment to participate in the U.S. Department of Education's evaluation. An LEA applicant must include a letter from the research office or research board approving its participation in the evaluation (if approval is needed), and a letter from the Authorized Representative agreeing to participate in the evaluation.

#### Required Performance Measures and Data Collection Methodology

Grantees are required to collect and report data on three GPRA measures using uniform data collection methods. For each measure, grantees would be required to collect and aggregate data from four discrete data collection periods throughout each year. If baseline data for these measures are not included in the application, grantees would have an additional data collection period in their first year of operation prior to program implementation to collect baseline data. For more information on GPRA for this program refer to page 17-18 of this application.

#### Supplement, Not Supplant

Grant funds awarded must be used to supplement and not supplant other Federal, State, and local funds available for physical education activities.

#### Restricted Indirect Cost Rate

Under the supplement, not supplant provision, in accordance with section 75.563 of EDGAR, applicants are also required to use a restricted indirect cost rate, as computed under sections 75.563 - 75.569. If you claim indirect costs, please provide documentation of your negotiated restricted indirect cost rate.

Special Rule

Grant funds may not be used to support extracurricular activities, such as team sports and the Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) program activities.

Private School and Home-Schooled Students

Home-schooled students, their parents, and teachers, or students enrolled in private nonprofit elementary or secondary schools, their parents and teachers, may participate in activities funded through the PEP grant. Applicants are not required to propose services for these groups.

## Selection Criteria

### **(A) Need for Project. (10 Points)**

In determining the need for the proposed project, we will consider the following factor:

**(1) The extent to which specific gaps or weaknesses in services, infrastructure, or opportunities have been identified and will be addressed by the proposed project, including the nature and magnitude of those gaps or weaknesses. (10 Points)**

(Note: Under this criterion, you should discuss specific gaps and weaknesses of your current program in helping students meet the priority. You should clearly and specifically identify **one or more State standards** and describe how the proposed program will help students meet the identified standard(s).

Also, in this section, you should discuss the outcomes of the self-assessment and how the results will help you develop a program to improve gaps or weaknesses. You may choose to describe the target population to be served; but, responsiveness to this criterion will be assessed based on the discussion of programmatic gaps or weaknesses relative to specific state standards and identified programmatic needs. If you choose to discuss the target population, you should provide statistics that are relevant to the specific community rather than broad, national statistics, unless these data are being used for comparison purposes.)

### **(B) Quality of the Project Design. (50 Points)**

In determining the quality of the design of the proposed project, we will consider the following factors:

**(1) The extent to which the goals, objectives, and outcomes to be achieved by the proposed project are clearly specified and measurable. (10 Points)**

(Note: Under this criterion, you should articulate your program's goals, objectives, and outcomes and how they will be measured and assessed throughout the project. You should describe how the planned activities meet the goals and objectives of the program, as well as clearly correlate those goals and objectives to the needs identified through the self-assessment process.)

**(2) The extent to which the design is appropriate to and will successfully address the needs of the target population or other identified needs. (15 points)**

(Note: Under this criterion, you should discuss your program design and how it will help meet needs of your specific population as identified through your self assessment. You should describe your plan for implementation including plans for program services, professional development, updates to curriculum, and other features of the program that contribute to a coherent project design. You may also use this section to describe your plans for integrating the PEP Requirements, as detailed in our Notice Inviting Applications, into your design.)

**(3) The extent to which the proposed project is designed to build capacity and yield results that will extend beyond the period of Federal financial assistance. (10 Points)**

(Note: Under this criterion, you should clearly demonstrate a process or plan for enhancing sustainability beyond the Federally-funded grant period.)

**(4) The extent to which the proposed project will be coordinated with similar or related efforts, and with other appropriate community, State, and Federal resources. (15 Points)**

(Note: Under this criterion, you should describe how your proposed project is coordinated with similar efforts at the Federal, state, and local levels most applicable to the community. You should address the coordination between PEP and the specific programs delineated in Requirements 3 and 4 of this program, as well as plans to align with and support, complement, and enhance the implementation of other related programs. A PEP project should complement, rather than duplicate, existing, ongoing or new efforts whose goals and objectives are to promote physical activity and healthy eating or help students meet their State standards for physical education.)

**(C) Quality of the Management Plan. (15 Points)**

In determining the quality of the management plan for the proposed project, we will consider the following factor:

**(1) The adequacy of the management plan to achieve the objectives of the proposed project on time and within budget, including clearly defined responsibilities, timelines, and milestones for accomplishing project tasks. (15 Points)**

(Note: You should clearly detail the management plan, including who will manage and operate the various facets of the program. Although you should define the roles and responsibilities related to management and implementation teams, you may not necessarily have staff already in mind for those positions and should describe only the necessary competencies that those professional staff should possess to carry out those roles. You should begin your timeline for the project in October, 2010.)

**(D) Quality of the Project Evaluation. (25 Points)**

In determining the quality of the evaluation, we will consider the following factors:

**(1) The extent to which the methods of evaluation are thorough, feasible, and appropriate to the goals, objectives, and outcomes of the proposed project. (15 Points)**

(Note: In response to this sub-criterion, you should address the required GPRA measures, as well as any additional project-specific measures. You may describe the general framework for the evaluation and describe the evaluation methods in response to this sub-criterion. The evaluation framework should describe broad approaches to the evaluation, rather than a description of how individual students will be assessed during the program. Although individual student assessments may provide data points for program measures, these individual assessments alone do not constitute an evaluation plan.)

**(2) The extent to which the methods of evaluation will provide performance feedback and permit periodic assessment of progress toward achieving intended outcomes. (10 Points)**

(Note: In response to this sub-criterion, you may describe your plan for collecting and using data for process and ongoing quality improvement. This data plan would include, but is not limited to, the methods that project management would use to collect, analyze, and apply the data to the project implementation. Please note that although funds may be used to hire an external evaluator to assist with this process, an external evaluator is **not** required.)

## FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

### General

- What is the deadline date for transmittal of applications under this grant competition?
- May I get an extension of the deadline date?
- When will grant awards be announced?
- Is this a multi-year grant program?
- How many new awards will be made?
- What steps can I take to maximize my chances of receiving a grant?
- This competition has a “supplement, not supplant” provision. What does this mean?
- What is an indirect cost rate?
- How do I obtain a negotiated, restricted indirect cost rate?
- Who in my organization may be able to provide information about our negotiated, restricted indirect cost rate?
- For my GEPA 427 statement, is it adequate to state that our organization does not discriminate on the basis of race, religion, sex, etc.?
- What should I use as the project start date?
- Do I have to get bids for goods and services under this grant?
- What is the project and budget period for these grants?
- May I use another district’s application as a model for my submission?
- Who do I contact for more information about this grant competition?

### Electronic Applications

- How do I submit my grant electronically?
- Do I have to submit my application electronically?
- How do I register to submit my grant electronically?
- How should I submit forms with signatures?
- Are there any compatibility restrictions, especially if I use Microsoft Vista?
- Are there any restrictions on the file name length or size of the document?

### Eligibility

- Who is eligible to apply?
- May I submit an application on behalf of my local school?
- My college or university would like to apply for this grant. Are we eligible?
- Are charter schools eligible for this program?
- Are Area Educational Districts or other similar entities eligible for this program?
- My organization currently has a PEP grant. Are we eligible to apply for another PEP grant under this competition?
- If we are on a no-cost extension for our current PEP grant, may we end early so that we can be eligible to apply this year?
- What are some of the circumstances that might cause a grant application to be deemed ineligible for review?

### **Program-Specific Content**

- May I use *only* national data to support the need for a grant in my district?
- If my state does not have physical education standards, what should I do?
- Will this grant pay for hiring project staff?
- Are we required to hire an external evaluator?
- Should we include resumes for key staff?
- May staff or community members regularly use equipment purchased with grant funds?
- Will the PEP grant support implementation of a general health education curriculum?
- Are we required to provide baseline GPRA data?

### **Absolute Priority**

- What program elements must we address?
- Must we measure Body Mass Index (BMI) as part of this project?
- We want to measure percentage of body fat *in addition to* BMI. Is that allowed?
- Where can we get more information about BMI measurement?
- Where can we find more information about how to measure students correctly for BMI?
- What must we do to receive the partnerships competitive preference?
- Which organizations must be included in an LEA's partnership agreement in order to receive the competitive preference?
- Which organizations must be included in a CBO's partnership agreement in order to receive the competitive preference?
- Are we required to complete the School Health Index (SHI) as part of our application?
- If we are a CBO, are we required to complete the School Health Index (SHI) as part of our application?
- After we've completed the School Health Index (SHI), what are the next steps?
- Will there be other School Health Index (SHI) requirements if we are selected as a PEP Grantee?
- Where can we get additional information about the School Health Index (SHI)?
- What is the PEP application requirement for nutrition and physical activity related policies?
- How can a PEP applicant identify nutrition and physical activity policy interventions?
- Will there be other nutrition and physical activity related policy requirements if we are selected as a PEP Grantee?
- What is a local wellness policy?
- What is the PEP grant requirement for linkages with local wellness policies?
- Where can we get information about CDC's Coordinated School Health Program?
- Where can we get information about USDA's Team Nutrition Initiative?
- Where can we get information about HHS' Communities Putting Prevention to Work Initiative?
- Are there other Federal, state, and local nutrition and physical activity initiatives with which an applicant should coordinate?
- What is the Physical Education Curriculum Analysis Tool (PECAT)?

- What is the PEP grant requirement for using the PECAT?
- What is the Health Education Curriculum Analysis Tool (HECAT)?
- What is the PEP grant requirement for using the HECAT?
- If we are proposing to create, update, or enhance my nutrition instruction with PEP grant funds, must we complete the entire HECAT?
- Will the PEP grant support implementation of a general health education curriculum?
- Is it required that PEP applicants use the PECAT/HECAT?
- Where can we get more information about the PECAT?
- Where can we get more information about the HECAT?
- What kinds of equipment may we propose to purchase with PEP grant funds?
- Are PEP applicants able to propose equipment purchases related to any of the six program elements identified in the absolute priority?
- What is the PEP grant requirement for increasing transparency and accountability?
- Would privacy provisions apply to the release of information described in this requirement?
- If we receive the grant, would I be required to participate in the national evaluation?
- What is required in the application to indicate participation in the national evaluation?
- How long will the national evaluation last?
- How many GPRA performance measures are required for this program?
- Are there specific data collection methodologies for the GPRA measures?
- Our program would like to use other measures *instead of* the three GPRA performance measures. Is that allowed?
- Our program would like to use other measures *in addition to* the three GPRA performance measures. Is that allowed?
- Are we required to provide baseline GPRA data?
- How often will grantees collect data on these measures?
- Am I required to include the use of pedometers in my application?
- Are pedometers the only measurement tool required to be used for this measure with older students?
- Where can I find additional information about the 3DPAR instrument?
- Our program would like to use heart rate monitors *instead of* pedometers. Is that allowed?
- Our program would like to use heart rate monitors *in addition to* pedometers. Is that allowed?
- Are pedometers able to accurately record children's physical activity?
  - What is the 20-meter shuttle run?
- Our program would like to use heart rate monitors *instead of* the 20-meter shuttle run. Is that allowed?
- Our program would like to use heart rate monitors *in addition to* the 20-meter shuttle run. Is that allowed?
  - Our program will serve high school students. What measurement tool should we use for the third GPRA measure that assesses fruit and vegetable consumption?
- Where can I find the fruit- and vegetable-related questions from CDC's YRBS?

- **How should I assess my elementary and middle school students?**

#### **Program-Specific Budget**

- **Is there a minimum or maximum amount that may be requested to support a project?**
  - **May grant funds be used to support professional development activities?**
  - **Do we need to submit a budget narrative for each year?**
  - **How much detail should be included in the budget narrative?**
  - **Where can we find guidance on developing a budget narrative?**
  - **Is there a match requirement for this program?**
  - **Are there certain items that cannot be purchased with grant or matching funds?**
  - **Does the in-kind match have to be in cash? What types of resources may be used as the required match?**
  - **Can the match include volunteered time or the value of existing equipment?**
  - **Can the match include the rental value of facilities?**
  - **Is there a cap on administrative costs?**
  - **May we use the funds for construction, such as building a gymnasium or other facility or to purchase land or building or another facility?**
  - **May we charge students activity fees?**
- 
-

## **General**

### **What is the deadline date for transmittal of applications under this grant competition?**

July 19, 2010.

### **May I get an extension of the deadline date?**

Waivers for individual applications failing to meet the deadline will not be granted, except in the circumstances described in the Federal Register notice. Under very extraordinary circumstances the Department may change the closing date for a grant competition. When this occurs, the Secretary announces such a change in a notice published in the Federal Register.

### **When will grant awards be announced?**

Grants will be announced by September 30, 2010.

### **Is this a multi-year grant program?**

Yes. Projects may be funded for up to 36 months (three budget periods of 12 months each), contingent upon the demonstration of substantial progress each year toward meeting project goals and objectives, and the availability of future funding.

### **How many new awards will be made?**

We estimate that we will make about 93 new awards.

### **What steps can I take to maximize my chances of receiving a grant?**

- Before preparing your application, read the application package carefully and completely.
- Follow all of the instructions exactly.
- If you're uncertain about any aspects of this application package, please first review the Frequently Asked Questions section. Most commonly asked questions are answered in this section. If your questions are not addressed, please contact the competition manager for clarification.
- Absolute priorities establish the parameters for applications under a grant competition. If your application does not meet the absolute priority or the additional requirements for this grant competition, it will not be considered for funding.
- A panel of three persons from the physical education, school health, student wellness, or child and adolescent development and other fields will review your application. Be sure to organize your application clearly, provide requested information in a comprehensive manner, and respond to each selection criterion thoroughly. Reviewers are not permitted to give you "the benefit of the doubt"; therefore, if information is not in your application, reviewers cannot award points for it.
- Be sure that your application includes a budget request (ED Form 524) and complete narrative justification.
- Transmit your application on or before the deadline date of **July 19, 2010**.

### **This competition has a "supplement, not supplant" provision. What does this mean?**

This provision requires that applicants not use grant funding to pay for any services or functions that would be covered as an ordinary function or service. Based on Federal regulations, if a grantee decides to charge indirect costs to a program that has a statutory requirement prohibiting the use of Federal funds to supplant non-Federal funds, the grantee must use a

**negotiated restricted indirect cost rate.** Your organization must submit proof of a **negotiated restricted indirect cost rate** with the application if you are planning to claim indirect costs.

#### **What is an indirect cost rate?**

An indirect cost is an expense that you incur that is necessary to implementing the grant, but may be difficult to identify directly with your grant. For example, indirect costs may include money spent for heat, light, rent, telephone, security, accounting, and Internet use.

If your organization prefers to use all of its grant funds for direct project costs, you are not required to charge the grant for indirect costs. If you wish to recover indirect costs, however, *you must use a **negotiated restricted indirect cost rate** for this competition.* This rate permits grantees to distribute indirect costs across grants so that grantees are able to recover these costs for grant funds.

For more information, please see: [www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocfo/fipao/icgindex.html](http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocfo/fipao/icgindex.html).

#### **How do I obtain a negotiated, restricted indirect cost rate?**

Your organization may already have a negotiated, restricted indirect cost rate with a Federal government agency. If your organization has not negotiated this rate in the past, please contact Katrina McDonald with the Department of Education's Indirect Cost Group at 202-377-3838 or [Katrina.Mcdonald@ed.gov](mailto:Katrina.Mcdonald@ed.gov).

#### **Who in my organization may be able to provide information about our negotiated, restricted indirect cost rate?**

If you do not know your negotiated, restricted indirect cost rate, please contact your business office. Please note, you will need to submit proof of this cost rate, such as a signed letter or a page from a state web site.

In most cases, state educational agencies calculate and assign indirect cost rates to their local educational agencies.

#### **For my GEPA 427 statement, is it adequate to state that our organization does not discriminate on the basis of race, religion, sex, etc.?**

No. An organization's non-discrimination statement is not sufficient to meet the GEPA requirements. A GEPA statement should outline an entity's potential barriers and solutions to equal access, specific to the proposed project.

#### **What should I use as the project start date?**

We expect to make awards around September 30, 2010. So you may use October 1, 2010 as your project start date for the purposes of the application. Should you receive an award and this date is different, you will be asked to adjust your timeline according to the actual start date.

#### **Do I have to get bids for goods and services under this grant?**

Yes. Generally, all procurement transactions by grantees made with Carol M. White Physical Education Program (PEP) grant funds must be conducted in a manner providing full and open competition, consistent with the standards in Section 80.36 (SEAs and LEAs) and Sections 74.40-74.48 (CBOs and IHEs) of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR). This section requires that grantees use their own procurement procedures (which reflect State and local laws and regulations) to select contractors, provided that those procedures meet certain standards described in EDGAR.

Because grantees must use appropriate procurement procedures to select contractors, generally applicants should not include information in their grant applications about specific contractors that will be used to provide services or goods for the proposed project if a grant is awarded. These requirements are not applicable in the event that the goods or services being procured are available only from a single source.

If a vendor assists an applicant in preparing an application for a grant, and subsequently is interested in providing contract services if the applicant receives a grant award, a close examination of all activities is warranted to ensure that the vendor did not act as an agent of the grantee, that the vendor does not have an organizational conflict of interest in the procurement, and that the requirements for full and open competition have not been violated.

The requirements regarding full and open competition could be violated even if a vendor's participation in the application process was limited. For example, a vendor that provides specifications that are then included in a grant application could have a competitive advantage over other vendors. Applicants for funding should carefully consider the requirements concerning competition contained in EDGAR as they interact with vendors during the application process, and if they are awarded a grant under the program.

EDGAR is available online at: [www.ed.gov/policy/fund/req/edgarReg/edgar.html](http://www.ed.gov/policy/fund/req/edgarReg/edgar.html)

#### **What is the project and budget period for these grants?**

The project period for this grant is up to three years. Each grant year is considered its own budget period. The application should include a description of the proposed activities for all three years, as well as a budget narrative that includes information about federal **and** non-federal funds for each budget year. Continuation awards are made based on an applicant's ability to demonstrate substantial progress in their required annual performance reports.

#### **May I use another district's application as a model for my submission?**

Information submitted in response to the scoring criteria must be specific to your district or organization; therefore, we strongly discourage using form or model applications. Identical or substantially similar applications are not responsive to the scoring criteria and may not be rated highly enough to receive funding. In addition, selection criteria, priorities, and other information have likely changed since the other entity's application was submitted and could result in your application scoring poorly or being ruled ineligible.

#### **Who do I contact for more information about this grant competition?**

Carlette Huntley, Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools; (phone) 202-245-7871, (email) [carlette.huntley@ed.gov](mailto:carlette.huntley@ed.gov), 550 12 Street., SW, Potomac Center Plaza, Room 10071, Washington, DC 20202.

### **Electronic Applications**

#### **How do I submit my grant electronically?**

For more information on using e-Application, please refer to the Notice Inviting Applications for this competition published in the Federal Register; the e-Application Submission Procedures and Tips document found in this application package; and/or visit <http://e-Grants.ed.gov>

**Do I have to submit my application electronically?**

Yes. Unless you qualify for an exception in accordance with the instructions found in the Notice Inviting Applications, you must submit your application electronically.

**How do I register to submit my grant electronically?**

If you are a new user, you will need to register to use e-Application. You will register from the e-Grants Portal Page <http://e-grants.ed.gov/>. Please reference pages 5-8 of this document for specific guidance on how to register.

**How should I submit forms with signatures?**

We *strongly encourage* you to scan and upload signed versions of the forms, in a .PDF format, to e-Application or you may fax the signed forms to the Department of Education.

These documents may be faxed to the attention of Carlette Huntley at 202-245-7166 and must be received within three days of your application submission.

**Are there any compatibility restrictions, especially if I use Microsoft Vista?**

You must submit your application in a .DOC (document), .RTF (rich text), .PDF (Portable Document) format in order for your application to submit successfully to the Department. If you submit your application in any other format, we will not be able to access your document. Also note if you are using the Microsoft Word from the Vista Operating System, you will need to convert your document from a .DOCX to a .DOC file before you can submit.

**Are there any restrictions on the file name length or size of the document?**

No. E-Application does not have a restriction on the number of characters in a file name or the size of a file being uploaded into the system. However, in the past we have encountered problems opening files that had large names or were extremely large documents, especially those that had quite a number of graphics embedded in the document. We suggest you limit these so the Department will not have any problems accessing the attachments you submit.

### **Eligibility**

**Who is eligible to apply?**

Eligible applicants for this program are local educational agencies (LEAs), including charter schools that are defined as LEAs in state law, and community-based organizations (CBOs).

**May I submit an application on behalf of my local school?**

The only eligible recipients are LEAs and CBOs. One of these entities must be the applicant for funding. An application submitted by an individual school will not be considered unless it meets the definition of a local educational agency or community-based organization.

**My college or university would like to apply for this grant. Are we eligible?**

Colleges and universities should carefully review the definition for the terms "LEA" and "CBO" to determine if they meet either of these definitions. Only entities that meet the definition of one of these terms may receive funding under this program.

**Are charter schools eligible for this program?**

Yes, charter schools that are considered LEAs under state law or that meet the definition of the term "CBO" are eligible to apply for funding under this program.

**Are Area Educational Districts or other similar entities eligible for this program?**

Yes, if these entities are considered LEAs under your State’s governance structure, they are eligible to apply for funding under this program. Alternatively, if these entities are considered CBOs according to the definition, they may be eligible to apply.

**My organization currently has a PEP grant. Are we eligible to apply for another PEP grant under this competition?**

No.

**If we are on a no-cost extension for our current PEP grant, may we end early so that we can be eligible to apply this year?**

If your PEP grant is scheduled to end after the application deadline date you are not eligible to apply this year for a grant. Your no-cost extension was granted to allow you to finish your program activities, and you continue with the schedule to successfully complete your grant activities

**What are some of the circumstances that might cause a grant application to be deemed ineligible for review?**

Some of the reasons an application submitted for funding under this competition will be deemed ineligible include:

- the application it does not meet the absolute priority;
- the applicant does not include assurances;
- the applicant does not address required elements;
- the applicant does not specifically address their state standards for PE;
- the applicant does not include adequate or allowable matching funds;
- the applicant is not an eligible agency or entity;
- the application does not include a narrative;
- the application is submitted after the deadline date.

**Program-Specific Content**

**May I use *only* national data to support the need for a grant in my district?**

No. Needs assessments must be based on identified needs of the specific target population to be served by the grant and must link to gaps and weaknesses in meeting your State’s standards. However, you may compare local data to national or state data.

**If my state does not have physical education standards, what should I do?**

If your state does not have physical education standards, you may pick another state’s standards to use. You are not permitted to use the National Standards for PE.

**Will this grant pay for hiring project staff?**

Grant funds can be used to hire a project coordinator or physical education instructors, provided that their functions are above and beyond their normal job functions. Grant funds may also be used to hire supplemental project staff, including community coordinators, evaluators, or other professionals whose functions support the implementation of the project. However, please note this grant has a “supplement and not supplant” provision.

**Are we required to hire an external evaluator?**

No. You are not required to hire an external evaluator, though this is an allowable expense for this program. Many grantees find this expertise useful. Please note, costs for the external evaluator should be reasonable and commensurate with the scope of the proposed evaluation.

**Should we include resumes for key staff?**

Yes, if key staff for the project have been identified. Please note, generally, external contractors should not be identified at the time of application, as districts are required to follow their district's policies on bids for goods and services, provided they meet the minimum requirements of those of the US Department of Education.

**May staff or community members regularly use equipment purchased with grant funds?**

No. The identified target population for this grant is K-12.

**Will the PEP grant support implementation of a general health education curriculum?**

No. The PEP grant will not support activities that fall outside the scope of the absolute priority. For example, the PEP grant will not support activities related to tobacco use prevention.

**Are we required to provide baseline GPRA data?**

To the extent practicable, applicants are asked to provide baseline GPRA data to assist with data collection for the national evaluation. If baseline data is not available to be included in the application, grantees will need to collect baseline information before beginning program implementation.

***Absolute Priority***

**What program elements must we address?**

Applicants must address: 1) Instruction in healthy eating habits and good nutrition **and** 2) at least one of the following:

- 1) Fitness education and assessment to help students understand, improve, or maintain their physical well-being.
- 2) Instruction in a variety of motor skills and physical activities designed to enhance the physical, mental, and social or emotional development of every student.
- 3) Development of, and instruction in, cognitive concepts about motor skills and physical fitness that support a lifelong healthy lifestyle.
- 4) Opportunities to develop positive social and cooperative skills through physical activity participation.
- 5) Opportunities for professional development for teachers of physical education to stay abreast of the latest research, issues, and trends in the field of physical education.

**Must we measure Body Mass Index (BMI) as part of this project?**

No. Applicants are not required to measure Body Mass Index (BMI) as part of this project. However, applicants that agree to implement aggregate BMI data collection, and use it as part of a comprehensive assessment of health and fitness, will receive competitive preference priority. If BMI measurement is undertaken, you should carefully consider the intended use of the data, confidentiality and reporting procedures, and other aspects of data collection as necessary. Please see pages 26-27 of this application package for more information about what is required in order to receive this competitive preference.

**We want to measure percentage of body fat *in addition to* BMI. Is that allowed?**

BMI measurement is a competitive preference priority for the Carol M. White Physical Education Program. Therefore, applicants can choose whether or not they want to use BMI as part of a

comprehensive assessment of health and fitness for their student populations. Applicants can also choose whether they want to use other tools as alternates to – or in addition to – BMI. However, only applicants that agree to implement aggregate BMI data collection would receive the competitive preference.

**Where can we get more information about BMI measurement?**

For more information about BMI measurement in schools, please see:  
[www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/overweight/BMI/index.htm](http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/overweight/BMI/index.htm).

**Where can we find more information about how to measure students correctly for BMI?**

For more information about how to take BMI measurements, go to:  
[http://www.cdc.gov/healthyweight/assessing/bmi/childrens\\_BMI/tool\\_for\\_schools.html](http://www.cdc.gov/healthyweight/assessing/bmi/childrens_BMI/tool_for_schools.html).

**What must we do to receive the partnerships competitive preference?**

In order to receive this competitive preference, the applicant must include an agreement that details the participation of required partners, including:

- (1) each partner’s roles and responsibilities in the project;
- (2) if and how each partner will contribute to the project, including any contribution to the local match;
- (3) an assurance that the application was developed after timely and meaningful consultation between the required parties, as defined in this notice; and
- (4) a commitment to work together to reach the desired goals and outcomes of the project.

The partner agreement would be required to be signed by the Authorized Representative of the required partners and by other partners as available and appropriate.

**Which organizations must be included in an LEA’s partnership agreement in order to receive the competitive preference?**

For an LEA applicant, this partnership agreement must include: (1) the LEA; (2) at least one CBO; (3) a local public health entity; (4) the LEA’s food service or child nutrition director; and (5) the head of the local government. For more information about the definitions of these partners, please see pages 14-15 of the application package.

**Which organizations must be included in a CBO’s partnership agreement in order to receive the competitive preference?**

For a CBO applicant, the partnership agreement must include: (1) the CBO; (2) a local public health entity, as defined in this notice; (3) a local organization supporting nutrition or healthy eating, as defined in this notice; (4) the head of the local government, as defined in this notice; and (5) the LEA from which the largest number of students expected to participate in the CBO’s project attend. If the CBO applicant is a school, such as a parochial or other private school, the applicant would need to describe its school as part of the partnership agreement but would not be required to provide an additional signature from a different LEA or school. A CBO applicant that is a school and serves its own population of students would be required also to include another community CBO as part of its partnership and include the head of that CBO as a signatory on the partnership agreement.

For more information about the definitions of these partners, please see pages 14-15 of the application package.

**Are we required to complete the School Health Index (SHI) as part of our application?**

Yes, you are required to complete a portion of the School Health Index (SHI) as part of your application. Applicants must complete Modules 1-4 of the SHI self-assessment tool. The applicant would use the results of the SHI to develop a School Health Improvement Plan focused on improving needs identified by the SHI, and design an initiative that addresses their identified gaps and weaknesses. Applicants are required to include their SHI Modules 1-4 Overall Score Cards in their applications, and correlate their School Health Improvement Plans to their project designs.

**If we are a CBO, are we required to complete the School Health Index (SHI) as part of our application?**

Because the School Health Index (SHI) must be done at the school-building level, CBOs cannot undertake the SHI without the support and participation of a school or LEA. Therefore, we suggest that CBO applicants collaborate with an identified school or LEA partner to complete Modules 1-4 of the SHI. To meet this requirement, CBO applicants that do not collaborate with an LEA or school may propose and use a local needs assessment tool that analyzes the physical activity and nutrition environments at the community level and, ideally, at the CBO site itself. The CBO applicant would need to specify the local needs assessment tool used and the results of the assessment.

**After we've completed the School Health Index (SHI), what are the next steps?**

After completing Modules 1-4 of the School Health Index, the applicant will use the SHI self-assessment to develop a School Health Improvement Plan focused on improving these issues, and design an initiative that addresses their identified gaps and weaknesses. Applicants would be required to include their Overall Score Card for the questions answered in modules 1-4 in their applications, and correlate their School Health Improvement Plans to their project designs.

**Will there be other School Health Index (SHI) requirements if we are selected as a PEP Grantee?**

Grantees will be required to complete the same SHI Modules at the end of the project period and submit the Overall Score Cards from the second assessments in their final reports. This information will demonstrate SHI completion and program improvement as a result of PEP funding.

**Where can we get additional information about the School Health Index (SHI)?**

You can get more information about the SHI at: <https://apps.nccd.cdc.gov/shi/default.aspx>.

**What is the PEP application requirement for nutrition and physical activity related policies?**

PEP grantees are required to develop, update, or enhance physical activity policies and food- and nutrition-related policies that promote healthy eating and physical activity throughout students' everyday lives, as part of their PEP projects. Applicants must describe their current policy framework, areas of focus, and the planned process for policy development, implementation, review, and monitoring.

Applicants are required to sign a Program- Specific Assurance that commits them to developing, updating, or enhancing these policies during the project period. Applicants that do not submit such a Program-Specific Assurance signed by the applicant's Authorized Representative would be ineligible for the competition, which can be found on page 141.

**How can a PEP applicant identify nutrition and physical activity policy interventions?**

Applicants can identify physical activity and nutrition policies to address using their State's standards for physical education and the results from their SHI assessments.

**Will there be other nutrition and physical activity related policy requirements if we are selected as a PEP Grantee?**

Grantees would be required to detail at the end of their project period in their final reports the physical activity and nutrition policies selected and how the policies improved through the course of the project.

**What is a local wellness policy?**

Under these provisions, a local wellness policy, at a minimum, includes goals for nutrition education, physical activity, and other school-based activities designed to promote student wellness; nutrition guidelines for all foods available on each school campus; guidelines for reimbursable school meals that are no less restrictive than the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) regulations and guidelines; and a plan for measuring implementation, including designation of one or more persons at the LEA or school level charged with operational responsibility for ensuring that the school meets the local wellness policies. In addition, parents, students, and various other "stakeholders" must be involved in the development of the local wellness policy. For more information about local wellness policies, please see <http://teamnnutrition.usda.gov/healthy/wellnesspolicy.html>.

**What is the PEP grant requirement for linkages with local wellness policies?**

We propose that applicants that are participating in a program authorized by the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act or the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 must describe in their applications their school district's established local wellness policy and how the proposed PEP project will align with and support, complement, and enhance the implementation of the applicant's local wellness policy. The LEA's local wellness policy should address all requirements in the Child Nutrition Act of 2004. CBO applicants describe in their applications how their proposed projects will enhance or support the intent of the local wellness policies of their LEA partner(s).

If an applicant or a member of its partnership group does not participate in the school lunch program authorized by the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act or the Child Nutrition Act of 1966, it would not necessarily have a local wellness policy and, thus, would not be required to meet this requirement or adopt a local wellness policy. However, we would encourage such applicants to develop and adopt a local wellness policy, consistent with the provisions in the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act or the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 in conjunction with its PEP project.

**Where can we get information about CDC's Coordinated School Health Program?**

The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) provides funding for state and territorial education agencies and tribal governments to help school districts and schools implement a Coordinated School Health Program (CSHP), and, through this approach, increase effectiveness of policies, programs, and practices to promote physical activity, nutrition, and tobacco-use prevention among students. For more information about which states receive coordinated school health funding (including program contacts), please see <http://www.cdc.gov/healthyouth/partners/funded/cshp.htm>.

**Where can we get information about USDA's Team Nutrition Initiative?**

Team Nutrition is an initiative of the USDA Food and Nutrition Service to support the Child Nutrition Programs through training and technical assistance for foodservice, nutrition education

for children and their caregivers, and school and community support for healthy eating and physical activity. For more information about Team Nutrition, please see <http://www.teamnutrition.usda.gov/>. To find out if which schools are enrolled in Team Nutrition, go to: <http://teamnutrition.usda.gov/database.html>.

### **Where can we get information about HHS' Communities Putting Prevention to Work Initiative?**

In March 2010, HHS awarded 44 communities with Communities Putting Prevention to Work funding. These awards will support evidence-based community approaches to chronic disease prevention and control in selected urban, rural, and tribal communities to achieve increased levels of physical activity; improved nutrition; decreased overweight/obesity prevalence; decreased smoking prevalence and decreased teen smoking initiation; and decreased exposure to secondhand smoke. For more information about Communities Putting Prevention to Work, including a list of grant recipients, please see <http://www.cdc.gov/chronicdisease/recovery/community.htm>.

### **Are there other Federal, state, and local nutrition and physical activity initiatives with which an applicant should coordinate?**

Many other Federal, state, and local initiatives also work to promote healthy nutrition and physical activity. These other initiatives include, but are not limited to:

- (1) Alliance for a Healthier Generation ([www.healthiergeneration.org](http://www.healthiergeneration.org));
- (2) Farm-to-School initiatives ([www.farmtoschool.org](http://www.farmtoschool.org));
- (3) The YMCA's Pioneering Healthier Communities ([www.ymca.net/activateamerica/](http://www.ymca.net/activateamerica/));
- (4) Action for Health Kids state or local teams ([www.actionforhealthykids.org](http://www.actionforhealthykids.org)); and
- (5) USDA's HealthierUS School Challenge ([www.fns.usda.gov/tn/healthierus/index.html](http://www.fns.usda.gov/tn/healthierus/index.html)).

### **What is the Physical Education Curriculum Analysis Tool (PECAT)?**

The PECAT is a tool for analyzing written physical education curricula to determine how closely they align with national standards for high-quality physical education. The purpose of the PECAT is to help school districts conduct a clear, complete, and consistent analysis of physical education curricula. PECAT results can help users enhance, develop, or select appropriate and effective physical education curricula for the delivery of quality physical education, which will improve the ability of schools to positively influence motor skills and physical activity behaviors among school-age youth.

### **What is the PEP grant requirement for using the PECAT?**

Applicants that plan to use PEP grant-related funds, including Federal and non-Federal matching funds, to create, update, or enhance their physical education curricula are required to complete the PECAT and submit their overall PECAT scorecard, and the curriculum improvement plan from PECAT.

### **What is the Health Education Curriculum Analysis Tool (HECAT)?**

The Health Education Curriculum Analysis Tool (HECAT) is an assessment tool for examining school health education curricula. The HECAT can help school districts conduct a clear, complete, and consistent analysis of health education curricula based on the National Health Education Standards and CDC's Characteristics of Effective Health Education Curricula. The HECAT results can help schools select or develop appropriate and effective health education curricula and improve the delivery of health education. HECAT modules address the following topic areas: Alcohol and Other Drugs; Healthy Eating; Mental and Emotional Health; Personal Health and Wellness; Physical Activity; Safety; Sexual Health; Tobacco; Violence Prevention; and Comprehensive Health Education.

**What is the PEP grant requirement for using the HECAT?**

Applicants that plan to use PEP grant-related funds, including Federal and non-Federal matching funds, to create, update, or enhance their nutrition instruction in health education are required to complete the healthy eating module of the HECAT. Applicants must describe how the HECAT assessment would be used to guide nutrition instruction curricular changes.

**If we are proposing to create, update, or enhance my nutrition instruction with PEP grant funds, must we complete the entire HECAT?**

No. Only the healthy eating module of the HECAT is required for grantees proposing to create, update, or enhance their nutrition instruction with PEP grant funds.

**Will the PEP grant support implementation of a general health education curriculum?**

No. The PEP grant will not support activities that fall outside the scope of the absolute priority. For example, the PEP grant will not support activities related to tobacco use prevention.

**Is it required that PEP applicants use the PECAT/HECAT?**

If an applicant is proposing to use grant-related funds for physical education and/or nutrition instruction curricula, the PECAT and/or HECAT are required. If the applicant is not proposing to use grant-related funds for these purposes, it would not need to use the PECAT and/or HECAT.

**Where can we get more information about the PECAT?**

For more information about the PECAT, including frequently asked questions, please see <http://www.cdc.gov/healthyouth/PECAT/index.htm>.

**Where can we get more information about the HECAT?**

For more information about the HECAT, including frequently asked questions, please see <http://www.cdc.gov/healthyouth/hecat/index.htm>. The healthy eating module can be found at [http://www.cdc.gov/healthyouth/hecat/pdf/HECAT\\_Module\\_HE.pdf](http://www.cdc.gov/healthyouth/hecat/pdf/HECAT_Module_HE.pdf).

**What kinds of equipment may we propose to purchase with PEP grant funds?**

Under this program, you may purchase durable goods designed for use for programs or staff training or other purposes. However, these equipment purchases must be aligned with the curricular components of your physical education and nutrition program. Applicants must commit to aligning the students' use of the equipment with PEP elements applicable to their projects, and any applicable curricula by signing a Program Specific Assurance. Applicants that do not submit such a Program Specific Assurance would be ineligible for the competition.

**Are PEP applicants able to propose equipment purchases related to any of the six program elements identified in the absolute priority?**

Applicants can only include equipment purchases related to the program elements applicable to their projects. Applicants that propose to address all six program elements would be able to include equipment related to all six elements in their applications. However, an application cannot include equipment purchases related to a program element that will not be addressed in the project. For instance, an applicant cannot include professional development equipment purchases if PE teacher professional development (element #6) is not included in the scope of the project.

**What is the PEP grant requirement for increasing transparency and accountability?**

Grantees are required to create or use existing reporting mechanisms to provide information on students' progress, in the aggregate, on key program indicators required by this grant, as well

as on any unique project-level measures proposed in the application. The aggregate-level information should be easily accessible to the public, such as posted on the grantee's or a partner's Web site.

**Would privacy provisions apply to the release of information described in this requirement?**

Grantees that are educational agencies or institutions would be subject to applicable Federal, state, and local privacy provisions, including the Family Educational Rights and Privacy (FERPA) Act – a law that generally prohibits the non-consensual disclosure of personally identifiable information in a student's education record. For more information about FERPA, please see <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/gen/guid/fpco/ferpa/index.html>.

**If we receive the grant, would I be required to participate in the national evaluation?**

Yes, if you receive an award under this program, you will be required to participate in the national evaluation.

**What is required in the application to indicate participation in the national evaluation?**

All applicants must provide documentation of their commitment to participate in the evaluation. An LEA applicant must include a letter from the research office or research board approving its participation in the evaluation if approval is needed, and a letter from the Authorized Representative agreeing to participate in the evaluation.

**How long will the national evaluation last?**

The evaluation will use the grantees funded in fiscal year 2010 for a national evaluation, and will follow this cohort through at least two years of implementation.

**How many GPRA performance measures are required for this program?**

There are three GPRA performance measures required for this program:

- 1) The percentage of students served by the grant program who are physically active for at least 60 minutes per day.
- 2) The percentage of students served by the grant who achieve age-appropriate cardiovascular fitness levels.
- 3) The percentage of students served by the grant who consumed fruit two or more times per day and vegetables three or more times per day.

**Are there specific data collection methodologies for the GPRA measures?**

Yes. Grantees are required to collect and report data on all three GPRA measures using uniform data collection methods. Please consult page 17 of the application for more information about both the measures and the required data collection methodologies.

**Our program would like to use other measures *instead of* the three GPRA performance measures. Is that allowed?**

No. Grantees are required to collect and report data on all three GPRA measures.

**Our program would like to use other measures *in addition to* the three GPRA performance measures. Is that allowed?**

Yes. Grantees are required to collect and report data on all three GPRA measures using uniform data collection methods. However, applicants can choose whether they want to use other measures in addition to the three required ones.

**Are we required to provide baseline GPRA data?**

To the extent practicable, applicants are asked to provide baseline GPRA data to assist with data collection for the national evaluation.

**How often will grantees collect data on these measures?**

Grantees will be required to collect and aggregate data four times annually. In addition, during the first year, grantees will have an additional data collection period prior to program implementation.

**Am I required to include the use of pedometers in my application?**

Yes. Pedometry is required in order to assess the PEP program's GPRA Measure 1: the extent to which grantees increase the number of students who are physically active for at least 60 minutes per day. Pedometers are to be used with all students in grades K-12.

**Are pedometers the only measurement tool required to be used for this measure with older students?**

No. In addition to the pedometers, grantees are required to use an additional three-day Physical Activity Recall (3DPAR) instrument to collect data on students in grades 5-12. The 3DPAR is a self-report instrument based on the Previous Day Physical Activity Recall and is designed to capture habitual physical activity of adolescents. 3DPAR uses a time-based recall approach over a three-day period. Physical activity is then determined using the metabolic equivalent (MET) levels. The instrument can be completed during a single 30 minute session, making it ideal for school-based data collection.

**Where can I find additional information about the 3DPAR instrument?**

For more information about the 3DPAR instrument, please see [http://www.sph.sc.edu/USC\\_CPARG/tool\\_detail.asp?id=3](http://www.sph.sc.edu/USC_CPARG/tool_detail.asp?id=3).

**Our program would like to use heart rate monitors *instead of* pedometers. Is that allowed?**

No. Pedometry is required in order to assess the PEP program's GPRA Measure 1: the extent to which grantees increase the number of students who are physically active for at least 60 minutes per day.

**Our program would like to use heart rate monitors *in addition to* pedometers. Is that allowed?**

Pedometry is required in order to assess the PEP program's GPRA Measure 1: the extent to which grantees increase the number of students who are physically active for at least 60 minutes per day. However, applicants can choose whether they want to use other measurement tools, such as heart rate monitors, in addition to pedometers.

**Are pedometers able to accurately record children's physical activity?**

A substantial amount of recent research has found pedometers to be valid and reliable measures of children's and adolescents' physical activity. As a result of these studies, pedometers are widely accepted as a cost-effective, accurate measure of physical activity for children. Pedometers can be used for all ages, from kindergarten through grade 12. Data collection with pedometers is relatively simple, straight forward, and noninvasive. Training individuals to collect data with pedometers will not take more than 1-2 hours at the most.

**What is the 20-meter shuttle run?**

The 20-meter shuttle run is a test that has been widely used in schools across the U.S. as part of physical education classes. The shuttle run provides a measure of students' cardio-

respiratory fitness, due to its predictive validity and correlation with maximal oxygen uptake, which indicates one's cardiovascular or aerobic capacity. The test measures aerobic capacity by having the student run back and forth over 20-meters at increasing rates of speed over specific periods of time.

**Our program would like to use heart rate monitors *instead of* the 20-meter shuttle run. Is that allowed?**

No. The 20-meter shuttle run is required in order to assess the PEP program's GPRA Measure 2: the number of students who achieve age-appropriate cardiovascular fitness levels.

**Our program would like to use heart rate monitors *in addition to* the 20-meter shuttle run. Is that allowed?**

The 20-meter shuttle run is required in order to assess the PEP program's GPRA Measure 2: the number of students who achieve age-appropriate cardiovascular fitness levels. However, applicants can choose whether they want to use other measurement tools, such as heart rate monitors, in addition to the 20-meter shuttle run.

**Our program will serve high school students. What measurement tool should we use for the third GPRA measure that assesses fruit and vegetable consumption?**

Programs serving high school students would be required to use the nutrition-related questions from CDC's Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS) to determine the number of students who meet these goals.

**Where can I find the fruit- and vegetable-related questions from CDC's YRBS?**

The YRBS survey can be found at [http://www.cdc.gov/healthyouth/yrbs/questionnaire\\_rationale.htm](http://www.cdc.gov/healthyouth/yrbs/questionnaire_rationale.htm). The questions related to fruit and vegetable consumption are questions 72-75 on the high school survey.

**How should I assess my elementary and middle school students?**

Applicants can choose an appropriate tool for their younger students. On pages 24, we offer guidance about factors to consider in selecting an appropriate assessment tool.

**Program-Specific Budget**

**Is there a minimum or maximum amount that may be requested to support a project?**

No. Although the application package includes an estimated range of awards, an applicant should request the amount needed to support the goals, objectives and scope of the proposed project, including a detailed justification for that amount.

**May grant funds be used to support professional development activities?**

Yes, as long as the activities directly support the purposes of the grant.

**Do we need to submit a budget narrative for each year?**

Yes, for both Federal and non-Federal funds. For a **sample** PEP budget narrative, please see [www.ed.gov/programs/whitephysed/applicant.html](http://www.ed.gov/programs/whitephysed/applicant.html).

**How much detail should be included in the budget narrative?**

Please include a per unit cost breakdown for all costs listed and describe in the narrative how each cost links to the goals and objectives of the program. Please be sure to provide sufficient detail for each item in the budget to clearly justify costs. When in doubt, please provide more information about each budget item than you may think necessary.

**Where can we find guidance on developing a budget narrative?**

For additional guidance on preparing a budget narrative, please see [www.ed.gov/admins/grants/apply/techassist/resource\\_pg8.html](http://www.ed.gov/admins/grants/apply/techassist/resource_pg8.html).

**Is there a match requirement for this program?**

Yes. Please see pages 28-29 for more information about this requirement.

**Are there certain items that cannot be purchased with grant or matching funds?**

Yes, generally. Grant funds cannot be used to purchase food, incentives, prizes, or other items identified by the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Cost Principles as unallowable.

For more information about OMB's Cost Principles, please see:

[www.whitehouse.gov/OMB/circulars/a087/a087-all.html](http://www.whitehouse.gov/OMB/circulars/a087/a087-all.html) for LEAs and

[www.whitehouse.gov/OMB/circulars/a122/a122.html](http://www.whitehouse.gov/OMB/circulars/a122/a122.html) for CBOs.

**Does the in-kind match have to be in cash? What types of resources may be used as the required match?**

No. The matching requirement may be met by using other non-Federal resources such as donated staff time or salary for the Project Director to perform administrative oversight of this project. Another example of an acceptable match is the cost of substitutes while teachers are being trained. Note that the salaries of current physical education teachers may not be used to satisfy the matching requirement. In addition, discounts on equipment purchases may not be used to satisfy the matching requirement.

**Can the match include volunteered time or the value of existing equipment?**

Yes. If you want to count the value of donated time towards your match, you must include letters of commitment with your application.

The value of existing equipment can only be counted towards part of the match if, and only if, the equipment will be used as part of the proposed project's implementation. If you want to include the market value of existing equipment towards your match, you must include in your application documentation as to how the market value was determined. Also, please note, when determining the value of the equipment to count towards the match, you cannot claim the full value of the equipment in one year, unless the full value of the equipment will be depleted in that year and the equipment will be rendered useless at the end of that year. You will need to determine the reasonable lifespan of the equipment in determining the value and only use the value of one year of that equipment's lifespan as part of the match. Also note, equipment depreciates over time and this rate of depreciation must also be taken into account when determining the value of the equipment.

For example, if you would like to use a recently-purchased treadmill, you would consider the current market value (which would take depreciation into account), and amortize the existing value over the expected remaining lifespan of the treadmill. Specifically, if the treadmill is two years old, its current market value is \$5,000, and your project proposes to significantly increase the number of students that use the treadmill, you might expect that the treadmill has five remaining years of life left. You might also reasonably assume a 10% annual depreciation of the treadmill, given the usual wear and tear. In year one of the project, you could reasonably count \$1,000 of the treadmill's value towards the match requirement. In year two, you could reasonably count \$900 of the treadmill's value towards the match requirement, which also accounts for a 10% depreciation of the total value of the treadmill. In year three, you could reasonably count \$810 towards your match, which again accounts for 10% depreciation. These

totals reflect the amount that you would be reasonably “consumed” in the project’s three years, again, assuming that the treadmill had a remaining five-year lifespan.

**Can the match include the rental value of facilities?**

Yes. You may include the cost to rent a facility towards your match if such facility will be used to conduct your program activities, and if you provide evidence that the facility is customarily rented at the cost claimed. Rental fees may not be claimed on classrooms, gymnasiums, pools, or other facilities that are not normally rented.

**Is there a cap on administrative costs?**

Yes. Not more than five percent of the grant funds made available to an LEA or CBO may be used for administrative costs.

**May we use the funds for construction, such as building a gymnasium or other facility or to purchase land or building or another facility?**

No. Facilities construction (such as tennis courts, volleyball courts, basketball courts, swimming pools, gymnasiums, and other permanent structures) is not an allowable expense.

**May we charge students activity fees?**

No. Students may not be charged to participate in activities that are being paid for with grant funds.

---

## **IV. LEGAL AND REGULATORY DOCUMENTS:**

---

### **NOTICE OF FINAL PRIORITIES, REQUIREMENTS, AND DEFINITIONS (NFP)**

4000-01-U

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Carol M. White Physical Education Program

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number: 84.215F.

AGENCY: Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools, Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice of final priorities, requirements, and definitions.

SUMMARY: The Assistant Deputy Secretary for Safe and Drug-Free Schools announces priorities, requirements, and definitions for the Carol M. White Physical Education Program (PEP). The Assistant Deputy Secretary may use one or more of these priorities, requirements, and definitions for competitions in fiscal year (FY) 2010 and later years. We take this action to align PEP projects more closely with best practices and research related to improving children's health and fitness, to improve students' physical activity, and to improve students' ability to meet their State physical education standards.

EFFECTIVE DATE: These priorities, requirements, and definitions are effective July 19, 2010

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Carlette Huntley, U.S. Department of Education, 550 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW., Room 10071, PCP, Washington, DC, 20202-6450. Telephone: (202) 245-7871 or by e-mail: Carlette.Huntley@ed.gov.

If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), call the Federal Relay Service (FRS), toll free, at 1-800-877-8339.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Purpose of Program: The purpose of PEP is to initiate, expand, and improve physical education for students in grades K-12.

Program Authority: 20 U.S.C. 7261-7261f.

Applicable Program Regulations: 34 CFR part 299.

We published a notice of proposed priorities, requirements, and definitions (NPP) in the Federal Register on March 16, 2010 (75 FR 12522). That notice contained background information and our reasons for proposing the particular priorities, requirements, and definitions.

There are several differences between the NPP and this notice of final priorities, requirements, and definitions (NFP) as discussed in the Analysis of Comments and Changes section elsewhere in this notice.

Public Comment: In response to our invitation in the NPP, 59 parties submitted comments on the proposed priorities, requirements, and definitions.

We discuss substantive issues under the title of the item to which they pertain. Generally, we do not address technical and other minor changes, or suggested changes we are not authorized to make under the applicable statutory authority. In addition we do not address general comments that raised concerns not directly related to the proposed priorities or requirements.

Analysis of Comments and Changes: An analysis of the comments and of any changes in the priorities, requirements, and definitions since publication of the NPP follows.

Absolute Priority--Programs Designed to Create Quality Physical Education Programs

Comment: One commenter suggested rewriting the absolute priority to include improving physical education as an educational outcome.

Discussion: We consider an improvement in physical education to be an educational outcome and do not see the need to include additional outcomes. The absolute priority clearly requires applicants to propose projects that address physical education. More specifically, the absolute priority requires every applicant to develop, expand, or improve its physical education program and address its State's physical education standards. Additionally, an applicant must provide instruction in healthy eating habits and implement at least one of the other program elements as described in the program statute (see sections 5501-5507 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended; 20 U.S.C. 7261-7261f). These 2010 program requirements will help applicants develop a strategic approach to improving physical education and nutrition instruction by requiring an assessment of local efforts to address identified deficiencies.

Changes: None.

Comment: Some commenters suggested that encouraging students to engage in moderate to vigorous exercise should be the primary focus of PEP. Some commenters also suggested that increasing the proportion of time in which students in physical education classes are active should be a priority.

Discussion: We agree that moderate to vigorous physical activity by students and increasing the proportion of time that students are active in physical education classes are important outcomes for physical education programs, but disagree with the commenters that these should be the exclusive or primary focus of PEP. Instead, we believe that a comprehensive approach, incorporating both high-quality physical education and nutrition instruction strategies, offers the best opportunity for students to acquire the knowledge and skills necessary to help them

understand the complementary relationship between physical education and nutrition, and the role that both of these areas can play in improving their health.

Further, we believe that the program requirements we are establishing will promote the types of programs that will improve the percentage of students who engage in moderate to vigorous physical activity during physical education classes and throughout the day. Through these requirements, we highlight the importance of initiatives that move students from being sedentary, often because of a lack of high-quality programming, to being more active, and towards a lifestyle that includes moderate to vigorous physical activity in various settings, including in physical education classes. The requirements reflect an approach that looks not just at student-level improvements, but at broad, systemic changes that will be sustained over time to continually improve opportunities for students to engage in moderate to vigorous physical activity. If grantees would like to assess the time that students engage in moderate to vigorous physical activity, we would encourage them to do so and have designed at least one of our required performance measures to support this type of assessment. For all of these reasons, we believe that improvements to physical education programs under PEP will result in more active time for students during physical education classes, resulting in improved student outcomes, and that there is no need to focus explicitly on moderate to vigorous physical activity and increased activity time in physical education classes as part of the absolute priority.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter suggested that all six of the PEP elements included in the program's authorizing statute be part of all quality physical education programs.

Discussion: We agree that all six elements are important facets of a comprehensive program, and applicants may propose to include all six elements as part of their proposed project if desired. At this time, however, we are not requiring applicants to include in their projects all six of the PEP program elements, because we want to provide flexibility for applicants to select approaches and activities that are linked to the priority needs identified for their schools and communities. We believe the absolute priority appropriately balances the positive aspects of moving to a more comprehensive approach with flexibility for applicants to design a project that effectively addresses their particular needs.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter expressed concern that the competitive preference priorities do not address the absolute priority.

Discussion: The competitive preference priorities are designed to encourage applicants to develop proposals that will result in stronger PEP projects within the context of the absolute priority.

We note that, in our judgment, the adoption of either, or both, of the approaches identified as competitive preference priorities is likely to produce superior results. Both competitive preference priorities are likely to enhance long-term sustainability by encouraging efforts to leverage community resources and to build community investment in the program (partnership), and also efforts to provide data to policymakers so that they can make informed decisions about budget and programming in the future. An effective PEP project could be implemented without a grantee engaging in either competitive preference priority, which is why we opted not to require either or both.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter expressed a desire to increase accountability in PEP, and suggested that adding the term "assessment" to each of the program elements in the absolute priority would emphasize the need for assessment to be part of activities implemented as part of a PEP grant.

Discussion: We agree that PEP would be strengthened by increasing the emphasis on assessment, evaluation, and accountability, and have already incorporated requirements in the final priorities, requirements, and definitions to address this concern. For example, we are ensuring accountability in the program by requiring the use of assessment tools such as the Physical Education Curriculum Assessment, the Health Education Curriculum Assessment, and the School Health Index, all of which enhance program assessment. As a result, we do not believe that it is necessary to make the change suggested by the commenter.

Changes: None.

Comment: Several commenters expressed a concern that requiring PEP grantees to address the program element related to nutrition instruction would weaken the focus on physical education and dilute limited funding available to support activities designed to improve physical education.

Discussion: We believe that a PEP project that incorporates both high-quality physical education and nutrition instruction strategies offers the best opportunity for students to acquire the information and skills necessary to help them understand the complementary relationship between physical education and nutrition, and understand the role that physical activity and nutrition can play in improving and maintaining their health.

Furthermore, the legislation authorizing PEP has always included nutrition instruction as a program element and a

significant number of past PEP grantees have elected to incorporate nutrition instruction in their projects. Generally, costs associated with including nutrition instruction have represented a fairly modest proportion of project funds, especially when compared to the costs of purchasing fitness equipment.

Changes: None.

Comment: Several commenters asked us to emphasize in the absolute priority the use of evidence-based approaches or established best practices in the field. For example, some commenters suggested that the Department focus the priority on research-based curriculum design, which is common in other subjects such as math, reading, and science, and encourage use of similar strategies for physical education, including alignment of curriculum, instruction, and assessment; other commenters stated that the Department should emphasize a variety of evidence-based approaches for which information is readily available via the Internet. Another commenter suggested that we fund only programs that use evidence-based approaches.

Discussion: We agree that use of research-based programs and established best practices strategies by PEP grantees would likely improve program outcomes. However, there is a limited research base of effective programs and strategies that would be applicable to the scope of PEP and relevant to all communities and applicants, and additionally, we want to encourage innovation in this area. We believe that the program requirements that require implementation of the School Health Index (SHI) assessment, as well as of the Physical Activity Curriculum Analysis Tool (PECAT) and the Health Education Curriculum Analysis Tool (HECAT) curriculum assessments will help applicants compare their current activities to established best practices in the field.

We provide examples of a range of resources for evidence-based practices in the application package, including some of those suggested by one commenter. We encourage applicants to refer to those resources, as well as other resources, to design an evidence-based program that addresses the applicant's greatest needs.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter requested that we more clearly define what we mean by the absolute priority elements concerning motor skills, physical activity, and the development of positive social and cooperative skills.

Discussion: We believe that the statutory language is sufficiently clear; these are terms that are commonly understood in the field or may be specifically defined in State standards.

Accordingly, we do not believe it is necessary to define them here.

Changes: None.

Competitive Preference Priority 1 -- Collection of Body Mass Index Measurement.

Comment: One commenter suggested that PEP grantees secure BMI information from physicians' offices and that this approach would help address some of the issues related to collection of BMI data, including privacy concerns and the need to purchase equipment and provide training on collecting BMI data.

Discussion: We believe that the approach suggested by the commenter would introduce different data collection and reporting challenges. For example, it is unlikely that all students have regular physicians that maintain wellness and other records. Also, physicians might not have collected BMI information and could not be compelled to furnish this information if it is available. Grantees and physicians would also need to be sure that requirements are satisfied concerning the non-consensual sharing of any protected health-related information or personally identifiable information from education records, such as the requirements contained in Federal, State, and local laws, regulations, and policies regarding student level data collection and privacy.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter urged the Department to exercise caution in using measures such as BMI to measure progress for the program, and indicated that the measures required under the Government Performance and Results Act of 1993 (GPRA) included in requirement 9 are more appropriate measures for short-term grant projects.

Discussion: We agree with the commenter. The competitive preference priority concerning BMI is designed to provide important aggregate information about the health status of students generally, and should serve as a surveillance tool for grantees that elect to implement the priority, not as a measure of program performance. We believe that the performance measures included as part of requirement 9 will complement the collection of BMI data by providing a range of measures that will permit grantees to assess improvements in several key areas, and provide data that the Department can use to help assess the overall effectiveness of PEP.

Changes: None.

Comment: Some commenters expressed concerns about the need to have appropriate supports in place for students and families when BMI data are reported. For example, one commenter expressed concern that the collection and reporting of BMI data to students and parents without appropriate information could be

associated with an increase in eating disorders and urged the Department to provide technical assistance to PEP grantees to help address this concern. Another commenter suggested that grantees collecting BMI data have a system in place to refer students with weight concerns to qualified health professionals for additional assessment and intervention if that is needed.

Discussion: We agree that careful consideration should be given to the complex policy and practice questions related to BMI data collection, particularly if BMI information is to be shared with both students and parents. The competitive preference priority requires that grantees who choose to address the priority ensure that their plan includes resources for safe and effective follow-up with trained medical care providers when BMI data suggest that such follow-up services are needed.

We plan to include in the application package a reference to available resources to help applicants implement these kinds of activities in the safest and most effective way possible, including the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) Children's BMI Tool for Schools; that information is available online at <http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/obesity/bmi/>. We will also offer technical assistance to applicants and grantees to ensure that students' privacy is protected and that procedures are carried out in a manner that is confidential and sensitive to all students' privacy.

We note that recent research shows no increase in eating disorders or disordered eating behaviors following an increased focus on obesity prevention. Data from Arkansas, where schools have been collecting BMI from students for several years, show no increase in eating disorders.<sup>7</sup>

Changes: None.

Comment: Several commenters suggested that we use an additional or alternative measure to BMI to assess population health status and the impact of PEP, including measures collected by a commercial fitness assessment tool, bioelectric impedance, skin fold tests, or measures such as attendance and academic performance that may correlate with fitness and health.

Discussion: BMI is relatively easy to measure, can be done quickly and non-invasively, and provides a standard tool for measuring and assessing student weight status across a site or between sites. We have opted to use the CDC's BMI-for-age growth charts as our standard for measurement and assessment because this approach represents the recommended method of reporting size and growth patterns among children in the United States. The CDC BMI-for-age growth charts provide a full array

---

<sup>7</sup> Schwarz M. and Henderson K. Does obesity prevention cause eating disorders? *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*, 2009, 48(8):784-786.

of percentile levels, which allows for greater interpretation of weight status in the population and among individuals. The CDC 2000 growth charts provide the best reference data available for the growth of U.S. children. Additionally, using the same method for interpreting BMI data collection will allow for data comparisons across PEP sites.

Applicants that opt to undertake BMI measurement and assessment as part of their project should describe their plan to obtain student-level data, consistent with the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) and the Protection of Pupil Rights Act Amendment (PPRA), which may be done using commercial fitness testing products that applicants may already have in use. The raw height and weight data collected using this tool can be easily converted to correspond with the CDC BMI-for-age growth charts, which must be used to be responsive to the competitive preference priority.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter expressed concern about BMI measurement and the lack of evidence that use of BMI measurements will lead to more physical activity or improved physical education programs.

Discussion: The use of BMI assessment data under this competitive priority is intended to create a mechanism to understand trends at the population level, including in the context of the other required measures of this program, in fitness, physical activity, and nutrition, and how the combination of these measures can be used to improve physical education programming and policy, and potentially help students meet their State standards for physical education.

The use of BMI assessment data would inform program planners about overall trends in the population's weight status, which may be used to inform decisions about programming and policy at the program site and in the broader community. BMI data are not intended to be used to measure a project's success; projects might not even reasonably expect to see major changes in BMI scores during the project period. Rather, applicants that choose to address the competitive preference priority for collecting and reporting BMI data should consider how BMI information would be used in the context of the required measures for PEP. We also encourage applicants who choose to address this priority to use this opportunity to create or enhance sustainable systems that can be used to make data-based decisions for continuous program improvement.

Changes: None.

Comment: Some commenters expressed concern that some States permit the collection and use of BMI data, while other States might prohibit or have restrictions on the collection and use of

such data. One commenter cited States that already require the use of BMI data, potentially providing an advantage to applicants from those States. Similarly, another commenter suggested that some States may prohibit BMI assessment and that including BMI assessment as a competitive preference priority would place applicants from those States at a disadvantage. These commenters suggested that if BMI assessment is included in the program, that applicants not receive any additional points for electing to implement a plan to use such data.

Discussion: While applicants that are already collecting BMI data may be able to implement the competitive preference priority more quickly if their project is funded, they will not have any advantage over other applicants because the priority requires only that applicants demonstrate their commitment to addressing the elements of the priority by including an assurance with their application. Grantees will be able to use program funds to obtain equipment, training, and other resources necessary to assist them in effectively implementing this competitive preference priority, helping to level the playing field for all applicants.

We do not believe that there are any States that prohibit BMI data collection, but we encourage applicants to understand and follow Federal, State, and local laws, regulations, and policies regarding student-level data collection and privacy.

Change: None.

Comment: One commenter suggested that the complexity involved with BMI data collection could discourage smaller educational entities and communities from applying for a grant.

Discussion: We understand that collecting and reporting BMI data might pose challenges for applicants. If small school districts or communities need additional assistance to implement the competitive preference priority, they should include costs associated with collecting and reporting BMI data in their proposed budget. Allowable costs might include, for example, additional staff time to facilitate collection and reporting, purchase of needed equipment, purchase of technical assistance services, professional development costs, or resources to develop and disseminate information to parents and the community about BMI data.

Changes: None.

Comment: We received several comments expressing concern that BMI data interpreted in isolation at the individual level might not provide an accurate assessment of health status, particularly for athletes, or at the program level to assess project goals.

Discussion: The intent of the BMI data collection is to provide a population-level analysis of the weight status of the student

population, at the school, site, or district level. Although applicants should consider whether and how individual assessments may be shared with students and their families, the intent of this priority is focused on population surveillance. BMI assessment is also not necessarily intended to serve as an assessment of the program's short- or long-term goals. Program planners should consider how they will use the data to assess the impact of the program on the population's weight patterns but we expect that the changes as a result of PEP implementation may take longer than the project period. We have measures to assess the project's goals, such as physical activity, that are, in theory, directly affected by the activities that grantees will implement.

Changes: None.

Comment: Two commenters suggested that the Department provide specific instructions on how to collect BMI data. The commenters stated that this information should be included on CDC's Web site.

Discussion: We agree that careful planning and training should be undertaken for projects that elect to address the proposed competitive preference priority concerning BMI assessment. As a result, we plan to include in the application package a reference to examples of available resources, including CDC's Children's BMI Tool for Schools, to help implement these kinds of activities in the safest and most effective way possible. This information is available on the CDC's Web site at: <http://www.cdc.gov/healthyyouth/obesity/bmi/>.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter questioned why parental permission would be necessary to collect BMI data since overall fitness testing or other assessments do not require parental permission.

Discussion: The competitive preference priority requires that parents be given the opportunity to have their child opt out of the BMI assessment after they have been informed of this choice. Applicants who wish to address the competitive preference priority related to BMI assessment are required to sign a Program-Specific Assurance that they will include parents in the development and implementation of their protocols to collect and report BMI data.

The final priorities, requirements, and definitions also reference the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects. Grantees that engage in BMI data collection could be subject to the U.S. Department of Education's Protection of Human Subjects regulations found in 34 CFR part 97 if the data are used in research funded by the Federal Government or for any future research conducted by an institution that has adopted the Federal policy for all research of that institution.

Grantees will need to review carefully the scope and design of their project to determine if parental permission for collecting and reporting BMI data is required by State or local laws, regulations, or policies, if applicable. We will provide technical assistance to grantees to help them make this determination.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter believed that by requiring the collection of BMI data, grantees would be compelled to purchase a commercial fitness assessment product.

Discussion: The use of a commercial product is not necessary to collect BMI data. Grantees can effectively collect BMI data without a specific fitness assessment product. In fact, many districts are conducting population-based BMI assessments with fairly simple equipment and spending more time and resources developing protocols and engaging in professional development to ensure that the assessment is done accurately and with sensitivity to students.

Grantees should design a program that is commensurate with their identified needs and propose a budget that is commensurate with that project design. Because BMI assessment is a competitive preference priority, applicants can opt not to undertake that collection. If, however, an applicant commits to undertaking BMI assessment, the applicant should determine the most appropriate methods and tools for undertaking this activity. While the grant does allow for costs associated with needed equipment, technical assistance, and resource products, the Department does not require, recommend, or endorse the purchase or use of any particular commercial product for meeting this priority.

Changes: None.

Comment: Some commenters requested that we change the competitive preference priority to an invitational priority.

Discussion: We believe the collection of BMI data has value in helping programs identify the percentage of students who might be obese, overweight, normal weight, and underweight, thus allowing them to better understand the needs of the population they serve. As such, we have opted to give competitive preference to applicants that choose to undertake this activity.

Changes: None.

#### Competitive Preference Priority 2--Partnerships Between Applicants and Supporting Community Entities

Comment: Several commenters expressed a concern about the requirement to include the "head of local government," as a required partner in order to satisfy the proposed competitive preference priority concerning partnerships. Specifically, commenters doubted that the head of local government would have

time to play a meaningful role in a PEP project and were also concerned about the difficulty of securing support from the head of local government, particularly in large urban areas. One commenter expressed concern that requiring involvement of the head of local government would inject a political element into the grant.

Discussion: Although we believe that the head of local government can provide a significant leadership role in community-wide efforts to improve physical education, increase levels of physical activity, and enhance knowledge about nutrition and healthy eating, we understand that in some communities it may be difficult or even impossible to secure support of the head of local government. We address this concern by providing a broader definition of the term "head of local government" in the final definitions.

Changes: We have revised the definition of "head of local government" as follows: "the head of, or an appropriate designee of, the party responsible for the civic functioning of the county, city, town, or municipality would be considered the head of local government."

Comment: Some commenters expressed concern that the competitive preference priority for partnerships is far-reaching and detracts from PEP's basic purpose of helping students meet State standards for physical education. Commenters also expressed concern about the burden associated with creating and maintaining the kinds of partnerships envisioned in the competitive preference priority, and stated that work on partnerships would dilute efforts to improve the quality of physical education programs. In some instances, commenters stated that it might also be difficult for community based organizations (CBOs) to establish such partnerships and that the inability to do so might place them at a competitive disadvantage.

Discussion: We believe that collaborative efforts between school and community entities will greatly enhance the ability of grantees to provide effective and comprehensive PEP programs that help students live and learn lifelong healthy habits. We believe that both schools and CBOs can contribute to partnerships that are designed specifically to meet the needs of their student population. Best practices in the field suggest that this type of community collaboration enhances the project's effectiveness and possibility for being sustained past the period of Federal assistance. Although all applicants who choose to address this competitive preference priority would be required to engage in additional work to create and maintain partnerships, we believe that the important outcomes that could

be gained by doing the work outweigh the concerns about the potential burden imposed.

We have designed a competitive preference priority to allow CBOs to identify community partners that would enhance their efforts and connect their programs to other community initiatives. Although the makeup of the partner groups will differ between LEAs and CBOs, we do not believe that there is a significant difference between the priority requirements for LEAs or CBOs or that the priority places CBOs at a competitive disadvantage because both LEAs and CBOs are equally able to create and maintain the partnerships required.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter stated that partners provide significant help in implementing and sustaining programs and policies and suggested that we incorporate competitive preference priority 2 into the absolute priority for the program.

Discussion: We agree that a coordinated, community-wide approach is likely to be the most powerful model for establishing and sustaining comprehensive efforts to provide physical education, nutrition education, and other activities and programs.

However, we are concerned that some potential applicants for PEP might not be able to secure each of the required partners. We believe that inclusion of the competitive preference priority strikes an appropriate balance between encouraging the use of this approach and not creating a disadvantage for applicants that cannot secure each of the required partners.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter suggested that applicants be permitted to use the State public health entity rather than the local public health entity to satisfy the competitive preference priority concerning partnerships because responsibility for some issues related to PEP might rest with State officials.

Discussion: The proposed definition of the term "local public health entity" included in the NPP provided an exception for applicants from Rhode Island and Hawaii because neither State has sub-State public health units. While we believe that a local public health entity is likely to be more involved in implementing a PEP project, we have learned that some States that have local public health units may not assign responsibility for issues related to nutrition, physical education, or physical activity to those local units. Based on this new information, we have revised the definition of the term "local public health entity" to address this situation.

Changes: We have revised the definition of the term "local public health entity" to permit applicants whose local public

health entity does not have responsibility for issues related to physical education, nutrition, or physical activity to partner with the State public health entity instead.

Comment: One commenter suggested that we revise the language concerning partner contributions in item (2) of the competitive preference priority by removing the word "if". Because partners are signing the partnership agreement, the commenter stated that it is reasonable to assume that they will be contributing to the partnership in some way and that those contributions should be specified in the agreement.

Discussion: We agree with the commenter's suggestion and have revised the priority.

Changes: We have revised item (2) in the competitive preference priority accordingly.

Comment: One commenter expressed concern that the time typically allowed to complete the application would not be sufficient to create a partnership as described in the competitive priority concerning partnerships.

Discussion: The Department must obligate all FY 2010 PEP funds by September 30, 2010 or those funds will revert to the U.S. Treasury. We are providing as much time as possible for applicants to develop and submit their applications under the FY 2010 PEP grant competition. All applicants will be subject to the same deadline.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter suggested that public health entities be allowed to function as the required partner representing an organization supporting nutrition or healthy eating under competitive preference priority 2.

Discussion: If the only entity in the community that can provide a perspective on nutrition to the advisory committee is the public health entity, we believe it would be an acceptable partner to satisfy the competitive priority and, therefore, have revised the priority.

Changes: We have revised the language in the priority and added public health entities to the definition of "organizations supporting nutrition and healthy eating."

Requirement 1--Align Project Goals with Identified Needs Using the School Health Index

Comment: One commenter suggested that the Department promote implementation of Coordinated School Health Programs in conjunction with the use of the School Health Index (SHI) as included in this requirement.

Discussion: We agree that a Coordinated School Health Program model provides a strong framework and context in which physical education, nutrition, and other important health topics can be addressed by schools. Proposed requirement 4, which concerns

linkages with Federal, State, and local initiatives, is designed to encourage applicants to consider how their proposed PEP project could be implemented in ways that maximize coordination with other health-related activities being implemented in schools and communities, including with Coordinated School Health Program initiatives. However, because eligible applicants for PEP include entities that are not schools or school districts, it would not be appropriate to require that all PEP projects implement a Coordinated School Health Program.

We believe that requirement 1, with its focus on SHI only, is an appropriate assessment tool because it can be used without requiring the use of the Coordinated School Health Program framework for programming and policy development.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter suggested that the Department use the CDC's SHI as part of a competitive preference priority rather than as part of a program requirement so that applicants would be encouraged to conduct an assessment for each application cycle.

Discussion: We agree that applicants should use the SHI assessment tool to plan their proposed PEP project. For that reason, we drafted this requirement to ensure that each applicant conducts the SHI assessment at the time of application and that funded grantees undertake the SHI at the end of their project period to assess their progress. With this structure, use of the SHI assessment is required, which we view as better than simply encouraging it.

Changes: None.

Comment: Some commenters suggested allowing applicants more flexibility in choosing a needs assessment tool rather than requiring that applicants use CDC's SHI. One commenter stated that any needs assessment should include a review of the legal and policy context in which the project would be implemented, and examine the incentives and enforcement mechanisms that are in place to ensure that students are receiving quality physical education.

Discussion: In part, we included this requirement in the NPP to respond to language in the conference report accompanying the FY 2010 appropriations statute that includes funding for PEP. In addition to Congressional interest in having PEP applicants complete the SHI, we believe that completing the questions concerning physical activity and nutrition required in Modules 1-4 of the SHI assessment tool will assist applicants in designing a project that is closely aligned with their needs and is consistent with best practices in the field.

The SHI is a relatively easy and straightforward tool, designed specifically for a school to assess its current

policies and practices based on evidence and best practices. Findings from the SHI are also tied to action plans, which should inform the project design. We do not believe there is another tool that is easy to use, free, publicly accessible, aligned with technical assistance opportunities, and broadly applies scientifically-based principles to program and policy in a national context. Moreover, by requiring LEA applicants to use a single assessment tool, we will be better able to understand how schools change over the course of their project.

As set forth in the text of the requirement, CBO applicants that have not identified a school or LEA partner in their applications are not required to use the SHI. However, they must use an alternative needs assessment tool to assess the nutrition and physical activity environment in the community for the children to be served by the grant. There are no comparable tools for CBOs that embody all of the desirable attributes of the SHI for the community-based setting. We will include, in the application package, guidance to CBO applicants on what CBO applicants might consider if they select an alternative assessment tool to the SHI.

Finally, while not required, we encourage all applicants to assess their policy and legal contexts if they determine it is appropriate and they are able to do so. We believe that the SHI will assess the policy context but because grantees cannot necessarily change the legal context in which they would implement their projects, we do not believe that we should require this type of assessment.

Changes: None.

Comment: A number of commenters offered suggestions about how CDC's SHI assessment should be used in the PEP program. One commenter recommended that the Department revise requirement 1 to make it clear that applicants must complete Modules 1-4 of the SHI, while another commenter recommended that we delete the requirement that applicants complete Module 1 because not all of the questions in that module relate to topics that are likely to be included in a PEP project. Other commenters recommended expanding the requirement to include Module 8 of the SHI (Family and Community Involvement) given the Department's increased focus on creating school-community partnerships, as evidenced by the proposed priorities, requirements, and definitions in the NPP.

Discussion: Applicants are only required to complete the physical activities and nutrition questions in Modules 1-4 of the SHI assessment tool. Applicants are not required to complete any other questions in those or other SHI modules. Applicants may choose to complete other questions (in addition to those physical activity and nutrition questions required) if

they believe that doing so would be helpful in designing their proposed PEP projects.

Changes: None.

Requirement 2--Nutrition- and Physical Activity-Related Policies

Comment: Two commenters expressed concern about the ability of an LEA or CBO to change or affect physical activity and nutrition policies in their respective settings. One commenter stated that it will be difficult for CBOs to change or affect policies because the scope of the policies subject to review and revision under this requirement is much broader than the scope of the policies that a CBO can adopt and implement. Another commenter discussed the challenges in writing and implementing specific policies in school districts, and stated that the focus of the requirement should be on reviewing and updating policies rather than developing new policies.

Discussion: Requirement 2, which addresses the nutrition- and physical activity-related policies to be developed, updated, or enhanced by grantees during the PEP grant, does not specify particular policies that must be developed, reviewed, and potentially revised. Rather, applicants must describe their current policy framework and the process they plan to use to review, develop, implement, and monitor policies. The purpose of this requirement is to ensure that PEP grantees carefully consider the role of policy development and implementation in creating comprehensive PEP projects, and that they commit to making policy changes that support improvements in the areas of physical activity and nutrition during the project period of the PEP grant. Policy changes are also likely key to institutionalizing and sustaining progress made during a PEP project.

We believe that examining the policy framework in which projects are implemented will help grantees identify needed policy changes that can remove impediments to, or provide incentives for, enhanced physical education or improved nutrition outcomes. We do not expect grantees to address policies that are outside their authorized mission or scope.

Changes: None.

Comment: Several comments expressed concern about the relationship between proposed requirements 2 (nutrition-and physical activity-related policies), 3 (linkage with local wellness policies), and 4 (linkages with Federal, State, and local initiatives). One commenter proposed that the Department offer applicants the option of meeting either requirement 2 or 3 stating that both requirements entail the same sort of analysis and action. Another commenter suggested that we combine the

three requirements into a single requirement because the foci of the three requirements are related.

Discussion: We acknowledge that requirements 2, 3, and 4 are related, but we elected not to combine them because the three requirements may apply differently depending on the applicant's organization and the context in which it operates. We believe that stating the three requirements separately enables us to address how each requirement applies in different contexts. We believe that this approach will help ensure that applicants understand the requirements and will be able to respond to them appropriately in their applications.

For example, requirement 3 concerns linkages with local wellness policies. LEAs are typically the entities responsible for developing and implementing local wellness policies. For this reason, the requirement, as applied to LEAs, is straightforward. Given that we also expect non-LEA applicants to apply for PEP grants, we have included information in this requirement to address those applicants as well. Under this requirement, CBOs whose PEP applications include a partnership with LEAs must describe in their applications how the project will enhance or support the intent of the local wellness policies of participating LEAs, while CBOs not in partnerships with LEAs do not have to satisfy this requirement.

Although we believe that the best approach to describing these three program requirements is to present them separately, applicants are encouraged to provide in their applications a comprehensive discussion of their policy framework and of linkages with other existing initiatives. Applicants need not repeat information that responds to more than one of the requirements.

Changes: None.

#### Requirement 3--Linkage with Local Wellness Policies

Comment: Some commenters raised concerns that proposed requirement 3, which concerns the linkage with local wellness policies, will be challenging for CBOs to meet and that time spent by staff in managing activities related to the requirement would reduce an organization's ability to provide direct services to students.

Discussion: As stated in this requirement, if an applicant or one its partners does not participate in the school programs authorized by the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004, it might not have a local wellness policy and, therefore, might not be required to meet this requirement or to adopt a local wellness policy. However, we encourage all applicants to consider developing a local wellness policy consistent with the policies required by the Richard B. Russell National School

Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004 in conjunction with their PEP projects. If a CBO applicant has an LEA partner, it would be required to address that LEA's local wellness policy.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter suggested that the Department revise this requirement concerning linkages to local wellness policies to accommodate any changes that might result from reauthorization of the Child Nutrition Act.

Discussion: In future years before using the priorities, requirements, and definitions established in this NFP, we will carefully review program requirements to determine if legislative action or other changes require the Department to modify the priorities, requirements, or definitions in this NFP under this requirement.

Changes: None.

#### Requirement 4--Linkages with Federal, State, and Local Initiatives

Comment: Two commenters suggested that we include a reference to the Recovery Act Community Putting Prevention to Work Community Initiative (CPPW) grantees in the application package.

Discussion: We agree that adding such a reference could be helpful to applicants. The link to the CPPW webpage ([www.cdc.gov/chronicdisease/recovery/community.htm](http://www.cdc.gov/chronicdisease/recovery/community.htm)), which includes a list of grant recipients and additional information on the initiative, will be provided in the application package. We believe that this program, which includes in its goals a focus on improving physical activity and nutrition habits of residents, has the potential to complement efforts undertaken as part of the PEP program.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter expressed concern that having programs align with Coordinated School Health programs or CPPW grants, as required under Requirement 4, would place a significant burden on applicants.

Discussion: We believe that applicants and PEP-funded projects must complement, rather than duplicate, existing, ongoing, or new efforts that promote physical activity and healthy eating, and help students meet their State standards for physical education. CDC's Coordinated School Health Program, USDA's Team Nutrition initiative, and HHS's CPPW grantees are working on projects directly related to one or more elements of PEP. Coordinating with these programs and initiatives will allow PEP grantees to maximize their resources, reduce duplication, provide more effective programming for their students, and increase chances for a PEP project's sustainability.

Changes: None.

Comment: Two commenters requested that we add State associations for health, physical education, recreation, and dance to the list of linkages to Federal, State, and local initiatives that could be made by PEP grantees.

Discussion: This requirement specifically requires applicants that are implementing CDC's Coordinated School Health Program, USDA's Team Nutrition Initiative, or CPPW, to align its proposed PEP project activities with these initiatives. Applicants that are implementing other Federal, State, or local initiatives are required to sign a Program-Specific Assurance that commits them to align their project with such initiatives.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter suggested that we add language to proposed requirement 4 that would mandate that USDA's Team Nutrition coordinators be involved in planning and implementing the PEP project and that their involvement be verified by a signed assurance or other documentation.

Discussion: We believe that it is important for PEP projects to complement rather than duplicate existing or new efforts to promote physical activity and healthy eating behaviors. For this reason, requirement 4 requires applicants that receive funding under the USDA's Team Nutrition initiative to describe how their proposed PEP project supports the efforts of the USDA's Team Nutrition initiative.

Although we agree that it is important for PEP-funded activities to be coordinated with other related activities such as those supported by Team Nutrition, we believe that the proposed requirement is sufficient to address this issue without imposing an additional requirement for a signed assurance from the Team Nutrition coordinator.

Changes: None.

#### *Requirement 5--Updates to Physical Education and Nutrition Instruction Curricula*

Comment: One commenter expressed concern that the proposed requirement related to updating physical education and nutrition instruction curricula is not aligned with the absolute priority. The commenter stated that completion of the PECAT and analysis of PECAT results should guide applicants in choosing which of the absolute priority elements related to physical education they should include in their proposed PEP project.

Discussion: We believe that each of the proposed requirements in the NPP (and adopted in this NFP) is closely linked to the components of the absolute priority in this notice and that each requirement supports the adoption of high-quality, evidence-based programming and curricula. As part of a general planning framework for a PEP grant, results from the PECAT and HECAT

should be used as part of the needs assessment process that each applicant will undertake to be optimally responsive to the absolute priority or as part of a grantee's analysis of available curricula during the project period. Undertaking the SHI or another needs assessment leads an applicant to select elements of the absolute priority to be included in their proposed project. If one of the needs identified is a curricular need, the PECAT and HECAT are intended to guide applicants or grantees to identify a curriculum that fills that identified need. These tools, therefore, should help applicants or grantees to be responsive to the absolute priority and function as tools to help meet the absolute priority. The PECAT and HECAT can be done as part of the application process or after the grant is awarded, as appropriate.

Changes: None.

Comment: Several commenters expressed concern about requiring the use of the HECAT and PECAT tools. Two commenters stated that use of these tools limits local flexibility and does not allow for alignment with State standards. Others contended that these tools have limited ability to assess cognitive components of physical education or that the tools are limited to secondary level curricula. Finally, one commenter expressed concerns that these tools do not assess implementation of curricula.

Discussion: We believe that the PECAT and HECAT tools provide a low-cost and rapid way to assess existing curricula and identify needed enhancements in those curricula. These tools are designed to provide a complete, consistent, and objective assessment of a site's needs and resources and to provide feedback on curricula to best meet the identified needs. According to CDC, the PECAT and HECAT are appropriate for all grade levels and relate to national physical education and health education standards. Our goal in requiring the use of these tools is to help grantees make the best choices for curricula and, in turn, equipment, before funds are spent unnecessarily on items that do not meet the needs of the site. However, this requirement does not prohibit applicants or grantees from also using additional analysis or needs assessment tools if they so choose.

We agree that the PECAT and HECAT are not designed to assess implementation of the curriculum or cognitive components of PE. For this reason, applicants must undertake the SHI or another comparable needs assessment tool to assess needs, which may include implementation issues. In addition, grantees must undertake the SHI at the end of their project period to assess their progress. The PECAT and HECAT complement the SHI in that the PECAT and HECAT address written curricula and the SHI addresses the implementation of those curricula. The SHI is a

self-assessment and planning tool that schools use to assess their student health policies and programs and their school health environments. We also note that, in addition to requiring the use of these assessment and planning tools, we also are establishing performance measures for this program that are designed to help assess the effectiveness of the chosen program, including curricula, on changing student outcomes.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter expressed concern about tying PEP-related equipment purchases to the curricular components of the applicant's physical education and nutrition program. The commenter stated that there would not be sufficient opportunity during the grant to create an action plan related to a newly developed or adopted curriculum to help students meet their State standards for physical education.

Discussion: The intent of this requirement is to ensure that grantees align equipment purchases using PEP-related funds to the PEP elements and curricula applicable to their PEP projects, as identified by the PECAT and HECAT. Grantees must tie equipment purchases to any curricula that will be implemented as part of a PEP project. Without this alignment, equipment purchased with PEP funds would not support the effective implementation of physical education or health curricula. For this reason, applicants must undertake the PECAT—either as part of the application process or during the grant's project period—to assess their needs and plan related equipment purchases accordingly. We do not intend to prohibit a grantee from changing its plans for equipment purchases during the project period so long as the grantee aligns the equipment purchases with the PEP elements applicable to their projects (identified in priority 1) and any applicable curricula, within the scope of the funded project.

Changes: None.

#### Requirement 6--Equipment Purchases

Comment: One commenter suggested that it would be appropriate for applicants to consider both the schools' and the community's physical activity needs when selecting equipment for purchase so that equipment purchased for schools could be used by community members under a shared-use agreement.

Discussion: Grantees under this program may only purchase equipment with PEP-related funds (either Federal funds or funds used to satisfy the program's matching requirement) if the purchase is aligned with the curricular components of the physical education and nutrition program. We expect that applicants will describe in their application what equipment they expect to purchase with PEP funds, and how the equipment

would address their curricular needs, including gaps and weaknesses in their current programming for the students served by the grant, and the specific curricular needs of the students to be served by the grant. However, it is important to note that during the project period, the equipment may be used only by students served by the grant in grades K-12. Therefore, community members may not use the equipment during the project period.

Changes: None.

Comment: None.

Discussion: Upon further review, we determined that it was appropriate to clarify the first sentence in requirement 6. Specifically, we did not think the phrase "purchases of equipment with PEP funds and related to grant activities" was sufficiently clear for applicants.

Changes: We revised the first sentence of requirement 6 to state that purchases of equipment with PEP funds or with funds used to meet the program's matching requirement must be aligned with the curricular components of the proposed physical education and nutrition program.

#### Requirement 7--Increasing Transparency and Accountability

Comment: One commenter suggested that we require reports generated by a particular commercial fitness product to be sent home to parents so that this additional information can be used by parents and pediatricians to monitor growth and development.

Discussion: The Department does not endorse specific commercial products. There are many mechanisms and reports that can provide information to parents and, if they so choose, parents may share this information with their child's pediatricians. We encourage applicants to consider plans to share student-level information with parents.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter requested clarification on whether reporting mechanisms required for grantees to increase transparency and accountability include making available to the public reports of students' progress towards meeting State physical education standards.

Discussion: The new PEP design seeks to increase accountability and transparency by requiring grantees to report aggregate student data to the public on program indicators required under GPRA, as published in the performance measurement section of the notice inviting applications (NIA), published elsewhere in this issue of the Federal Register, and any unique project-level measures proposed in their applications. Grantees may elect to establish measures specific to their project, which may include student's progress towards meeting State standards for physical education. Because of the diversity not only in grantee sites,

but also the quality of State physical education standards, it is not practical for us to require grantees to report on this issue as a performance measure for PEP. We have chosen performance measures that best balance the potential data collection burden, which we believe is low, with the value of providing grantees with practical and actionable student-level data and obtaining comparable data that can be aggregated across program sites, which we believe is high.

Changes: None.

Comment: None.

Discussion: Upon further review of this requirement, we determined that the language in the final paragraph regarding the Program-Specific Assurance might be confusing.

Specifically, we determined that the phrase "including parents of students under 18 years old" was not necessary, might cause readers to be confused as to what was required, and did not meaningfully add to the intent of the requirement.

Changes: We revised the first sentence in the last paragraph of requirement 7 to clarify that applicants must commit to reporting information to the public by signing a Program-Specific Assurance, and deleting the phrase "including parents of students under 18 years old."

#### Requirement 8--Participation in a National Evaluation

Comment: One commenter expressed concern about how much time would be needed to collect data related to the national evaluation and PEP's performance measures.

Discussion: Although we understand that the required performance measures and data collection methodology may be challenging for some grantees, they are similar to the measures and data collection methodology that many grantees currently collect and implement. Grantees are, and have always been, allowed to hire staff to assist in the collection and analysis of their site-specific data related to performance measurement. For the national evaluation, the Department will work directly with a contractor, who will use existing data, to the extent possible and minimize the data collection burden on grantees.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter requested information about the national evaluation of the PEP program.

Discussion: The scope of the national evaluation is still being considered. If a grantee is selected to participate in the national evaluation, more specific information about the study will be shared prior to the initiation of the evaluation. We expect that the evaluation will broadly examine the performance measures, which focus on increases in the percentage of students meeting the recommended levels of physical activity (at least 60 minutes every day), and improvements in student fitness levels

and nutritional intake. These measures will likely be examined at the PEP program level to illustrate the range of projects implemented and outcomes achieved by grantees funded under this program.

Changes: None.

Requirement 9--Required Performance Measures and Data Collection Methodology

Additional or Alternative Measures

Comment: One commenter suggested requiring applicants to gather data on the four CDC physical activity recommendations in addition to the GPRA measures already listed in requirement 9. These CDC measures include assessments of the type and intensity of physical activity in which students engage, such as whether or not a student has engaged in moderate to vigorous physical activity, bone strengthening and muscle strengthening for at least three days; as well as the student's consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages; hours of sleep; and "screen time."

Discussion: Although we agree that these CDC measures can be useful for understanding a student's nutrition and physical activity habits, we have found that grantees are best able to focus fully on a smaller set of measures that most closely align with the desired goals and objectives of their program. We expect that the three performance measures that we have selected will serve as a proxy for the full range of these CDC measures, as well as for longer-term outcomes, and will provide the Department with the most useful assessment of whether a program is making substantial progress from year to year. With that said, we encourage grantees to adopt these CDC measures or other site-specific measures to assess their performance during their project period.

Changes: None.

Comment: Several commenters suggested expanding the required performance measures to include components, such as a standard metric that would assess the number of physical activity minutes offered to students during a school year, by school and by program, as well as the actual number of minutes that a student is engaged in physical activity, which would be assessed by using direct observation or pedometry. Another commenter suggested assessing the program's effectiveness in improving children's ability to pursue different physical activities, and the extent to which students embrace a healthy lifestyle. Still another commenter recommended that we require grantees to collect and report data on performance measures that are aligned with the six PEP program elements outlined in the absolute priority and State standards for physical education.

Discussion: Under requirement 7 (Increasing Transparency and Accountability), applicants may propose a variety of unique

project-level performance measures for their individual programs that would best help them understand their program's progress towards their unique goals and objectives and assess their students' performance. However, we are requiring three performance measures that are aligned with the desired program outcomes. Although we agree that one metric would be optimal for cross-site comparability, PEP grantees represent a diverse array of programs that would make a single specific metric difficult, if not impossible, to implement. For example, some programs operate only after school or in the summer, and others are school-based physical education programs. Because of this diverse array of programs, many grantees will not have the ability to increase the minutes of physical activity offered to students. Also, grantees are not required to undertake all six of the PEP program elements, and, as such, we cannot hold all grantees accountable for elements that they will not address as part of their funded project.

We are also interested in measuring changes in students' physical activity habits throughout the day and in multiple settings, not just in the activities funded under the PEP program. We believe that measuring changes to students' overall activity level will not only measure improvements in programming, but also changes in students' behavior. As such, we prefer to assess student-level outcomes, such as the minutes spent in physical activity, fitness levels, and improvements in nutritional intake. These outcome measures are also the logical outcomes of the adoption of healthier lifestyles, as we hope that there will be increases in the percentage of students who practice healthy habits. We also believe these outcomes will serve as a proxy for a teacher's effectiveness in imparting lessons that students understand and, in turn, apply to their daily lives, and are reflected in healthier activity and nutritional choices.

Changes: None.

Comment: Due to a concern about program quality and the need to ensure that programs are comprehensive and not just focused on equipment purchases for physical activity, one commenter suggested that grantees be required to demonstrate their progress during the period of the grant using at least one indicator of change, such as the development of a school- or district-level curriculum, or changes as assessed by the PECAT and HECAT, or SHI.

Discussion: We agree with the commenter that projects should be comprehensive in nature, improve physical education, and enhance physical activity opportunities for youth, as well as help students develop lifelong healthy habits, rather than just support equipment purchases. All grantees will be required to

use the PECAT if they are developing or purchasing a new curriculum for physical education or the HECAT if they are developing or adopting a new curriculum for nutrition education. All applicants will also be required to undertake the SHI or a comparable local needs assessment, submit their scores as part of their application, and create a program designed to address their greatest needs in programming and policy. Although the SHI is designed to help schools assess their policy and practice environments, it is not designed as an evaluation tool and may not be used for this purpose. Grantees will be required to undertake the SHI at the end of their project to determine if they have made the changes that they had desired (and to assess any unplanned consequences). The SHI should be used only as a program management tool-- not to assess accountability-- because a grantee's progress, as measured by the SHI, may or may not reflect the results of the grantee's project. Similarly, the PECAT and HECAT are tools designed to help schools and CBOs assess curricula and choose improvement areas based on their needs, rather than as tools to evaluate a project's progress. Not all grantees will need to develop or adopt new curricula; for example, some grantees may have recently adopted a new curriculum while others may be part of a larger organization that has control over the curriculum used.

We encourage grantees to track their progress towards implementing changes identified through these tools, or the adoption of any curriculum; grantees are welcome to include these process measures as part of their own performance goals and objectives. We believe that the required performance measures will appropriately assess the desired student-level outcomes related to changing curriculum, practice, and policy.

Changes: None.

Comment: Two commenters suggested that the Department add two new measures to this requirement. These new measures would assess students' progress towards meeting State standards on competency and proficiency in motor skills and movement forms and physical activity-related knowledge, as measured by the National Association of Sport and Physical Education's (NASPE) assessment tools. The commenter noted that NASPE's elementary school assessment tools are currently complete and tools for secondary schools will be complete in fall, 2010.

Discussion: We agree that it is important to assess students' progress towards meeting State standards on competency and proficiency in motor skills and movement forms and physical activity-related knowledge. Grantees may adopt metrics that assess students' competency and proficiency in motor skills and movement forms and students' physical activity related knowledge, but we do not believe it is appropriate to require

them to do so. We continue to believe that the measures proposed in requirement 9 will appropriately assess the student-level outcomes that we seek to change through PEP, as they are designed to measure changes in student's knowledge, skills, and abilities related to physical activity and movement, as well as changes in their adoption of lifelong healthy habits.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter expressed concern about the validity of the 3-day physical activity recall (3DPAR) for middle school students required in measure 1, and proposed piloting a 1-day measure with a small group of grantees to determine feasibility, reliability, and validity.

Discussion: The 3DPAR is a validated self-report instrument designed to capture habitual physical activity of adolescents. The instrument can be completed during a single 30 minute session, making it ideal for school-based data collection. Particularly when combined with pedometer data, the 3DPAR provides a reasonably good estimate of the type and intensity of students' physical activity. It is important to gather three days of physical activity data through self-report to help identify not only the amount, but also the type, of physical activity. The 3DPAR is not meant to be used on three separate occasions; rather, students are asked to report their physical activity one time and to report about their physical activity from the past three days. The use of the 3DPAR in combination with the pedometer is designed to capture small changes in behavior because the pedometer measures activity continuously and we can determine time and intensity through pedometers.

We require that students in grades 5-12 complete the 3DPAR because it has been used successfully with middle school and high school students. Several recent studies have used the 3DPAR with this population, combined with an objective measure of physical activity such as data gathered via pedometer use.<sup>8,9</sup>

With grantees using a uniform data collection and assessment methodology, we will be able to aggregate data to provide information that informs our national evaluation.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter stated that the 3DPAR methodology is too cumbersome to implement and recommended that the Department require the use of a pen and paper or computer-based seven-day

---

8 [Ward DS](#), [Dowda M](#), Trost SG, [Felton GM](#), [Dishman RK](#), and [Pate RR](#). Physical activity correlates in adolescent girls who differ by weight status. *Obesity*. Jan 2006;14(1):97-105

9 Dowda M, Pate RR, Felton GM, Saunders R, et al. Physical activities and sedentary pursuits in African American and Caucasian girls. *Res Q Exerc Sport*. Dec 2004;75(4):352-360.

recall survey instrument based on the Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBSS) survey.

Discussion: Although a seven-day physical activity recall instrument is an option for grantees, we believe that the resources involved in implementing and completing a seven-day survey outweigh the relative benefits. Additionally, a seven-day recall instrument would not be appropriate for younger children, who have a harder time recalling the seven prior days. The YRBSS survey instrument has historically been used with high-school students and, although some States collect YRBS data from middle school students, we are uncertain about the validity and reliability of YRBS data collected at grade levels lower than middle school.

We recognize that some applicants and grantees will not have experience in implementing the 3DPAR. We intend to provide grantees with technical assistance to ensure relatively uniform data collection and to help students and staff understand what type of physical activity to include in the data collection.

Changes: None.

Comment: Several commenters expressed concern about the validity of the pedometer data required to be collected under measure 1. The first concern was about accurately reporting data because the data would be self-reported and could be reported inaccurately either inadvertently or deliberately by the teacher or the student. The second concern focused on the collection of pedometer data, which the commenter stated could be inflated by, for example, the student shaking the pedometer.

Discussion: The use of pedometers to assess students' physical activity during the day is well-validated and recommended by many physical activity researchers. Multiple studies conducted over the last decade have examined noncompliance, and the overwhelming finding is that the use of pedometers does not present data collection or aggregation challenges that compromise the validity and reliability of student-level self-reported data. A nationally-representative study of over 11,000 Canadian students used pedometers as its data collection methodology and did not find data collection methodology challenges with pedometers. This population-based study and other studies relied on self-report data and found this method to be acceptable and to produce valid and reliable data.

We will provide technical assistance to grantees to help them introduce pedometers during physical education lessons, including explaining how pedometers work, allowing students to explore moving with pedometers, teaching students how pedometers should be worn and taken care of, and how to record the data from the pedometers. Physical education teachers' prompts and reminders to students about wearing the pedometers during the

data collection period are also important in helping students accurately collect their activity data.

Although self-reported data may be a challenge because of the potential for students to report socially desirable responses, self-report is still the most widely used method for assessing physical activity among all age groups. Combining the use of pedometers with a 3DPAR provides researchers, physical education teachers, and program coordinators with a good idea of young people's physical activity levels from a subjective (self-report 3DPAR) and objective (pedometer) method. This combination of strategies provides information regarding how much activity (through both pedometers and 3DPAR), as well as what types of activity (3DPAR) students are engaged in.

Changes: None.

Comment: Two commenters suggested that we allow grantees to collect data from a sample of students rather than collect pedometer data from all participants.

Discussion: Depending on the size of the project and the number of students served, grantees may use a sampling methodology and framework instead of assessing their whole target population. We have developed a sampling methodology that will be shared with grantees and, if the grantee decides to use sampling, we will provide technical assistance in setting up the sample and ensuring that the methodology is implemented correctly.

Changes: None.

Comment: A few commenters expressed concern that pedometers are not able to appropriately and adequately reflect physical activity for specific populations, such as young children, or specific activities, such as riding a recumbent bike, and requested information on "approved" pedometers to be used in these instances.

Discussion: Pedometers have been shown to be a cost-effective, noninvasive, valid, and reliable method of collecting information on students' activity levels while engaging in a variety of activities. Research shows that pedometers are reliable and valid for use with children even children as young as kindergarten age and for adolescents because they measure the physical activity of youth in steps accurately on a consistent basis. Researchers in Canada implemented a nationwide study using pedometers with 5-19 year olds, and were able to obtain reliable data from this age group.<sup>10</sup>

Additionally, for all ages, it is possible to use pedometers to determine moderate to vigorous physical activity. For example, one study showed that approximately 120 steps per

---

<sup>10</sup> Craig, C.L., Cameron, C., Griffiths, J.M. and C. Tudor-Locke. Descriptive epidemiology of youth pedometer-determined physical activity: CANPLAY. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*. 2010; in press.

minute equates to moderate activity.<sup>11</sup> Another study showed that the number of steps taken per day was a significant predictor of activity time.<sup>13</sup>

There are many different kinds of pedometers made by a variety of manufacturers and, to the extent practicable, we will provide guidance in the application package on specifications that may enhance the validity and reliability of pedometers for this population and provide an accurate overall depiction of physical activity across a student's day.<sup>14</sup><sup>15</sup><sup>16</sup><sup>17</sup><sup>18</sup><sup>19</sup><sup>20</sup>

Changes: None.

Comment: Some commenters expressed concern about the burden associated with collecting, reporting, and analyzing pedometer data; commenters stated that additional staff would be needed to facilitate the collection of these data. Two commenters suggested that some of the proposed GPRA measures for the program would be better collected by the national evaluator to mitigate burden to the local grant sites.

Discussion: Under PEP, applicants may propose to hire staff, including a project manager, program coordinator, or evaluator

---

11 "Moderate physical activity" is defined as a level of exercise that makes one sweat and breathe hard. During moderate activity, one can talk but not sing, and includes activities such as walking briskly, ballroom dancing, doubles tennis, or gardening. "Vigorous physical activity," is defined as a level of activity during which one can only talk with a pause between words, and includes activities such as singles tennis, jumping rope, or speed walking, jogging, or running.

12 Graser, S.V., R.P. Pangrazi, and W.J. Vincent. Steps it up: Activity intensity using pedometers. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance. 2009; 80(1): 22-24.

13 Beighle and Pangrazi. Measuring Children's Activity Levels: The Association between Step-Counts and Activity Time. Journal of Physical Activity and Health. 2006; 1: 221-229.

14 Eston RG, Rowlands AV, Ingledew, DK. Validity of heart rate, pedometry, and accelerometry for predicting the energy cost of children's activities. J Appl Physiol. 1998;84(1):362-371.

15 Kilanowski CK, Consalvi AR, Epstein LH. Validation of an electronic pedometer for measurement of physical activity in children. Pediatr Exerc Sci. 1999;11:63-68.

16 Louie, L., Eston, R.G., Rowlands, A.V., Tong, K.K., Ingledew, D.K., & Fu, F.H. (1999). Validity of heart rate, pedometry, and accelerometry for estimating the energy cost of activity in Hong Kong Chinese boys. Pediatr Exerc Sci. 11, 229-239.

17 Rowlands AV, Eston RG, Ingledew DK. Measurement of physical activity in children with particular reference to the use of heart rate and pedometry. Sports Med. 1997;24(4):258-272.

18 Beets M, Patton MM, Edwards S. The accuracy of pedometer steps and time during walking in children. Med Sci Sport Exer. 2005;37(3):513-520.

19 Schneider PL, Crouter SE, Lukajic O, Bassett, DR. Accuracy and reliability of 10 pedometers for measuring steps over 400-m walk. Med Sci Sport Exer. 2003;35:1779-1784.

20 Bassett, DR, et al. Accuracy of five electronic pedometers for measuring distance walked. Med Sci Sport Exer. 1996, 28(8) 1071-1077.

to support, within reason, activities commensurate with the scope of work and activities of the program. This would include efforts related to data collection and analysis. PEP does not allow applicants to propose a staffing plan that would supplant existing staffing requirements, but the program does allow for funding to supplement the existing program to carry out the tasks delineated in the project or evaluation design. We believe that these data are best collected by the grantee because they are able to structure their data collection appropriate to their particular site.

Changes: None.

Comment: We received some comments regarding the potential complexity of collecting pedometer data during out-of-school hours as well as the related burden on parents, students, and grantees that lack an appropriate project management structure.

Discussion: We acknowledge that the responsibility of collecting pedometer data during out-of-school hours will result in some additional burden on students and their families. We carefully considered issues of burden in developing the requirements for the program, and believe that the value of obtaining comprehensive information about changes in levels of student physical activity served by PEP grants outweighs the relatively limited burden on students and families.

Moreover, grantees can implement strategies to limit this burden for parents and students. For example, grantees could provide orientation sessions to both students and parents to introduce pedometer use to them and provide instruction on using the pedometer, how a pedometer should be worn and taken care of, as well as on how students should record the data from the pedometers. We will provide additional technical assistance to grantees on these and other strategies to enhance the validity and reliability of the data collected.

Finally, under PEP, grantees may propose to hire a project manager or program coordinator, as well as evaluation support, within reason and commensurate with their project's scope of work. PEP does not allow grantees to supplant existing staff requirements, but will allow funding to supplement an existing program to carry out new tasks delineated in the project, including the project evaluation.

Changes: None.

Comment: We received several comments concerning the durability of pedometers. These commenters expressed concern that requiring the use of pedometers would result in grantees wasting funds by purchasing replacement pedometers when they are lost, stolen, or broken.

Discussion: Like other types of equipment, pedometers can be lost, stolen, or broken. However, there are straps that are

available to connect the pedometer to a belt loop or waistband to minimize loss. Student training in correct pedometer use and care before data collection begins may also help to minimize breakage. As an objective measure of physical activity, the pedometer is one of the most moderately priced options and one that requires minimal training to use. Pedometer use is also much less time and labor intensive than other objective measures of physical activity.

Changes: None.

Comment: We received several comments recommending that other tools be used instead of, or in addition to, pedometers to measure activity levels. Suggestions included using downloadable heart rate monitors, accelerometers, or a type of watch to appropriately measure physical activity levels. These commenters stated that such tools would be more accurate and effective than pedometers for recording and evaluating information about physical activity.

Discussion: Applicants are welcome to propose using other measurement tools in addition to pedometers. We have elected to use pedometers to measure physical activity under performance measure 1 because they are an accurate, feasible, and unobtrusive measure of physical activity, particularly in physical education. They can be put on quickly, and measure many types of activity, including walking, jogging, running, tennis, dancing, aerobics, and roller skating. Pedometers record physical activity of all intensities, and provide immediate concrete feedback to students. Some pedometers also measure the number of steps and activity time; this then allows the calculation of steps per minute, which can then be associated with intensity.<sup>21</sup>

Research also shows that pedometers can be used in large population-based assessments of physical activity, which implies that they are practical in a range of settings with different populations. Pedometers also tend to be more affordable and require little or no additional investments in complementary pieces of technology such as computers or handheld devices to upload the data.

Changes: None.

Comment: Several commenters shared a concern about the use of the 20-meter shuttle run as a performance measure. Specifically, some commenters expressed concern that grantees would be required to purchase a particular commercial fitness-assessment package to meet the requirement. Other commenters sought clarification about whether we intend for the 20-meter

---

<sup>21</sup>Graser, S.V., R.P. Pangrazi, and W.J. Vincent, Step it up: Activity intensity using pedometers. Journal of Physical Education, Recreation, and Dance, 2009. 80(1): 22-24.

shuttle run to be implemented as a criterion- or norm-referenced test.

Discussion: The 20-meter shuttle run is a test that has been widely used in schools across the U.S. as part of physical education classes. It is not necessary for grantees to purchase a commercial package to collect and report data on this performance measure. The shuttle run provides a measure of students' cardio-respiratory fitness, due to its predictive validity and correlation with maximal oxygen uptake, which indicates one's cardiovascular or aerobic capacity. The test measures aerobic capacity by having the student run back and forth over 20-meters at increasing rates of speed over specific periods of time.

We intend for grantees to implement the 20-meter shuttle run as a criterion-referenced test, rather than as a norm-referenced test, such as the 20-meter shuttle run test that is used as part of the President's Fitness Challenge. While grantees are not required to purchase any commercial package to meet this requirement, grantees may choose to use the 20-meter shuttle run test from a commercial package to satisfy the 20-meter shuttle run test requirement.

Changes: None.

Comment: Two commenters recommended that the Department permit, rather than require, grantees to use the 20-meter shuttle run for purposes of performance measure 2. One commenter recommended that the Department allow grantees to use the 1-mile walk/run as an alternative assessment to the 20-meter shuttle run.

Discussion: Research demonstrates that the 20-meter shuttle run is a better measure of cardio-respiratory fitness than the 1 mile walk/run.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter expressed concern as to the size and safety of some school's facilities for conducting the 20-meter shuttle run assessment.

Discussion: We recognize that many LEAs and CBOs face challenges in maintaining adequate facilities to implement physical education activities, but the space requirements necessary to implement the 20-meter shuttle run in a safe manner are minimal (e.g., a volleyball court is approximately 20 meters in length). If the area is not wide enough for all students to complete the run simultaneously, the test can be completed in shifts, with half the class running at a time. This is not ideal, but it is an acceptable alternative if space is limited. Also, the shuttle run can be conducted outdoors if needed.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter suggested adding descriptive and clarifying language related to the second GPRA measure, including describing the shuttle run as a criterion-referenced health-related fitness testing protocol and identifying the measure as an assessment of student health-related fitness levels.

Discussion: We agree with the commenter. The 20-meter shuttle run is a criterion-referenced health-related fitness testing protocol used to assess student health-related fitness levels. Therefore, we have changed the language in the requirement accordingly.

Changes: We have changed the language in the requirement to refer to the criterion-referenced health-related fitness testing protocol when describing the shuttle run and referring to the GPRA measure as an assessment of student health-related fitness levels.

#### Consumption of Fruits and Vegetables

Comment: Some commenters objected to the proposed performance measure concerning daily consumption of fruits and vegetables, based on their opposition to the requirement contained in the absolute priority that nutrition education be required as part of each PEP-funded program. One commenter stated that fruit and vegetable consumption is not an outcome of effective physical education.

Discussion: After a careful review of comments received about the proposed absolute priority, we have elected to retain the requirement that projects include a component addressing healthy eating habits and good nutrition because we believe that a PEP project that incorporates both high-quality physical education and nutrition instruction strategies offers the best opportunity for students to acquire the information and skills necessary to help them understand the complementary relationship between physical education and nutrition, and the role that both can play in improving their health. We believe that the measure related to daily consumption of fruits and vegetables is an important measure that will provide data about project effectiveness.

Changes: None.

Comment: Several commenters recommended methods for collecting information on elementary and middle school students' nutritional intake. Suggestions included using a new nutrition survey, adapting nutrition-related questions from the YRBS, and administering a seven-day nutrition recall assessment, the Healthy Eating Index, or the USDA's MyPyramid nutrition tools. Two commenters suggested that the performance measures be revised to give grantees flexibility to select, depending on their local needs, the method to collect this information (such

as through the use of site-, region-, or State-specific instruments).

Discussion: We appreciate the variety of recommendations provided by these commenters and carefully considered all the different tools suggested. We are not aware of any available tools that are free and publicly accessible, that would provide valid and reliable data for elementary and middle school students, and that are not associated with commercial products or curriculum, which the Department is prohibited from endorsing. Because we are unable to identify an appropriate data collection tool, we are not requiring a specific measurement tool for programs serving students in elementary or middle school. Instead, we will provide guidance to applicants on factors they should consider in selecting an appropriate assessment tool to collect data on the percentage of elementary and middle school students who consumed fruit two or more times per day and vegetables three or more times per day.

Changes: We have revised this requirement to clarify that we will not require programs serving elementary and middle school students to use a specific measurement tool, and that they may select an appropriate assessment tool for their population.

#### General Issues Related to Performance Measures

Comment: One commenter encouraged us to consider requiring all grantees to aggregate the data they collect on the required performance measures at the school level, as opposed to the district level, to increase and enhance accountability for school teachers and school personnel.

Discussion: All participating schools or other grant sites will be responsible for collecting data on the students served and aggregating those data. Grantees must provide to the Department (as part of their required annual and final reports) data that are aggregated across all students served in the grant. To minimize burden, we do not require that grantees provide data to the Department for required performance measures at the school building or classroom levels. While not required, grantees are welcome to use data collected at the school building and classroom levels to assess project progress.

Changes: None.

Comment: Two commenters questioned the need for counting out-of-school physical activity, stating that there has been little evidence of the relationship between school-based programs and a student's out-of-school physical activity.

Discussion: Because of the diversity of PEP programs, not all programs will be school-based or implemented during school hours. Some programs will occur during the after-school hours, on the weekend, or during the summer. Other programs may be primarily school-based or combine in-school programming with

programs and initiatives during out-of-school hours, sometimes in partnership with community groups. Our intent is to fund programs that begin to create systemic changes in students' environments, as well as changes in students' overall habits and behavior throughout the day.

Changes: None.

Comment: Several commenters stated that the requirement to collect data four times during the project period in addition to baseline data would be challenging and cumbersome. Some commenters stated that it would be difficult for grantees to begin data collection at the start of the grant period when initial implementation and professional development would be occurring.

Discussion: Although we recognize that taking time from service delivery to collect data may pose challenges for some grantees, we have used this data collection strategy and methodology for several years with several cohorts of PEP grantees. Generally, we have found that grantees have not been challenged by multiple data collections or the additional baseline data collection during the first year of the grant before program implementation begins. This data collection methodology allows us to standardize the way that data are collected and ensure that grantees are collecting enough data to evaluate program quality and student progress. The frequency of the data collection reduces potential confounds related to changes in student population or expected seasonal differences. The collection of baseline data before and follow-up data after the project is implemented provides data for grantees to assess the effectiveness of their individual PEP projects. If grantees are unable to collect baseline data at the time of their application, they may do so before large-scale implementation of their projects at the beginning of the project period.

Changes: None.

#### GENERAL COMMENTS

Comment: Some commenters recommended that some of the terms used in the NPP be defined. Commenters suggested defining the terms "physical education," "quality physical education," "physical activity," and "physical fitness" to improve clarity.

Discussion: We agree that providing more information about these terms as they are used in the context of the PEP competition could be helpful to applicants. We will include this information in the application package for the program.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter expressed concern that some school districts do not have the expertise to prepare an application for a PEP grant based on the requirements proposed in the NPP,

and suggested that LEAs be allowed to join together to prepare and submit an application for a PEP grant.

Discussion: Under the Department's existing general administrative regulations (34 CFR 75.127), applicants eligible to receive a PEP grant (LEAs or CBOs) may elect to submit an application on behalf of a consortium. All members of a consortium applying for a PEP grant must be either LEAs or CBOs. One eligible entity within the consortium must submit the application on behalf of the consortium and serve as the program's administrative and fiscal agent. We encourage applicants applying as a consortium to establish a partnership agreement or a memorandum of understanding to delineate roles, responsibilities, and expectations.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter expressed concern that the proposed priorities and requirements for PEP will entail outside-the-classroom responsibilities for physical education teachers and that these responsibilities might, in turn, reduce the effectiveness of those teachers in the classroom.

Discussion: We understand that physical education teachers already have significant responsibilities, and that activities related to implementing a PEP project are likely to increase those responsibilities. However, we do not expect that physical education teachers will be responsible for all aspects of implementing a funded PEP project. Applicants are free to request funding for project personnel, consistent with the scope of their proposed projects.

Changes: None.

Comment: Two commenters recommended increasing the focus on "shared use" or "joint-use" agreements so as to enhance and encourage the use of school and community recreation facilities and community linkages.

Discussion: We generally agree that shared-use or joint-use agreements have the potential to expand options for increasing the opportunities for physical activity in a community. However, we believe that requirement 2, which requires a review of the broad policy context in which projects will operate, is preferable to imposing a requirement for all applicants to enact a particular policy, such as shared-use or joint-use agreements.

Additionally, we note that PEP funds must be used to provide services to students from kindergarten through the twelfth grade; other individuals are not permitted to use the equipment purchased with PEP grant funds during the grant period.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter suggested that we encourage teachers to utilize recreational facilities in the community as a way to

increase links between schools and communities and to help students and their families become more aware of opportunities for physical activity in their communities.

Discussion: We agree that collaborative efforts between schools and communities are likely to produce the kind of benefits identified by the commenter. We believe that the competitive preference priority for partnerships will encourage coordinated, collaborative approaches that include strategies such as use of community recreational facilities by teachers and students.

Changes: None.

Comment: Two commenters encouraged the Department to make awards to communities with populations that are at risk for obesity and obesity-related health problems or to sites that experience other significant barriers to promoting physical activity for youth.

Discussion: We agree that the needs of an applicant's target population should be considered in selecting grantees. As indicated in the NIA, published elsewhere in this issue of the Federal Register, applications will be judged by peer reviewers against selection criteria that include documentation of the need for the proposed project.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter expressed concern that the page limit for a PEP application is insufficient to address all of the required priorities.

Discussion: The NPP did not propose a page limit for applications submitted under the PEP competition. We note that the NIA provides a recommended length for the project narrative section of the application, but applicants are not bound by that recommendation.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter suggested the Department award only one-year grants so that more schools might receive funding in a year.

Discussion: At the inception of PEP, we made only one-year grants under the program. Based on our experience in monitoring the implementation of early PEP projects and reviewing final reports for those early grants, we concluded that those projects consisted largely of purchasing equipment that could be used to assist students in meeting State standards for physical education. Many funded projects lacked a comprehensive approach. Beginning in fiscal year 2004, we expanded the program to permit applicants to propose longer-term projects that are more comprehensive and incorporate strategies such as curriculum development (or revision), modification of policies, and professional development strategies. Many program applicants have incorporated some of these strategies in

subsequent years. Based on this experience, we believe that continuing to support multi-year projects will provide the best opportunity for schools and communities to make meaningful and sustainable changes in their physical and nutrition education activities.

Changes: None.

Comment: Several commenters expressed concern about the number of proposed priorities and requirements, and the time commitment that would be required to implement the priorities and requirements, including obtaining needed assurances.

Discussion: We acknowledge that meeting the priorities and requirements will require PEP grantees to invest additional time in implementing their PEP projects. However, we believe that the absolute priority and requirements are necessary to encourage the development of comprehensive PEP projects that provide opportunities for schools and communities to make a significant contribution to improving the health status of the students they serve and to build systems and programs that are sustainable. Applicants are not required to address or implement the activities in the competitive preference priorities.

In the past, PEP projects have too often consisted primarily of large expenditures for equipment without convincing evidence that those project expenditures were coordinated with other related activities in the community, or were based on a careful assessment of gaps and needs. We have balanced the impact on grantees of additional requirements against the potential for creating a cohort of comprehensive and focused PEP projects, and believe that the additional investment of time and effort is justified.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter stated that grantees need to be able to use PEP grant funds to support a staff position so that the grant requirements can be met.

Discussion: PEP grantees have always been able to request funding for a project director or project coordinator position, and many grantees have done so. In that regard, applicants should ensure that their budget requests for proposed projects are closely aligned with the activities and strategies in their application, including funding for a project director or project coordinator, if such a position is needed.

Changes: None.

Comment: One commenter suggested we include a focus on infrastructure development and sustainability in PEP.

Discussion: We agree that infrastructure development and sustainability are important elements of a quality physical education program. Many of the elements of this program address

both infrastructure development and sustainability, particularly those activities centered on updating nutrition and physical activity related policies; building linkages with Federal, State, and local initiatives; and updating physical education and nutrition curricula. In addition, applicants that opt to establish partnerships may strengthen their infrastructure and sustainability capabilities.

Changes: None.

Comment: Two commenters requested that we modify certain language used throughout the NPP. Specifically, these commenters stated that all references to the term "physical activity" should be changed to "physical education." The commenters also recommended that whenever the terms "nutrition" and "physical education" or "physical activity" appear, that "physical education" be placed first because the program's primary purpose is to improve physical education.

Discussion: There are differences between the terms "physical education" and "physical activity", and we believe that we have used each term to specifically reference either education or activity consistent with the context of the priorities, requirements, and definitions. We acknowledge that the intent of the program is to increase the percentage of students who meet their State standards for physical education; however, the program is also intended to help students adopt lifelong healthy habits, as evidenced by an increase in physical activity and better nutrition.

In this context, placing the terms "physical education" or "physical activity" before references to "nutrition" would be an artificial distinction that undercuts the concept of more coordinated, comprehensive PEP projects.

Changes: None.

#### FINAL PRIORITIES:

This priority is:

#### Absolute Priority.

Under this priority, an applicant is required to develop, expand, or improve its physical education program and address its State's physical education standards by undertaking the following activities: (1) instruction in healthy eating habits and good nutrition and (2) physical fitness activities that must include at least one of the following: (a) fitness education and assessment to help students understand, improve, or maintain their physical well-being; (b) instruction in a variety of motor skills and physical activities designed to enhance the physical, mental, and social or emotional development of every student; (c) development of, and instruction in, cognitive concepts about motor skills and physical fitness that support a lifelong healthy lifestyle; (d) opportunities to develop positive social

and cooperative skills through physical activity participation; or (e) opportunities for professional development for teachers of physical education to stay abreast of the latest research, issues, and trends in the field of physical education.

Competitive Preference Priority 1 -- Collection of Body Mass Index (BMI) Measurement.

We will give a competitive preference priority to applicants that agree to implement aggregate BMI data collection, and use it as part of a comprehensive assessment of health and fitness for the purposes of monitoring the weight status of their student population across time. Applicants are required to sign a Program-Specific Assurance that will commit them to:

(a) Use the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) BMI-for-age growth charts to interpret BMI results ([www.cdc.gov/growthcharts](http://www.cdc.gov/growthcharts));

(b) Create a plan to develop and implement a protocol that will include parents in the development of their BMI assessment and data collection policies, including a mechanism to allow parents to provide feedback on the policy. Applicants are required to detail the following required components in their aggregate BMI data collection protocol: the proposed method for measuring BMI, who will perform the BMI assessment (i.e., staff members trained to obtain accurate and reliable height and weight measurements), the frequency of reporting, the planned equipment to be used, methods for calculating the planned sampling frame (if the applicant would use sampling), the policies used to ensure student privacy during measurement, how the data will be secured to protect student confidentiality, who will have access to the data, how long the data will be kept, and what will happen to the data after that time. Applicants that intend to inform parents of their student's weight status must include plans for notifying parents of that status, and must include their plan for ensuring that resources are available for safe and effective follow-up with trained medical care providers;

(c) Create a plan to notify parents of the BMI assessment and to allow parents to opt out of the BMI assessment and reasonable notification of their choice to opt out. Unless the BMI assessment is permitted or required by State law, LEA applicants are required to detail their policies for providing reasonable notice of the adoption or continued use of such policies directly to the parents of the students enrolled in the LEA's schools served by the agency. At a minimum, the LEA must provide such notice at least annually, at the beginning of the school year and within a reasonable period of time after any

substantive change in such policies, pursuant to the Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment, 20 U.S.C. 1232h(c)(2)(A); and

(d) De-identify the student information (such as by removing the student's name and any identifying information from the record and assigning a record code), aggregate the BMI data at the school or district level, and make the aggregate data publicly available and easily accessible to the public annually. Applicants must describe their plan for the level of reporting they plan to use, depending on the size of the population, such as at the district level or the school level. Applicants must also detail in their application their plan for how these data will be used in coordination with other required data for the program, such as fitness, physical activity, and nutritional intake measures, and how the combination of these measures will be used to improve physical education programming and policy.

On June 18, 1991, 17 Federal Departments and Agencies, including the Department of Education, adopted a common set of regulations known as the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects or "Common Rule." See 34 CFR part 97. Applicants that engage in BMI data collection may be subject to the Department's Protection of Human Subjects regulations if the data are used in research funded by the Federal government or for any future research conducted by an institution that has adopted the Federal policy for all research of that institution. The regulations define research as "a systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge. Activities that meet this definition constitute research for purposes of this policy, whether or not they are conducted or supported under a program which is considered research for other purposes. For example, some demonstration and service programs may include research activities." 34 CFR 97.102(d). Information on Human Subjects requirements is found at:

<http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocfo/humansub.html>.

Applications that do not provide a Program-Specific Assurance signed by an Authorized Representative committing the applicant to completing previously listed tasks (a) through (d) during their project period are not eligible for additional points under competitive preference priority 1.

In implementing this priority, we encourage applicants to consult with their partners to determine if and how any of the partners could contribute to the data collection, reporting, or potential referral processes.

Competitive Preference Priority 2-- Partnerships Between Applicants and Supporting Community Entities.

We will give a competitive preference priority to an applicant that includes in its application an agreement that

details the participation of required partners, as defined in this notice. The agreement must include a description of: (1) each partner's roles and responsibilities in the project; (2) how each partner will contribute to the project, including any contribution to the local match; (3) an assurance that the application was developed after timely and meaningful consultation between the required parties, as defined in this notice; and (4) a commitment to work together to reach the desired goals and outcomes of the project. The partner agreement must be signed by the Authorized Representative of each of the required partners and by other partners as appropriate.

For an LEA applicant, this partnership agreement must include: (1) the LEA; (2) at least one CBO; (3) a local public health entity, as defined in this notice; (4) the LEA's food service or child nutrition director; and (5) the head of the local government, as defined in this notice.

For a CBO applicant, the partnership agreement must include: (1) the CBO; (2) a local public health entity, as defined in this notice; (3) a local organization supporting nutrition or healthy eating, as defined in this notice; (4) the head of the local government, as defined in this notice; and (5) the LEA from which the largest number of students expected to participate in the CBO's project attend. If the CBO applicant is a school, such as a parochial or other private school, the applicant must describe its school as part of the partnership agreement but is not required to provide an additional signature from an LEA or another school. A CBO applicant that is a school and serves its own population of students is required to include another CBO as part of its partnership and include the head of that CBO as a signatory on the partnership agreement.

Although partnerships with other parties are required for this priority, the eligible applicant must retain the administrative and fiscal control of the project.

#### Types of Priorities:

When inviting applications for a competition using one or more priorities, we designate the type of each priority as absolute, competitive preference, or invitational through a notice in the Federal Register. The effect of each type of priority follows:

Absolute priority: Under an absolute priority, we consider only applications that meet the priority (34 CFR 75.105(c)(3)).

Competitive preference priority: Under a competitive preference priority, we give competitive preference to an application by (1) awarding additional points, depending on the extent to which the application meets the priority (34 CFR 75.105(c)(2)(i)); or (2) selecting an application that meets the

priority over an application of comparable merit that does not meet the priority (34 CFR 75.105(c)(2)(ii)).

Invitational priority: Under an invitational priority, we are particularly interested in applications that meet the priority. However, we do not give an application that meets the priority a preference over other applications (34 CFR 75.105(c)(1)).

FINAL REQUIREMENTS:

The Assistant Deputy Secretary for Safe and Drug-Free Schools establishes the following requirements for this program. We may apply one or more of these requirements in any year in which this program is in effect.

Requirement 1--Align Project Goals with Identified Needs Using the School Health Index.

Applicants must complete the physical activity and nutrition questions in Modules 1-4 of the CDC's SHI self-assessment tool and develop project goals and plans that address the identified needs. Modules 1-4 are School Health and Safety Policies and Environment, Health Education, Physical Activity and Other Physical Activity Programs, and Nutrition Services. LEA applicants must use the SHI self-assessment to develop a School Health Improvement Plan focused on improving these issues, and design an initiative that addresses their identified gaps and weaknesses. Applicants must include their Overall Score Card for the questions answered in Modules 1-4 in their application, and correlate their School Health Improvement Plan to their project design. Grantees must also complete the same modules of the SHI at the end of the project period and submit the Overall Score Card from the second assessment in their final reports to demonstrate SHI completion and program improvement as a result of PEP funding.

If a CBO applicant (unless the CBO is a school) is in a partner agreement with an LEA or school, it must collaborate with its partner or partners to complete Modules 1-4 of the SHI.

Alternatively, if the CBO has not identified a school or LEA partner, the CBO is not required to do Modules 1-4 of the SHI but must use an alternative needs assessment tool to assess the nutrition and physical activity environment in the community for children. CBO applicants are required to include their overall findings from the community needs assessment and correlate their findings with their project design. Grantees will be required to complete the same needs assessment at the end of their project and submit their findings in their final reports to demonstrate the completion of the assessment and program involvement as a result of PEP funding.

Requirement 2--Nutrition- and Physical Activity-Related Policies.

Grantees must develop, update, or enhance physical activity policies and food- and nutrition-related policies that promote healthy eating and physical activity throughout students' everyday lives, as part of their PEP projects. Applicants must describe in their application their current policy framework, areas of focus, and the planned process for policy development, implementation, review, and monitoring. Grantees will be required to detail at the end of their project period in their final reports the physical activity and nutrition policies selected and how the policies improved through the course of the project.

Applicants must sign a Program-Specific Assurance that commits them to developing, updating, or enhancing these policies during the project period. Applicants that do not submit such a Program-Specific Assurance signed by the applicant's Authorized Representative are ineligible for the competition.

Requirement 3--Linkage with Local Wellness Policies.

Applicants that are participating in a program authorized by the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004 must describe in their applications their school district's established local wellness policy and how the proposed PEP project will align with, support, complement, and enhance the implementation of the applicant's local wellness policy. The LEA's local wellness policy should address all requirements in the Child Nutrition Act of 1966.

CBO applicants must describe in their applications how their proposed projects would enhance or support the intent of the local wellness policies of their LEA partner(s), if they are working in a partnership group.

If an applicant or a member of its partnership group does not participate in the school lunch program authorized by the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004, it will not necessarily have a local wellness policy and, thus, is not required to meet this requirement or adopt a local wellness policy. However, we encourage those applicants to develop and adopt a local wellness policy, consistent with the provisions in the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004 in conjunction with its PEP project.

Applicants must sign a Program-Specific Assurance that commits them to align their PEP project with the district's Local Wellness Policy, if applicable. Applicants to whom this

requirement applies that do not submit a Program-Specific Assurance signed by the applicant's Authorized Representative are ineligible for the competition.

Requirement 4--Linkages with Federal, State, and Local Initiatives.

If an applicant is implementing the CDC's Coordinated School Health program, it must coordinate project activities with that initiative and describe in its application how the proposed PEP project would be coordinated and integrated with the program.

If an applicant receives funding under the USDA's Team Nutrition initiative (Team Nutrition Training Grants), the applicant must describe in its application how the proposed PEP project supports the efforts of this initiative.

An applicant for a PEP project in a community that receives a grant under the Recovery Act Communities Putting Prevention to Work--Community Initiative must agree to coordinate its PEP project efforts with those under the Recovery Act Communities Putting Prevention to Work-Community Initiative.

Applicants and PEP-funded projects must complement, rather than duplicate, existing, ongoing or new efforts whose goals and objectives are to promote physical activity and healthy eating or help students meet their State standards for physical education.

Applicants must sign a Program-Specific Assurance that commits them to align their PEP project with the Coordinated School Health program, Team Nutrition Training Grant, Recovery Act Communities Putting Prevention to Work--Community Initiative, or any other similar Federal, State, or local initiatives. Applicants that do not submit a Program-Specific Assurance signed by the applicant's Authorized Representative are ineligible for the competition.

Requirement 5--Updates to Physical Education and Nutrition Instruction Curricula.

Applicants that plan to use grant-related funds, including Federal and non-Federal matching funds, to create, update, or enhance their physical education or nutrition education curricula are required to use the Physical Education Curriculum Analysis Tool (PECAT) and submit their overall PECAT scorecard, and the curriculum improvement plan from PECAT. Also, those applicants that plan to use grant-related funds, including Federal and non-Federal matching funds to create, update, or enhance their nutrition instruction in health education must complete the healthy eating module of the Health Education Curriculum Analysis Tool (HECAT). Applicants must use the curriculum improvement plan from the HECAT to identify

curricular changes to be addressed during the funding period. Applicants must also describe how the HECAT assessment would be used to guide nutrition instruction curricular changes. If an applicant is not proposing to use grant-related funds for physical education or nutrition instruction curricula, it would not need to use these tools.

Requirement 6--Equipment Purchases.

Purchases of equipment with PEP funds or with funds used to meet the program's matching requirement must be aligned with the curricular components of the proposed physical education and nutrition program. Applicants must commit to aligning the students' use of the equipment with PEP elements applicable to their projects, identified in the absolute priority in this notice, and any applicable curricula by signing a Program-Specific Assurance. Applicants that do not submit a Program-Specific Assurance signed by the applicant's Authorized Representative are ineligible for the competition.

Requirement 7--Increasing Transparency and Accountability.

Grantees must create or use existing reporting mechanisms to provide information on students' progress, in the aggregate, on the key program indicators, as described in this notice and required under the Government Performance and Results Act, as well as on any unique project-level measures proposed in the application. Grantees that are educational agencies or institutions are subject to applicable Federal, State, and local privacy provisions, including the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act-- a law that generally prohibits the non-consensual disclosure of personally identifiable information in a student's education record. All grantees must comply with applicable Federal, State, and local privacy provisions. The aggregate-level information should be easily accessible by the public, such as posted on the grantee's or a partner's Web site. Applicants must describe in their application the planned method for reporting.

Applicants must commit to reporting information to the public by signing a Program-Specific Assurance. Applicants that do not submit a Program-Specific Assurance signed by the applicant's Authorized Representative are ineligible for the competition.

Requirement 8--Participation in a National Evaluation.

Applicants must provide documentation of their commitment to participate in the Department's national evaluation. An LEA applicant must include a letter from the research office or research board approving its participation in the evaluation (if approval is needed), and a letter from the Authorized Representative agreeing to participate in the evaluation.

Requirement 9--Required Performance Measures and Data Collection Methodology.

Grantees must collect and report data on three GPRA measures using uniform data collection methods. Measure one assesses student physical activity levels: The percentage of students served by the grant who engage in 60 minutes of daily physical activity. Grantees are required to use pedometers for students in grades K-12 and an additional 3-Day Physical Activity Recall (3DPAR) instrument to collect data on students in grades 5-12.

Measure two focuses on student health-related fitness levels: The percentage of students served by the grant who achieve age-appropriate cardiovascular fitness levels. Grantees are required to use the 20-meter shuttle run, a criterion-referenced health-related fitness testing protocol, to assess cardiovascular fitness in middle and high school students.

Measure three focuses on student nutrition: The percentage of students served by the grant who consume fruit two or more times per day and vegetables three or more times per day. Programs serving high school students are required to use the nutrition-related questions from the Youth Risk Behavior Survey to determine the number of students who meet these goals. Programs serving elementary and middle school students are not required to use a specific measurement tool, and may select an appropriate assessment tool for their population.

For each measure, grantees are required to collect and aggregate data from four discrete data collection periods throughout each year. During the first year, grantees have an additional data collection period prior to program implementation to collect baseline data.

FINAL DEFINITIONS:

The Assistant Deputy Secretary for Safe and Drug-Free Schools applies the following definitions for this program.

We may apply one or more of these definitions in any year in which this program is in effect.

Head of local government means the head of, or an appropriate designee of, the party responsible for the civic functioning of the county, city, town, or municipality would be considered the head of local government. This includes, but is not limited to, the mayor, city manager, or county executive.

Local public health entity means an administrative or service unit of local or State government concerned with health and carrying some responsibility for the health of a jurisdiction smaller than the State (except for Rhode Island and Hawaii, because these States' health departments operate on behalf of local public health and have no sub-State unit). The definition applies to the State health department or the State

public health entity in the event that the local public health entity does not govern health and nutrition issues for the local area.

Organization supporting nutrition or healthy eating means a local public or private non-profit school, health-related professional organization, local public health entity, or local business that has demonstrated interest and efforts in promoting student health or nutrition. This term includes, but is not limited to LEAs (particularly an LEA's school food or child nutrition director), grocery stores, supermarkets, restaurants, corner stores, farmers' markets, farms, other private businesses, hospitals, institutions of higher education, Cooperative Extension Service and 4H Clubs, and community gardening organizations, when such entities have demonstrated a clear intent to promote student health and nutrition or have made tangible efforts to do so. This definition does not include representatives from trade associations or representatives from any organization representing any producers or marketers of food or beverage product(s).

Note: This notice does not solicit applications. In any year in which we choose to use one or more of these priorities and requirements, we invite applications through a notice in the Federal Register.

Executive Order 12866: This notice has been reviewed in accordance with Executive Order 12866. Under the terms of the order, we have assessed the potential costs and benefits of this final regulatory action.

The potential costs associated with this final regulatory action are those resulting from statutory requirements and those we have determined as necessary for administering this program effectively and efficiently.

In assessing the potential costs and benefits-- both quantitative and qualitative-- of this final regulatory action, we have determined that the benefits of the final priorities and requirements justify the costs.

We have determined, also, that this final regulatory action does not unduly interfere with State, local, and tribal governments in the exercise of their governmental functions.

Discussion of Costs and Benefits:

We fully discussed the costs and benefits of this regulatory action in the notice of proposed priorities, requirements, and definitions. After review, we determined that, although grantees may anticipate costs in developing infrastructure partnerships, supporting integrated, comprehensive programming and policies, and building data and accountability systems and processes, the benefits of the priorities, requirements, and definitions justify the costs.

## Regulatory Flexibility Act Certification

The Secretary certifies that this regulatory action will not have a significant economic impact on a substantial number of small entities. The small entities that this proposed regulatory action will affect are small LEAs or nonprofit organizations applying for and receiving funds under this program. The Secretary believes that the costs imposed on applicants by the priorities, requirements, and definitions would be limited to paperwork burden related to preparing an application and that the benefits of implementing these proposals would outweigh any costs incurred by applicants.

Participation in this program is voluntary. For this reason, the priorities, requirements, and definitions would impose no burden on small entities in general. Eligible applicants will determine whether to apply for funds, and have the opportunity to weigh the requirements for preparing applications, and any associated costs, against the likelihood of receiving funding and the requirements for implementing projects under the program. Eligible applicants most likely would apply only if they determine that the likely benefits exceed the costs of preparing an application. The likely benefits include the potential receipt of a grant as well as other benefits that may accrue to an entity through its development of an application, such as the use of that application to spur improvement in physical education planning without additional Federal funding.

The U.S. Small Business Administration Size Standards defines as "small entities" for-profit or nonprofit institutions with total annual revenue below \$7,000,000 or, if they are institutions controlled by small governmental jurisdictions (that are comprised of cities, counties, towns, townships, villages, school districts, or special districts), with a population of less than 50,000. The Urban Institute's National Center for Charitable Statistics reported that of 203,635 nonprofit organizations that had an educational mission and reported revenue to the IRS by July 2009, 200,342 (or about 98 percent) had revenues of less than \$5 million. In addition, there are 12,484 LEAs in the country that meet the definition of small entity. However, given program history, the Secretary believes that only a small number of these entities would be interested in applying for funds under this program, thus reducing the likelihood that this final regulatory action would have a significant economic impact on small entities.

Further, the action may help small entities determine whether they have the interest, need, or capacity to implement activities under the program and, thus, prevent small entities

that do not have such an interest, need, and capacity from absorbing the burden of applying.

This regulatory action would not have a significant economic impact on small entities once they receive a grant because they would be able to meet the costs of compliance using the funds provided under this program and with any funds they might obtain from external parties to fulfill the matching requirements of the program.

Intergovernmental Review: This program is subject to Executive Order 12372 and the regulations in 34 CFR part 79. One of the objectives of the Executive Order is to foster an intergovernmental partnership and a strengthened federalism. The Executive Order relies on processes developed by State and local governments for coordination and review of proposed Federal financial assistance.

This document provides early notification of our specific plans and actions for this program.

Accessible Format: Individuals with disabilities can obtain this document in an accessible format (e.g., braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the program contact person listed under FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT.

Electronic Access to This Document: You can view this document, as well as all other documents of this Department published in the Federal Register, in text or Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) on the Internet at the following site:

[www.ed.gov/news/fedregister](http://www.ed.gov/news/fedregister). To use PDF you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is available free at this site.

Note: The official version of this document is the document published in the Federal Register. Free Internet access to the official edition of the Federal Register and the Code of Federal Regulations is available on GPO Access at: [www.gpoaccess.gov/nara/index.html](http://www.gpoaccess.gov/nara/index.html).

Dated:

---

Kevin Jennings,  
Assistant Deputy Secretary for Safe and  
Drug-Free Schools.

**NOTICE INVITING APPLICATIONS (NIA)**

4000-01-U

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools

Overview Information

Carol M. White Physical Education Program

Notice inviting applications for new awards for fiscal year (FY) 2010.

Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) Number: 84.215F.

Dates:

Applications Available: June 18, 2010.

Deadline for Transmittal of Applications: July 19, 2010.

Deadline for Intergovernmental Review: September 16, 2010.

Full Text of Announcement

I. Funding Opportunity Description

Purpose of Program: The Carol M. White Physical Education Program (PEP) provides grants to local educational agencies (LEAs) and community-based organizations (CBOs) to initiate, expand, and improve physical education for students in grades K-12. Grant recipients must implement programs that help students make progress toward meeting State standards.

Priorities: These priorities are from the notice of final priorities, requirements, and definitions for this program, published elsewhere in this issue of the Federal Register.

Absolute Priority:

For FY 2010 and any subsequent year in which we make awards from the list of unfunded applicants from this competition, this priority is an absolute priority. Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(3), we consider only applications that meet this priority.

The priority is:

Under this priority, an applicant is required to develop, expand, or improve its physical education program and address its State's physical education standards by undertaking the following activities: (1) instruction in healthy eating habits and good nutrition and (2) physical fitness activities that must include at least one of the following: (a) fitness education and assessment to help students understand, improve, or maintain their physical well-being; (b) instruction in a variety of motor skills and physical activities designed to enhance the physical, mental, and social or emotional development of every student; (c) development of, and instruction in, cognitive concepts about motor skills and physical fitness that support a lifelong healthy lifestyle; (d) opportunities to develop positive social and cooperative skills through physical activity participation; or (e) opportunities for professional development for teachers of physical education to stay abreast of the latest research, issues, and trends in the field of physical education.

Within this absolute priority, we are particularly interested in applications that address the following invitational priority.

Invitational Priority: Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(1) we do not give an application that meets this invitational priority a competitive or absolute preference over other applications.

This priority is:

Projects that propose to align their programs with the goals and principles of the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) HealthierUS School Challenge (HUSSC) initiative.

Background. The USDA's HUSSC initiative was established in 2004 to recognize those schools participating in the National School Lunch Program that have created healthier school environments through promotion of nutrition and physical activity. Schools can apply for recognition at four levels of performance, Bronze, Silver, Gold, and Gold of Distinction. To qualify for an award, a school must submit a formal application to the USDA's Food and Nutrition Service and demonstrate that they meet basic criteria set forth by USDA. These criteria reflect the recommendations of the 2005 Dietary Guidelines for Americans and the Institute of Medicine's published recommendations for foods that should be served in schools, outside of the organized school lunch meals. HealthierUS Schools must also have a local school wellness policy as mandated by Congress. We believe that the intent of the HUSSC initiative complements the priorities and requirements in this notice, as well as helps schools meet the goals established by First Lady Michelle Obama's Let's Move! initiative focused on improving school food. Additional information about the HUSSC initiative is available at the USDA's Web site at: <http://www.fns.usda.gov/tn/healthierus/index.html>.

Competitive Preference Priorities: There are two competitive preference priorities for this competition. For FY 2010 and any subsequent year in which we make awards from the list of unfunded applicants from this competition, these priorities are competitive preference priorities. Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(2)(ii) we will award up to an additional 5 points to an application that meets these priorities.

Competitive Preference Priority 1 -- Collection of Body Mass Index (BMI) Measurement.

Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(2)(i), we will award an additional 2 points to an application that meets this priority.

This priority is:

We will give a competitive preference priority to applicants that agree to implement aggregate BMI data collection, and use it as part of a comprehensive assessment of health and fitness for the purposes of monitoring the weight

status of their student population across time. Applicants are required to sign a Program-Specific Assurance that will commit them to:

(a) Use the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) BMI-for-age growth charts to interpret BMI results ([www.cdc.gov/growthcharts](http://www.cdc.gov/growthcharts));

(b) Create a plan to develop and implement a protocol that will include parents in the development of their BMI assessment and data collection policies, including a mechanism to allow parents to provide feedback on the policy. Applicants are required to detail the following required components in their aggregate BMI data collection protocol: the proposed method for measuring BMI, who will perform the BMI assessment (i.e., staff members trained to obtain accurate and reliable height and weight measurements), the frequency of reporting, the planned equipment to be used, methods for calculating the planned sampling frame (if the applicant would use sampling), the policies used to ensure student privacy during measurement, how the data will be secured to protect student confidentiality, who will have access to the data, how long the data will be kept, and what will happen to the data after that time. Applicants that intend to inform parents of their student's weight status must include plans for notifying parents of that status, and must include their plan for ensuring that resources are available for safe and effective follow-up with trained medical care providers;

(c) Create a plan to notify parents of the BMI assessment and to allow parents to opt out of the BMI assessment and reasonable notification of their choice to opt out. Unless the BMI assessment is permitted or required by State law, LEA applicants are required to detail their policies for providing reasonable notice of the adoption or continued use of such policies directly to the parents of the students enrolled in the LEA's schools served by the agency. At a minimum, the LEA must provide such notice at least annually, at the beginning of the school year and within a reasonable period of time after any substantive change in such policies, pursuant to the Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment, 20 U.S.C. 1232h(c)(2)(A); and

(d) De-identify the student information (such as by removing the student's name and any identifying information from the record and assigning a record code), aggregate the BMI data at the school or district level, and make the aggregate data publicly available and easily accessible to the public annually. Applicants must describe their plan for the level of reporting they plan to use, depending on the size of the population, such as at the district level or the school level. Applicants must also detail in their application their plan for how these data

will be used in coordination with other required data for the program, such as fitness, physical activity, and nutritional intake measures, and how the combination of these measures will be used to improve physical education programming and policy.

On June 18, 1991, 17 Federal Departments and Agencies, including the Department of Education, adopted a common set of regulations known as the Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects or "Common Rule." See 34 CFR part 97. Applicants that engage in BMI data collection may be subject to the Department's Protection of Human Subjects regulations if the data are used in research funded by the Federal government or for any future research conducted by an institution that has adopted the Federal policy for all research of that institution. The regulations define research as "a systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge. Activities that meet this definition constitute research for purposes of this policy, whether or not they are conducted or supported under a program which is considered research for other purposes. For example, some demonstration and service programs may include research activities." 34 CFR 97.102(d). Information on Human Subjects requirements is found at:  
<http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocfo/humansub.html>.

Applications that do not provide a Program-Specific Assurance signed by an Authorized Representative committing the applicant to completing previously listed tasks (a) through (d) during their project period are not eligible for additional points under competitive preference priority 1.

In implementing this priority, we encourage applicants to consult with their partners to determine if and how any of the partners could contribute to the data collection, reporting, or potential referral processes.

Competitive Preference Priority 2-- Partnerships Between Applicants and Supporting Community Entities.

Under 34 CFR 75.105(c)(2)(i), we will award an additional 3 points to an application that meets this priority.

This priority is:

We will give a competitive preference priority to an applicant that includes in its application an agreement that details the participation of required partners, as defined in this notice. The agreement must include a description of: (1) each partner's roles and responsibilities in the project; (2) how each partner will contribute to the project, including any contribution to the local match; (3) an assurance that the application was developed after timely and meaningful consultation between the required parties, as defined in this notice; and (4) a commitment to work together to reach the

desired goals and outcomes of the project. The partner agreement must be signed by the Authorized Representative of each of the required partners and by other partners as appropriate.

For an LEA applicant, this partnership agreement must include: (1) the LEA; (2) at least one CBO; (3) a local public health entity, as defined in this notice; (4) the LEA's food service or child nutrition director; and (5) the head of the local government, as defined in this notice.

For a CBO applicant, the partnership agreement must include: (1) the CBO; (2) a local public health entity, as defined in this notice; (3) a local organization supporting nutrition or healthy eating, as defined in this notice; (4) the head of the local government, as defined in this notice; and (5) the LEA from which the largest number of students expected to participate in the CBO's project attend. If the CBO applicant is a school, such as a parochial or other private school, the applicant must describe its school as part of the partnership agreement but is not required to provide an additional signature from an LEA or another school. A CBO applicant that is a school and serves its own population of students is required to include another CBO as part of its partnership and include the head of that CBO as a signatory on the partnership agreement.

Although partnerships with other parties are required for this priority, the eligible applicant must retain the administrative and fiscal control of the project.

#### REQUIREMENTS:

The Assistant Deputy Secretary for Safe and Drug-Free Schools establishes the following requirements for this program. We may apply one or more of these requirements in any year in which this program is in effect.

#### Requirement 1--Align Project Goals with Identified Needs Using the School Health Index.

Applicants must complete the physical activity and nutrition questions in Modules 1-4 of the CDC's SHI self-assessment tool and develop project goals and plans that address the identified needs. Modules 1-4 are School Health and Safety Policies and Environment, Health Education, Physical Activity and Other Physical Activity Programs, and Nutrition Services. LEA applicants must use the SHI self-assessment to develop a School Health Improvement Plan focused on improving these issues, and design an initiative that addresses their identified gaps and weaknesses. Applicants must include their Overall Score Card for the questions answered in Modules 1-4 in their application, and correlate their School Health Improvement Plan to their project design. Grantees must also complete the same modules of the SHI at the end of the project period and submit

the Overall Score Card from the second assessment in their final reports to demonstrate SHI completion and program improvement as a result of PEP funding.

If a CBO applicant (unless the CBO is a school) is in a partner agreement with an LEA or school, it must collaborate with its partner or partners to complete Modules 1-4 of the SHI.

Alternatively, if the CBO has not identified a school or LEA partner, the CBO is not required to do Modules 1-4 of the SHI but must use an alternative needs assessment tool to assess the nutrition and physical activity environment in the community for children. CBO applicants are required to include their overall findings from the community needs assessment and correlate their findings with their project design. Grantees will be required to complete the same needs assessment at the end of their project and submit their findings in their final reports to demonstrate the completion of the assessment and program involvement as a result of PEP funding.

#### Requirement 2--Nutrition- and Physical Activity-Related Policies.

Grantees must develop, update, or enhance physical activity policies and food- and nutrition-related policies that promote healthy eating and physical activity throughout students' everyday lives, as part of their PEP projects. Applicants must describe in their application their current policy framework, areas of focus, and the planned process for policy development, implementation, review, and monitoring. Grantees will be required to detail at the end of their project period in their final reports the physical activity and nutrition policies selected and how the policies improved through the course of the project.

Applicants must sign a Program-Specific Assurance that commits them to developing, updating, or enhancing these policies during the project period. Applicants that do not submit such a Program-Specific Assurance signed by the applicant's Authorized Representative are ineligible for the competition.

#### Requirement 3--Linkage with Local Wellness Policies.

Applicants that are participating in a program authorized by the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004 must describe in their applications their school district's established local wellness policy and how the proposed PEP project will align with, support, complement, and enhance the implementation of the applicant's local wellness policy. The LEA's local wellness policy should address all requirements in the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004.

CBO applicants must describe in their applications how their proposed projects would enhance or support the intent of the local wellness policies of their LEA partner(s), if they are working in a partnership group.

If an applicant or a member of its partnership group does not participate in the school lunch program authorized by the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004, it will not necessarily have a local wellness policy and, thus, is not required to meet this requirement or adopt a local wellness policy. However, we encourage those applicants to develop and adopt a local wellness policy, consistent with the provisions in the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act and the Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act of 2004 in conjunction with its PEP project.

Applicants must sign a Program-Specific Assurance that commits them to align their PEP project with the district's Local Wellness Policy, if applicable. Applicants to whom this requirement applies that do not submit a Program-Specific Assurance signed by the applicant's Authorized Representative are ineligible for the competition.

Requirement 4--Linkages with Federal, State, and Local Initiatives.

If an applicant is implementing the CDC's Coordinated School Health program, it must coordinate project activities with that initiative and describe in its application how the proposed PEP project would be coordinated and integrated with the program.

If an applicant receives funding under the USDA's Team Nutrition initiative (Team Nutrition Training Grants), the applicant must describe in its application how the proposed PEP project supports the efforts of this initiative.

An applicant for a PEP project in a community that receives a grant under the Recovery Act Communities Putting Prevention to Work--Community Initiative must agree to coordinate its PEP project efforts with those under the Recovery Act Communities Putting Prevention to Work--Community Initiative.

Applicants and PEP-funded projects must complement, rather than duplicate, existing, ongoing or new efforts whose goals and objectives are to promote physical activity and healthy eating or help students meet their State standards for physical education.

Applicants must sign a Program-Specific Assurance that commits them to align their PEP project with the Coordinated School Health program, Team Nutrition Training Grant, Recovery Act Communities Putting Prevention to Work--Community Initiative, or any other similar Federal, State, or local

initiatives. Applicants that do not submit a Program- Specific Assurance signed by the applicant's Authorized Representative are ineligible for the competition.

Requirement 5--Updates to Physical Education and Nutrition Instruction Curricula.

Applicants that plan to use grant-related funds, including Federal and non-Federal matching funds, to create, update, or enhance their physical education or nutrition education curricula are required to use the Physical Education Curriculum Analysis Tool (PECAT) and submit their overall PECAT scorecard, and the curriculum improvement plan from PECAT. Also, those applicants that plan to use grant-related funds, including Federal and non-Federal matching funds to create, update, or enhance their nutrition instruction in health education must complete the healthy eating module of the Health Education Curriculum Analysis Tool (HECAT). Applicants must use the curriculum improvement plan from the HECAT to identify curricular changes to be addressed during the funding period. Applicants must also describe how the HECAT assessment would be used to guide nutrition instruction curricular changes. If an applicant is not proposing to use grant-related funds for physical education or nutrition instruction curricula, it would not need to use these tools.

Requirement 6--Equipment Purchases.

Purchases of equipment with PEP funds or with funds used to meet the program's matching requirement must be aligned with the curricular components of the proposed physical education and nutrition program. Applicants must commit to aligning the students' use of the equipment with PEP elements applicable to their projects, identified in the absolute priority in this notice, and any applicable curricula by signing a Program-Specific Assurance. Applicants that do not submit a Program-Specific Assurance signed by the applicant's Authorized Representative are ineligible for the competition.

Requirement 7--Increasing Transparency and Accountability.

Grantees must create or use existing reporting mechanisms to provide information on students' progress, in the aggregate, on the key program indicators, as described in this notice and required under the Government Performance and Results Act, as well as on any unique project-level measures proposed in the application. Grantees that are educational agencies or institutions are subject to applicable Federal, State, and local privacy provisions, including the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act-- a law that generally prohibits the non-consensual disclosure of personally identifiable information in a student's education record. All grantees must comply with applicable Federal, State, and local privacy provisions. The aggregate-

level information should be easily accessible by the public, such as posted on the grantee's or a partner's Web site. Applicants must describe in their application the planned method for reporting.

Applicants must commit to reporting information to the public by signing a Program-Specific Assurance. Applicants that do not submit a Program-Specific Assurance signed by the applicant's Authorized Representative are ineligible for the competition.

Requirement 8--Participation in a National Evaluation.

Applicants must provide documentation of their commitment to participate in the Department's national evaluation. An LEA applicant must include a letter from the research office or research board approving its participation in the evaluation (if approval is needed), and a letter from the Authorized Representative agreeing to participate in the evaluation.

Requirement 9--Required Performance Measures and Data Collection Methodology.

Grantees must collect and report data on three GPRA measures using uniform data collection methods. Measure one assesses student physical activity levels: The percentage of students served by the grant who engage in 60 minutes of daily physical activity. Grantees are required to use pedometers for students in grades K-12 and an additional 3-Day Physical Activity Recall (3DPAR) instrument to collect data on students in grades 5-12.

Measure two focuses on student health-related fitness levels: The percentage of students served by the grant who achieve age-appropriate cardiovascular fitness levels. Grantees are required to use the 20-meter shuttle run, a criterion-referenced health-related fitness testing protocol, to assess cardiovascular fitness in middle and high school students.

Measure three focuses on student nutrition: The percentage of students served by the grant who consume fruit two or more times per day and vegetables three or more times per day. Programs serving high school students are required to use the nutrition-related questions from the Youth Risk Behavior Survey to determine the number of students who meet these goals. Programs serving elementary and middle school students are not required to use a specific measurement tool, and may select an appropriate assessment tool for their population.

For each measure, grantees are required to collect and aggregate data from four discrete data collection periods throughout each year. During the first year, grantees have an additional data collection period prior to program implementation to collect baseline data.

Program Authority: 20 U.S.C. 7261-7261f.

Applicable Regulations: (a) The Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) in 34 CFR parts 74, 75, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 84, 85, 86, 97, 98, 99, and 299. (b) The notice of final eligibility requirements for the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools discretionary grant programs published in the Federal Register on December 4, 2006 (71 FR 70369). (c) The notice of final priorities, requirements, and definitions published elsewhere in this issue of the Federal Register.

Note: The regulations in 34 CFR part 79 apply to all applicants except federally recognized Indian tribes.

Note: The regulations in 34 CFR part 86 apply to institutions of higher education only.

## II. Award Information

Type of Award: Discretionary grants.

Estimated Available Funds: \$39,729,000

Contingent upon the availability of funds and the quality of applications, we may make additional awards later in FY 2010 and in subsequent years from the list of unfunded applicants from this competition.

Estimated Range of Awards: \$100,000-\$750,000.

Estimated Average Size of Awards: \$427,000.

Estimated Number of Awards: 93.

Note: The Department is not bound by any estimates in this notice.

Project Period: Up to 36 months.

## III. Eligibility Information

1. Eligible Applicants: (a) LEAs, including charter schools that are considered LEAs under State law, and CBOs, including faith-based organizations provided that they meet the applicable statutory and regulatory requirements.

(b) The Secretary limits eligibility under this discretionary grant competition to LEAs or CBOs that do not currently have an active grant under the PEP program. For the purpose of this eligibility requirement, a grant is considered active until the end of the grant's project or funding period, including any extensions of those periods that extend the grantee's authority to obligate funds.

2. (a) Cost Sharing or Matching: In accordance with section 5506 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as amended (ESEA), the Federal share of the project costs may not exceed (i) 90 percent of the total cost of a program for the first year for which the program receives assistance; and (ii) 75 percent of such cost for the second and each subsequent year.

(b) Supplement-Not-Supplant: This competition involves supplement-not-supplant funding requirements. Funds made available under this program must be used to supplement, and not

supplant, any other Federal, State, or local funds available for physical education activities in accordance with section 5507 of the ESEA.

3. Other: An application for funds under this program may provide for the participation, in the activities funded, of (a) students enrolled in private nonprofit elementary schools or secondary schools, and their parents and teachers; or (b) home-schooled students, and their parents and teachers.

#### IV. Application and Submission Information

##### 1. Address to Request Application Package:

Carlette Huntley, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 10071 PCP, Washington, DC 20202. Telephone: (202) 245-7871. You can also obtain an application package via the Internet. To obtain a copy via internet, use the following address: <http://www.ed.gov/programs/whitephysed/applicant.html>.

If you use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD), call the Federal Relay Service (FRS), toll free, at 1-800-877-8339.

Individuals with disabilities can obtain a copy of the application package in an accessible format (e.g., braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) by contacting the program contact person listed under Accessible Format in section VIII of this notice.

##### 2. Content and Form of Application Submission:

Requirements concerning the content of an application, together with the forms you must submit, are in the application package for this program.

##### 3. Submission Dates and Times:

Applications Available: [INSERT DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER].

Deadline for Transmittal of Applications: [INSERT DATE 30 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER].

Applications for grants under this program must be submitted electronically using the Electronic Grant Application System (e-Application) accessible through the Department's e-Grants site. For information (including dates and times) about how to submit your application electronically, or in paper format by mail or hand delivery if you qualify for an exception to the electronic submission requirement, please refer to section IV. 7. Other Submission Requirements of this notice.

We do not consider an application that does not comply with the deadline requirements.

Individuals with disabilities who need an accommodation or auxiliary aid in connection with the application process should contact the person listed under For Further Information Contact in section VII of this notice. If the Department provides an accommodation or auxiliary aid to an individual with a

disability in connection with the application process, the individual's application remains subject to all other requirements and limitations in this notice.

Deadline for Intergovernmental Review: [INSERT DATE 90 DAYS AFTER DATE OF PUBLICATION IN THE FEDERAL REGISTER].

4. Intergovernmental Review: This program is subject to Executive Order 12372 and the regulations in 34 CFR part 79. Information about Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs under Executive Order 12372 is in the application package for this program.

5. Funding Restrictions: Funds may not be used for construction activities or for extracurricular activities, such as team sports and Reserve Officers' Training Corps program activities (See section 5503 (c) of the ESEA).

In accordance with section 5505(b) of the ESEA, not more than five percent of grant funds provided under this program to an LEA or CBO for any fiscal year may be used for administrative expenses.

We reference additional regulations outlining funding restrictions in the Applicable Regulations section of this notice. Information about prohibited activities and use of funds also is included in the application package for this competition.

6. Data Universal Numbering System Number, Taxpayer Identification Number, and Central Contractor Registry: To do business with the Department of Education, (1) you must have a Data Universal Numbering System (DUNS) number and a Taxpayer Identification Number (TIN); (2) you must register both of those numbers with the Central Contractor Registry (CCR), the Government's primary registrant database; and (3) you must provide those same numbers on your application.

You can obtain a DUNS number from Dun and Bradstreet. A DUNS number can be created within one business day.

If you are a corporate entity, agency, institution, or organization, you can obtain a TIN from the Internal Revenue Service. If you are an individual, you can obtain a TIN from the Internal Revenue Service or the Social Security Administration. If you need a new TIN, please allow 2-5 weeks for your TIN to become active.

The CCR registration process may take five or more business days to complete. If you are currently registered with the CCR, you may not need to make any changes. However, please make certain that the TIN associated with your DUNS number is correct. Also note that you will need to update your CCR registration on an annual basis. This may take three or more business days to complete.

7. Other Submission Requirements: Applications for grants under this program must be submitted electronically unless you qualify for an exception to this requirement in accordance with the instructions in this section.

a. Electronic Submission of Applications.

Applications for grants under the Carol M. White Physical Education Program--CFDA Number 84.215F must be submitted electronically using e-Application, accessible through the Department's e-Grants Web site at: <http://e-grants.ed.gov>.

We will reject your application if you submit it in paper format unless, as described elsewhere in this section, you qualify for one of the exceptions to the electronic submission requirement and submit, no later than two weeks before the application deadline date, a written statement to the Department that you qualify for one of these exceptions. Further information regarding calculation of the date that is two weeks before the application deadline date is provided later in this section under Exception to Electronic Submission Requirement.

While completing your electronic application, you will be entering data online that will be saved into a database. You may not e-mail an electronic copy of a grant application to us.

Please note the following:

- You must complete the electronic submission of your grant application by 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, DC time, on the application deadline date. E-Application will not accept an application for this program after 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, DC time, on the application deadline date. Therefore, we strongly recommend that you do not wait until the application deadline date to begin the application process.

- The hours of operation of the e-Grants Web site are 6:00 a.m. Monday until 7:00 p.m. Wednesday; and 6:00 a.m. Thursday until 8:00 p.m. Sunday, Washington, DC time. Please note that, because of maintenance, the system is unavailable between 8:00 p.m. on Sundays and 6:00 a.m. on Mondays, and between 7:00 p.m. on Wednesdays and 6:00 a.m. on Thursdays, Washington, DC time. Any modifications to these hours are posted on the e-Grants Web site.

- You will not receive additional point value because you submit your application in electronic format, nor will we penalize you if you qualify for an exception to the electronic submission requirement, as described elsewhere in this section, and submit your application in paper format.

- You must submit all documents electronically, including all information you typically provide on the following forms: the Application for Federal Assistance (SF 424), the Department of Education Supplemental Information for SF 424, Budget Information--Non-Construction Programs (ED 524), and all

necessary assurances and certifications. You must attach any narrative sections of your application as files in a .DOC (document), .RTF (rich text), or .PDF (Portable Document) format. If you upload a file type other than the three file types specified in this paragraph or submit a password protected file, we will not review that material.

- Your electronic application must comply with any page limit requirements described in this notice.
- Prior to submitting your electronic application, you may wish to print a copy of it for your records.
- After you electronically submit your application, you will receive an automatic acknowledgment that will include a PR/Award number (an identifying number unique to your application).

• Within three working days after submitting your electronic application, fax a signed copy of the SF 424 to the Application Control Center after following these steps:

- (1) Print SF 424 from e-Application.
- (2) The applicant's Authorizing Representative must sign this form.
- (3) Place the PR/Award number in the upper right hand corner of the hard-copy signature page of the SF 424.
- (4) Fax the signed SF 424 to the Competition Manager for this program, Carlette Huntley at 202-245-7166.

• We may request that you provide us original signatures on other forms at a later date.

Application Deadline Date Extension in Case of e-Application

Unavailability: If you are prevented from electronically submitting your application on the application deadline date because e-Application is unavailable, we will grant you an extension of one business day to enable you to transmit your application electronically, by mail, or by hand delivery. We will grant this extension if--

- (1) You are a registered user of e-Application and you have initiated an electronic application for this competition; and
- (2) (a) E-Application is unavailable for 60 minutes or more between the hours of 8:30 a.m. and 3:30 p.m., Washington, DC time, on the application deadline date; or
- (b) E-Application is unavailable for any period of time between 3:30 p.m. and 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, DC time, on the application deadline date.

We must acknowledge and confirm these periods of unavailability before granting you an extension. To request this extension or to confirm our acknowledgment of any system unavailability, you may contact either (1) the person listed elsewhere in this notice under For Further Information Contact

(see VII. Agency Contact) or (2) the e-Grants help desk at 1-888-336-8930. If e-Application is unavailable due to technical problems with the system and, therefore, the application deadline is extended, an e-mail will be sent to all registered users who have initiated an e-Application. Extensions referred to in this section apply only to the unavailability of e-Application.

Exception to Electronic Submission Requirement: You qualify for an exception to the electronic submission requirement, and may submit your application in paper format, if you are unable to submit an application through e-Application because--

- You do not have access to the Internet; or
- You do not have the capacity to upload large documents to e-Application;

and

- No later than two weeks before the application deadline date (14 calendar days or, if the fourteenth calendar day before the application deadline date falls on a Federal holiday, the next business day following the Federal holiday), you mail or fax a written statement to the Department, explaining which of the two grounds for an exception prevents you from using the Internet to submit your application. If you mail your written statement to the Department, it must be postmarked no later than two weeks before the application deadline date. If you fax your written statement to the Department, we must receive the faxed statement no later than two weeks before the application deadline date.

Address and mail or fax your statement to: Carlette Huntley, U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW., room 10071, Potomac Plaza Center, Washington, DC 20202-6450. FAX: (202) 245-7166. Your paper application must be submitted in accordance with the mail or hand delivery instructions described in this notice.

b. Submission of Paper Applications by Mail.

If you qualify for an exception to the electronic submission requirement, you may mail (through the U.S. Postal Service or a commercial carrier) your application to the Department. You must mail the original and two copies of your application, on or before the application deadline date, to the Department at the following address:

U.S. Department of Education  
Application Control Center  
Attention: (CFDA Number 84.215F)  
LBJ Basement Level 1  
400 Maryland Avenue, SW.  
Washington, DC 20202-4260

You must show proof of mailing consisting of one of the following:

- (1) A legibly dated U.S. Postal Service postmark.
- (2) A legible mail receipt with the date of mailing stamped by the U.S. Postal Service.
- (3) A dated shipping label, invoice, or receipt from a commercial carrier.
- (4) Any other proof of mailing acceptable to the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Education.

If you mail your application through the U.S. Postal Service, we do not accept either of the following as proof of mailing:

- (1) A private metered postmark.
- (2) A mail receipt that is not dated by the U.S. Postal Service.

If your application is postmarked after the application deadline date, we will not consider your application.

Note: The U.S. Postal Service does not uniformly provide a dated postmark. Before relying on this method, you should check with your local post office.

c. Submission of Paper Applications by Hand Delivery.

If you qualify for an exception to the electronic submission requirement, you (or a courier service) may deliver your paper application to the Department by hand. You must deliver the original and two copies of your application, by hand, on or before the application deadline date, to the Department at the following address:

U.S. Department of Education  
Application Control Center  
Attention: (CFDA Number 84.215F)  
550 12th Street, SW.  
Room 7041, Potomac Center Plaza  
Washington, DC 20202-4260

The Application Control Center accepts hand deliveries daily between 8:00 a.m. and 4:30:00 p.m., Washington, DC time, except Saturdays, Sundays, and Federal holidays.

Note for Mail or Hand Delivery of Paper Applications: If you mail or hand deliver your application to the Department--

(1) You must indicate on the envelope and--if not provided by the Department--in Item 11 of the SF 424 the CFDA number, including suffix letter, if any, of the competition under which you are submitting your application; and

(2) The Application Control Center will mail to you a notification of receipt of your grant application. If you do not receive this grant notification within 15 business days from the application deadline date, you should call the U.S.

Department of Education Application Control Center at (202) 245-6288.

#### V. Application Review Information

1. Selection Criteria: The selection criteria for this program are from 34 CFR 75.210 and are listed in the application package.

2. Review and Selection Process: An additional factor we consider in selecting an application for an award is equitable distribution of awards among LEAs and CBOs serving urban and rural areas. (See 20 U.S.C. 7261e(b).)

#### VI. Award Administration Information

1. Award Notices: If your application is successful, we notify your U.S. Representative and U.S. Senators and send you a Grant Award Notification (GAN). We may notify you informally, also.

If your application is not evaluated or not selected for funding, we notify you.

2. Administrative and National Policy Requirements: We identify administrative and national policy requirements in the application package and reference these and other requirements in the Applicable Regulations section of this notice.

We reference the regulations outlining the terms and conditions of an award in the Applicable Regulations section of this notice and include these and other specific conditions in the GAN. The GAN also incorporates your approved application as part of your binding commitments under the grant.

3. Reporting: There are reporting requirements under this program, including under section 5505(a) of the ESEA and 34 CFR 75.118 and 75.720. In accordance with section 5505(a) of the ESEA, grantees under this program are required to submit an annual report that--

(1) Describes the activities conducted during the preceding year; and

(2) Demonstrates that progress has been made toward meeting State standards for physical education.

If you receive a multi-year award, you must submit an annual performance report that provides the most current performance and financial expenditure information as directed by the Secretary under 34 CFR 75.118. The Secretary may also require more frequent performance reports under 34 CFR 75.720(c).

This annual report must also address progress toward meeting the performance and efficiency measures established by the Secretary for this program and described in the next section of this notice.

At the end of your project period, you must submit a final performance report, including financial information, as directed

by the Secretary. The Secretary may also require more frequent performance reports under 34 CFR 75.720. For specific requirements on reporting, please go to [www.ed.gov/fund/grant/apply/appforms/appforms.html](http://www.ed.gov/fund/grant/apply/appforms/appforms.html).

4. Performance Measures: The Secretary has established the following key performance measures for collecting data to use in assessing the effectiveness of PEP.

(a) The percentage of students served by the grant who engage in 60 minutes of daily physical activity.

(b) The percentage of students served by the grant who achieve age-appropriate cardiovascular fitness levels.

(c) The percentage of students served by the grant who consume fruit two or more times per day and vegetables three or more times per day.

(d) The cost (based on the amount of the grant award) per student who achieves the level of physical activity required to meet the physical activity measures above (percentage of students who engage in 60 minutes of daily physical activity).

These measures constitute the Department's measures of success for this program. Consequently, applicants for a grant under this program are advised to give careful consideration to these measures in conceptualizing the approach and evaluation of their proposed project. If funded, applicants will be asked to collect and report data in their performance and final reports about progress toward these measures. For specific requirements on grantee reporting, please go to [www.ed.gov/fund/grant/apply/appforms/appforms.html](http://www.ed.gov/fund/grant/apply/appforms/appforms.html).

#### VII. Agency Contact

For Further Information Contact: Carlette Huntley, U.S. Department of Education, 550 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW., room 10071, Potomac Center Plaza, Washington, DC 20202-6450. Telephone: 202-245-7871 or by e-mail: [Carlette.Huntley@ed.gov](mailto:Carlette.Huntley@ed.gov).

If you use a TDD, call the FRS, toll free, at 1-800-877-8339.

#### VIII. Other Information

Accessible Format: Individuals with disabilities can obtain this document and a copy of the application package in an accessible format (e.g., braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the program contact person listed under For Further Information Contact in section VII of this notice.

Electronic Access to This Document: You can view this document, as well as all other documents of this Department published in the Federal Register, in text or Adobe Portable Document Format (PDF) on the Internet at the following site:

[www.ed.gov/news/fedregister](http://www.ed.gov/news/fedregister).

To use PDF you must have Adobe Acrobat Reader, which is

available free at this site.

Note: The official version of this document is the document published in the Federal Register. Free Internet access to the official edition of the Federal Register and the Code of Federal Regulations is available on GPO Access at:

[www.gpoaccess.gov/nara/index.html](http://www.gpoaccess.gov/nara/index.html).

Dated:

---

Kevin Jennings,  
Assistant Deputy Secretary for  
Safe and Drug-Free Schools.

## **AUTHORIZING LEGISLATION**

Section 5501, Part D, Subpart 10  
Title V, ESEA

Subpart 10- Physical Education

### **SEC. 5501. SHORT TITLE.**

This subpart may be cited as the 'Carol M. White Physical Education Program'.

### **SEC. 5502. PURPOSE.**

The purpose of this subpart is to award grants and contracts to initiate, expand, and improve physical education programs for all kindergarten through 12th-grade students.

### **SEC. 5503. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.**

(a) AUTHORIZATION- The Secretary is authorized to award grants to local educational agencies and community-based organizations (such as Boys and Girls Clubs, Boy Scouts and Girl Scouts, and the Young Men's Christian Organization (YMCA) and Young Women's Christian Organization (YWCA)) to pay the Federal share of the costs of initiating, expanding, and improving physical education programs (including after-school programs) for kindergarten through 12th-grade students by —

- (1) providing equipment and support to enable students to participate actively in physical education activities; and
- (2) providing funds for staff and teacher training and education.

(b) PROGRAM ELEMENTS- A physical education program funded under this subpart may provide for one or more of the following:

- (1) Fitness education and assessment to help students understand, improve, or maintain their physical well-being.
- (2) Instruction in a variety of motor skills and physical activities designed to enhance the physical, mental, and social or emotional development of every student.
- (3) Development of, and instruction in, cognitive concepts about motor skill and physical fitness that support a lifelong healthy lifestyle.
- (4) Opportunities to develop positive social and cooperative skills through physical activity participation.
- (5) Instruction in healthy eating habits and good nutrition.
- (6) Opportunities for professional development for teachers of physical education to stay abreast of the latest research, issues, and trends in the field of physical education.

(c) SPECIAL RULE- For the purpose of this subpart, extracurricular activities, such as team sports and Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) program activities, shall not be considered as part of the curriculum of a physical education program assisted under this subpart.

### **SEC. 5504. APPLICATIONS.**

(a) SUBMISSION- Each local educational agency or community-based organization desiring a grant or contract under this subpart shall submit to the Secretary an application that contains a plan to initiate, expand, or improve physical education programs in order to make progress toward meeting State standards for physical education.

- (b) PRIVATE SCHOOL AND HOME-SCHOOLED STUDENTS- An application for funds under this subpart may provide for the participation, in the activities funded under this subpart, of —
- (1) students enrolled in private nonprofit elementary schools or secondary schools, and their parents and teachers; or
  - (2) home-schooled students, and their parents and teachers.

**SEC. 5505. REQUIREMENTS.**

(a) ANNUAL REPORT TO THE SECRETARY- In order to continue receiving funding after the first year of a multiyear grant or contract under this subpart, the administrator of the grant or contract for the local educational agency or community-based organization shall submit to the Secretary an annual report that —

- (1) describes the activities conducted during the preceding year; and
- (2) demonstrates that progress has been made toward meeting State standards for physical education.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES- Not more than 5 percent of the grant funds made available to a local educational agency or community-based organization under this subpart for any fiscal year may be used for administrative expenses.

**SEC. 5506. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.**

- (a) FEDERAL SHARE- The Federal share under this subpart may not exceed —
- (1) 90 percent of the total cost of a program for the first year for which the program receives assistance under this subpart; and
  - (2) 75 percent of such cost for the second and each subsequent such year.

(b) PROPORTIONALITY- To the extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure that grants awarded under this subpart shall be equitably distributed among local educational agencies and community-based organizations serving urban and rural areas.

(c) REPORT TO CONGRESS- Not later than June 1, 2003, the Secretary shall submit a report to Congress that —

- (1) describes the programs assisted under this subpart;
- (2) documents the success of such programs in improving physical fitness; and
- (3) makes such recommendations as the Secretary determines appropriate for the continuation and improvement of the programs assisted under this subpart.

(d) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS- Amounts made available to the Secretary to carry out this subpart shall remain available until expended.

**SEC. 5507. SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.**

Funds made available under this subpart shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, any other Federal, State, or local funds available for physical education activities.

## Program Regulations

The following Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR) apply to the competition described in this application package:

- 34 CFR Part 74 (Administration of grants and agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and other Non-Profit Organizations)
- 34 CFR Part 75 (Direct Grant Programs)
- 34 CFR Part 77 (Definitions that Apply to Department regulations)
- 34 CFR Part 79 (Intergovernmental Review of Department of Education Programs and activities)
- 34 CFR Part 80 (Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments)
- 34 CFR Part 81 (General Education Provisions Act—Enforcement)
- 34 CFR Part 82 (New Restrictions on Lobbying)
- 34 CFR Part 84 (Government-wide Requirements for Drug-Free Workplace Financial Assistance)
- 34 CFR Part 85 (Government wide Debarment and Suspension (Nonprocurement))
- 34 CFR Part 86 (Drug and Alcohol Abuse Prevention)
- 34 CFR Part 97 (Protection of Human Subjects)
- 34 CFR Part 98 (Student Rights in Research, Experimental Programs, and Testing)
- 34 CFR Part 99 (Family Educational Rights and Privacy)
- 34 CFR Part 299 (General Provisions)

The notice of final eligibility requirement for the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools discretionary grant programs published in the Federal Register on December 4, 2006 (71 FR 70369).

Note: The regulations in 34 CFR part 79 apply to all applicants except federally recognized Indian tribes.

Note: The regulations in 34 CFR part 86 apply to institutions of higher education only.

## **V. GENERAL APPLICATION INSTRUCTIONS AND INFORMATION:**

---

### **Preparing the Application**

A completed application for assistance under this competition consists of two parts: a detailed narrative description of the proposed project and budget, and all forms and assurances that must be submitted in order to receive a grant. An application under this program should address the specific needs of the applicant and propose activities specifically designed to meet those needs. We strongly discourage applicants from using “form” applications or proposals that address general rather than specific local needs. Identical or substantially similar applications are not responsive to the scoring criteria.

A panel of non-federal readers with experience in physical education, nutrition, health education, program evaluation, child or adolescent development, or community linkages will review each eligible application submitted by the deadline. The panel will award points ranging from 0 to 100 to each application depending on how well the selection criteria are addressed. Be sure you provide a comprehensive response to each factor under each selection criterion. Applications that fail to do so will be read, but our experience suggests they may not score well enough to be funded.

All applicants should adhere to the following formatting guidelines:

- Use 1-inch margins. If you submit your application in paper format by mail or hand delivery, your application must be printed on 8 1/2” x 11” paper.
- Use consistent font no smaller than 11-point type throughout your document (you may use smaller text in charts or tables, as long as the text is legible). You may use boldface type, underlining, and italics; however, do not use colored text.
- For the project narrative, your application should consist of the number and text of each selection criterion followed by the narrative. The text of the selection criterion, if included, does not count against any page limitation.
- Place a page number at the bottom right of each page beginning with 1, and number your pages consecutively throughout your document, beginning with the Abstract and ending with the Appendices. **Note:** *Do not paginate any of the forms.*
- Your narrative should be no longer than 25 typed double-spaced pages, printed only on one side.

If you submit your proposal via e-application, you will use your own word-processing software to complete the application for this grant competition.

### **D-U-N-S Number Instructions**

All applicants must obtain and use a D-U-N-S number, and all applicants applying through Grants.gov must register with Grants.gov. The D-U-N-S Number used on the application must be the same number that the applicant’s organization used to register with Grants.gov. If the numbers are not the same, Grants.gov will reject the application.

The D-U-N-S Number is a unique nine-digit number that does not convey any information about the recipient. A built-in check digit helps to ensure the accuracy of the D-U-N-S Number. The ninth digit of each number is the check digit, which is mathematically related to the other digits. It lets computer systems determine if a D-U-N-S Number has been entered correctly.

You can obtain a D-U-N-S Number at no charge by calling 800/333-0505 or by completing the D-U-N-S Number Request Form, available online at [www.dnb.com/US/duns\\_update/index.html](http://www.dnb.com/US/duns_update/index.html).

Dun & Bradstreet, a global information provider, has assigned D-U-N-S Numbers to more than 43 million companies worldwide. Customer service is available on Monday-Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. (Eastern Time) at 888/814-1435.

## Organizing the Application

Applications submitted electronically must follow the format given in the e-Application system. The system will then organize the information automatically.

**1. Application for Federal Assistance (SF 424):** Use the Application for Federal Assistance and the Department of Education Supplemental Information for SF 424. This is the title page of your application. Be sure that Item 11 identifies the CFDA Number for this grant competition: **84.215F** and the Title as **Carol M. White Physical Education Program**.

If you submit your proposal for this grant competition via e-Application, please complete the SF424 (Application for Federal Assistance) first. e-Application will insert the correct CFDA and program name automatically where needed.

Under Item 3 in the ED Supplemental Information, indicate whether the proposed project includes human subjects research activities, and if so, whether any or all of the proposed activities are exempt. For additional guidance, see instructions for ED Supplemental Information in the required forms section of this application package or call ED's protection of human subjects coordinator at 202-260-3353.

If you submit your proposal in paper format by mail or hand delivery, you will need to insert the correct CFDA number and program name where requested.

**Please note: The Authorized Representative of your organization must sign the SF 424. If a signed copy of this form is not received with your application (either included in the hard copy submission or faxed within three days of your electronic submission to the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools at (202) 245-7166), your application WILL NOT BE ELIGIBLE FOR REVIEW.**

**2. Table of Contents:** Include a table of contents with page references.

**3. Abstract:** Include a concise, one-page, double-spaced abstract. This is a key element and should include a brief narrative summary of the project goals and objectives and the intended outcomes of the project. Clearly mark this page with the applicant's name as shown in Item 1 of SF 424.

**4. Project Narrative:** This section should be no more than 25 double-spaced typewritten pages. The narrative must contain evidence that the applicant meets the absolute priority and should contain and follow in sequence the information requested for each selection criterion.

**5. Budget Form (ED Form 524):** Use the Budget Information Form to prepare a budget that covers the entire (up to 36 month) budget period. List each year's budget in the appropriate column. Provide amounts for major budget categories.

**6. Budget Narrative:** You must include a detailed budget narrative for the entire (up to 36 month period) that supports and explains the information provided on ED Form 524. Use the same budget categories as those on ED Form 524 and explain the basis used to estimate costs for all budget categories, and how the cost items relate to the proposed project's goals, objectives, and activities. All expenditures must be necessary to carry out the goals and

objectives of the project, reasonable for the scope and complexity of the project, and allowable under the terms and conditions of the grant and in accordance with government cost principles.

The Budget Information Form and accompanying narrative should provide enough detail for ED staff to easily understand how costs were determined and if the budget is commensurate with the scope of the project.

**Note: Failure to submit a detailed budget narrative that will permit ED to determine if requested funds are necessary, reasonable, and allowable may result in significant cuts to your request.**

For this grant competition, you may charge indirect costs using the rate negotiated with your cognizant federal agency (e.g., Department of Education, Department of Health and Human Services, Department of the Interior). Be sure to include evidence of a federally negotiated indirect cost rate. Individuals who apply for any grant competition through ED are not allowed to budget for an indirect cost rate. If you budget for contractual services, please note that indirect costs may be applied only to the first \$25,000 of each subcontract, regardless of the period covered by the subcontract.

If you claim indirect costs in the budget for your proposed project and do not have a negotiated rate with the federal government, you have 90 days from the time you transmit your application to submit the necessary paperwork to the Department to receive a negotiated indirect cost rate. For more information about indirect cost rates, please visit [www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocfo/intro.html](http://www.ed.gov/about/offices/list/ocfo/intro.html).

**7. Forms and Appendices:** This section should contain any supplementary information that applicants may choose to submit in support of an applicant's capacity and preparation to undertake the proposed project. These documents may include resumes, letters of agreement with cooperating entities, if appropriate, evaluation results, or materials. Do not include budget or program narrative information in this section. Also, do not include CD-ROMS, photographs, or floppy disks as we will not review or return them.

If you submit your application via e-Application, the Appendices section is where you will attach proposal appendices that you may choose to submit in support of your capacity and preparation to undertake the proposed project. You should consolidate your documents for this section and upload as one attachment ensuring you do not exceed the file size restriction identified for the Appendices section.

All required forms are available in e-Application if submitting electronically.

**8. Assurances and Certifications:** If you are submitting an electronic application, you must print out the required forms, complete them, and either upload all signed forms to the e-Application Web site (under the Program Assurances section) or fax them (along with the SF 424 and other forms) to Carlette Huntley at (202) 245-7166 within (3) working days of the date on which you submitted your electronic application. You should indicate your PR/Award number in the upper right corner of the form and the forms need to have been signed by the closing date for this application.

This application package also includes the following—Standard Form 424B, Assurances – Non-Construction Programs, Certification Regarding Lobbying; and Standard Form LLL – Disclosure

of Lobbying Activities. By signing the 424B, the applicant agrees to abide by requirements regarding drug-free workplace, debarment and environmental tobacco smoke.

**Note:** If Item 2 of the Standard Form LLL applies because of lobbying activities related to a previous grant, or are anticipated to occur with this project if it is funded, you must submit Standard Form LLL. If your organization does not engage in lobbying, please submit Standard Form LLL and indicate as “Not Applicable.”

### **Intergovernmental Review of Federal Programs (Executive Order 12372)**

This grant competition is subject to the requirements of Executive Order 12372 and the regulations in 34 CFR Part 79. One of the objectives of the Executive Order is to foster an intergovernmental partnership and a strengthened federalism. The Executive Order relies on processes developed by State and local governments for coordination and review of proposed Federal financial assistance.

Applicants must contact the appropriate State Single Point of Contact to find out about, and to comply with, the State’s process under Executive Order 12372. Applicants proposing to perform activities in more than one State should immediately contact the Single Point of Contact for each of those States and follow the procedure established in each State under the Executive Order. The name and address of each State Single Point of Contact is listed below. **Note: A copy of the applicant’s letter sent to the State Single Point of Contact must be included with their application (on letterhead).**

Any State Process Recommendation and other comments submitted by a State Single Point of Contact (SSPOC) and any comments from State, area-wide, regional, and local entities must be received by September 16, 2010, at the following address: The Secretary, EO 12372—[CFDA #84.215F], U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue, SW, Room 7W300, Washington, DC 20202-0124. Recommendations or comments may be hand-delivered until 4:30 p.m. (Washington, DC time) on September 16, 2010. Please do not send applications to this address.

**States that are not listed on this page have chosen not to participate in the intergovernmental review process, and therefore do not have a SSPOC. If you are located within one of these States, you may still send application materials directly to a Federal awarding agency.**

States that are not listed on this page have chosen not to participate in the intergovernmental review process, and therefore do not have a SPOC. If you are located within one of these States, you may still send application materials directly to a Federal awarding agency.

Contact information for Federal agencies that award grants can be found in Appendix IV of the Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance. [[www.cfda.gov/public/cat-app4-index.htm](http://www.cfda.gov/public/cat-app4-index.htm)]

Please note: Inquiries about obtaining a Federal grant should not be sent to the OMB e-mail or postal address shown above. The best source for this information is the OMB website at [WWW.WHITEHOUSE.GOV/OMB/GRANTS/SPOC.HTML](http://WWW.WHITEHOUSE.GOV/OMB/GRANTS/SPOC.HTML).

## General Education Provisions Act (GEPA) Section 427

Section 427 of GEPA affects applicants for new discretionary grant awards under this program. All applicants for new awards must include information in their applications to address this provision, summarized below, in order to receive funding under this program.

Section 427 requires each applicant for funds (other than an individual person) to include in its application a description of the steps the applicant proposes to take to ensure equitable access to, and participation in, its federally-assisted program for students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries with special needs.

This section allows applicants discretion in developing the required description. The statute highlights six types of barriers that can impede equitable access or participation that you may address: *gender, race, national origin, color, disability, or age*. Based on local circumstances, you can determine whether these or other barriers may prevent your students, teachers, or others, from equitable access or participation. Your description need not be lengthy; you may provide a clear and succinct description of how you plan to address those barriers that are applicable to your circumstances. In addition, the information may be provided in a single narrative, or, if appropriate, may be discussed in connection with related topics in the application.

**NOTE: A general statement of an applicant's nondiscriminatory hiring policy is *not* sufficient to meet this requirement. Applicants must identify potential barriers unique to their community and explain the specific steps they will take to overcome these barriers.**

Section 427 is not intended to duplicate the requirements of civil rights statutes, but rather to ensure that, in designing their projects, applicants for Federal funds address equity concerns that may affect the ability of certain potential beneficiaries to fully participate in the project and to achieve to high standards. Consistent with program requirements and its approved application, an applicant may use the Federal funds awarded to it to eliminate barriers it identifies.

### Examples

The following examples help illustrate how an applicant may comply with section 427.

- (1) An applicant that proposes to include all students in their PE program might describe in its application how it intends to incorporate adaptive PE teaching methods and equipment into their program.
- (2) An applicant that proposes to develop instructional materials for classroom use might describe how it will make the materials available on audiotape or in Braille for students who are blind.
- (3) An applicant that proposes to implement a middle school program, an age group that girls are less likely than boys to participate, the applicant might indicate how it tends to conduct "outreach" efforts to girls, to encourage their enrollment or provide activities that are more appealing to girls in their school based on surveys conducted with the target audience.

We recognize that many applicants may already be implementing effective steps to ensure equity of access and participation in their grant programs, and we appreciate your cooperation in responding to the requirements of this provision.

### Paperwork Burden Statement for GEPA 427

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number. The valid OMB control number for the GEPA 427 is OMB No. 1894-0007. The time required to complete GEPA 427 is estimated to average 1.5 hours

per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather and maintain the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. If you have any comments concerning the accuracy of the time estimate(s) or suggestions for improving this form, please write to: U.S. Department of Education, Washington, DC 20202-4651. If you have comments or concerns regarding the status of your individual submission of this form, write directly to: Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools, U.S. Department of Education, 550 12<sup>th</sup> Street, SW, Potomac Center Plaza, Room 10071, Washington, DC 20202-6450.

## **VI. APPLICATION CHECKLIST AND TIPS FOR APPLICANTS:**

---

**Please use this checklist to ensure that your agency is prepared to submit an application for this grant.**

- \_\_\_ 1. We have read the entire application package and accompanying Federal Register notices to determine if the program is a good fit for us.
- \_\_\_ 2. We are certain that we meet the eligibility requirements as we are an eligible LEA or CBO as defined by this grant program.
- \_\_\_ 3. We are not a current, active PEP grantee.
- \_\_\_ 4. We have a DUNS number and have included it on our SF424.
- \_\_\_ 5. Our application addresses the **Absolute Priority** by proposing a program that  
\_\_\_ Specifically and clearly addresses one or more of our State's physical education standards (not national standards); If our State does not have State PE standards, we have identified another states' standards and explained this in the application  
\_\_\_ serves only K-12 students  
\_\_\_ proposes instruction in healthy eating habits and good nutrition;  
\_\_\_ proposes physical fitness activities that include at least one of the following:
  - (a) fitness education and assessment to help students understand, improve, or maintain their physical well-being;
  - (b) instruction in a variety of motor skills and physical activities designed to enhance the physical, mental, and social or emotional development of every student;
  - (c) development of, and instruction in, cognitive concepts about motor skills and physical fitness that support a lifelong healthy lifestyle;
  - (d) opportunities to develop positive social and cooperative skills through physical activity participation; or
  - (e) opportunities for professional development for teachers of physical education to stay abreast of the latest research, issues, and trends in the field of physical education.
- \_\_\_ 6. **(If you address Competitive Preference Priority #1)** Our application includes a signed Program-Specific Assurance signed by the Authorized representative committing us to Competitive Preference Priority #1 -- Collection of Body Mass Index Measurement.
- \_\_\_ 7. **(If you address Competitive Preference Priority #2)** Our application includes a signed Program-Specific Assurance signed by the Authorized representative committing us to Competitive Preference Priority #2-- Partnerships Between Applicants and Supporting Community Entities

- \_\_\_ 8. We have included a budget narrative that fully details the costs listed on the ED524 (including both the Federal and Non-Federal expenditures) of each year we are requesting funding. This narrative presents a breakdown of costs by the budget categories on the listed on ED524. Our budget narrative includes as much detail as possible and clearly links the expenses listed with the project's goals and objectives. In addition, our total expenditures for each year appear in the appropriate column on the ED524 budget form. (For example, the first year of your budget should appear in the column marked "Project Year 1.")
- \_\_\_ 9. We have addressed and/or assured ALL requirements of the grant program including:
- \_\_\_ The matching requirement
  - \_\_\_ Aligning Project Goals with Identified Needs Using the School Health Index
  - \_\_\_ Nutrition- and Physical Activity-Related Policies
  - \_\_\_ Linkage with Local Wellness Policies
  - \_\_\_ Linkages with Federal, State, and Local Initiatives
  - \_\_\_ Updates to Physical Education and Nutrition Instruction Curricula (if applicable)
  - \_\_\_ Equipment Purchases
  - \_\_\_ Increasing Transparency and Accountability
  - \_\_\_ Participation in a National Evaluation
  - \_\_\_ Required Performance Measures and Data Collection Methodology
- \_\_\_ 10. *(If requesting funds for indirect costs)* We have a determined negotiated, restricted indirect cost rate and have provided proof of with our application.
- \_\_\_ 11. We have named and obtained the signature of our Authorized Representative for all required forms.
- \_\_\_ 12. We have included the percentage of time the project director will be working on this project.
- \_\_\_ 13. We have included the required GEPA 427 statement ensuring that there is sufficient detail regarding specific barriers related to your proposed PEP project and how those barriers will be addressed. Our GEPA 427 Statement does more than simply affirm our Equal Employment Opportunity statement.
- \_\_\_ 14. As required by EO 12372, we have notified our State Single Point of Contact about this application if required. (If applicable, a copy of your letter on letterhead should be included with the application).
- \_\_\_ 15. We have completed and included the screening sheet to help expedite the review of our application.
- \_\_\_ 16. Our application contains valid e-mail and mailing addresses for both the Project Director and Authorized Representative.

**\*\*Applications must be submitted electronically by July 19, 2010. Please review all submission requirements.**

### **What Happens Next?**

---

- If you submit your application electronically, you will receive an email acknowledging receipt and giving you the PR/ Award number assigned to your application. Please refer to this number if you need to contact us about your application.
- If you submit your application in hard copy, you should receive a postcard from ED's Application Control Center acknowledging receipt of your application and giving you its assigned number in approximately two weeks (depending on the volume of applications). If you do not receive this notification within 15 business days from the application deadline date, contact ACC via email at [application.center@ed.gov](mailto:application.center@ed.gov) for information.
- Staff members will screen each application to ensure that all program eligibility requirements are met, requisite signatures from partners are included, and that the Authorized Representative signed all required forms and they were received by ED by the established deadline.
- If your application is deemed ineligible for review, you will receive notification from OSDFS.
- If your application is deemed eligible, it will be assigned to a three-person panel of expert reviewers who will evaluate and score your proposal according to the selection criteria in this package. Your application will receive a score from 0 to 100 awarded by peer reviewers depending upon how well you respond to the requirements of the selection criteria.
- Unsuccessful applicants (those scoring below the funding range) will receive a notification letter following notification of recipients. Both successful and unsuccessful applicants will receive copies of the peer review comments. Please be sure your application contains valid email and mailing addresses for both the Project Director and Authorized Representative so that reviewers' comments can be delivered successfully.

### **Do you still have questions?**

**First...** Review the entire application package, particularly the Frequently Asked Questions section and the [Federal Register](#) notice.

**Secondly...** Connect to the technical assistance webinars and conference calls. Specific information regarding these technical assistance opportunities can be found at: [www.ed.gov/programs/whitephysed/applicant.html](http://www.ed.gov/programs/whitephysed/applicant.html).

- **June 21, 2010** (Webinar) --information specific to SHI, HECAT/PECAT, and BMI
- **June 22, 2010** (Webinar) --information specific to SHI
- **June 29, 2010** (AM Conference Call) –general information on program and application submission
- **June 29, 2010** (PM Conference Call) general information on program and application submission
- **July 7, 2010** ( Conference Call) general information on program and application submission

**Finally...** If your questions are not addressed, please contact the competition manager, Carlette Huntley at 202-245-7871 or [Carlette.Huntley@ed.gov](mailto:Carlette.Huntley@ed.gov). Please be patient, as we receive a high volume of inquiries during the competition.

## VII. APPENDECIES AND FORMS:

---

### Screening Form

***To help us expedite the review of your application for eligibility, please submit this form with your application.***

1. The State standard(s) for physical education to which the proposed activities/design of our program are aligned are clearly stated on page(s):

---

---

2. Our intent to provide instruction in healthy eating habits and good nutrition is clearly discussed on page(s):

---

---

3. Our intent to physical fitness activities that include at least one of the elements outlined by this grant in clearly discussed on page(s):

---

---

4. We have included adequate and appropriate matching funds, which are described in the budget narrative on page(s):

---

---

5. We have included our overall Score Card for the questions answered in modules 1-4 of the School Health Index and correlated our School Health Improvement Plan to our project design on page(s).

---

---

6. We have provided documentation of our commitment to participate in the U.S. Department of Education's evaluation on page(s).

---

---

7. We have included our Program specific assurances? ---  YES  NO

**Program Specific Assurances**

Please ensure you have included this form with your application. You must print out this form, complete it, and either (1) upload it with all signed forms to the Other Attachments or (2) fax it (along with the ED 424 and other forms) to the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools at (202) 245-7166 within 3 working days of submitting your electronic application. You must indicate your PR/Award number in the upper right corner of the form.

---

**As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I certify that the applicant shall:**

1. Develop, update, or enhance physical activity policies and food- and nutrition-related policies that promote healthy eating and physical activity throughout students' everyday lives, as part of our PEP project.
2. Align our PEP project with the district's Local Wellness Policy, if applicable.  
 \*\* Please check here if this requirement is not applicable to your application because your entity does not participate in the school lunch program authorized by the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act or the Child Nutrition Act of 1966 and therefore is not required to have a Local Wellness Policy and you are not part of a partner group required to have a Local Wellness Policy.\*\*
3. Align our PEP project with similar ongoing initiatives, whose goals and objectives are to promote physical activity and healthy eating or help students meet their State standards for physical education, specifically:  
 Coordinated School Health Program  
 Team Nutrition Training Grant  
 Recovery Act Communities Putting Prevention to Work – Community Initiative  
 Others not listed here, such as Farm-to-School, Alliance for a Healthier Generation, HealthierUS School Challenge, YMCA Pioneering Healthier Communities, or Action for Healthy Kids  
  
 We do not have any ongoing initiatives at this time in our community but will coordinate with any that may be initiated during the program period.
4. Align students' use of the equipment with PEP elements applicable to our project, identified in the absolute priority, and any applicable curricula.
5. Report project-level information to the public, in the aggregate, on the key program indicators including both GPRA and program specific measures

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Signature of Authorized Representative**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Title**

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

**Applicant Organization**

**Date Submitted**

**PR Award No: Q215F10**

---

**Program Specific Assurances for Competitive Preference #1 -- Collection of Body Mass Index Measurement**

This form is only necessary if you intend to address Competitive Preference Priority #1 -- Collection of Body Mass Index Measurement. You must print out this form, complete it, and either (1) upload it with all signed forms to the Other Attachments or (2) fax it (along with the ED 424 and other forms) to the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools at (202) 245-7166 within 3 working days of submitting your electronic application. You must indicate your PR/Award number in the upper right corner of the form.

---

**As the duly authorized representative of the applicant, I certify that the applicant shall:**

Implement aggregate BMI data collection, and use it as part of a comprehensive assessment of health and fitness for the purposes of monitoring the weight status of their student population across time. The applicant shall commit to:

- (a) Use the CDC's BMI-for-age growth charts to interpret BMI results;
- (b) Create a plan to develop and implement a protocol that would include parents in the development of their BMI assessment and data collection policies, including a mechanism to allow parents to provide feedback on the policy.
- (c) Create a plan to notify parents of the BMI assessment and to allow parents to opt out of the BMI assessment and reasonable notification of their choice to opt out.
- (d) De-identify the student information (such as by removing the student's name and any identifying information from the record and assigning a record code), aggregate the BMI data to the school or district level, and make the aggregate data publicly available and easily accessible to the public annually.

---

**Signature of Authorized Representative**

---

**Title**

---

**Applicant Organization**

---

**Date Submitted**

**Sample LEA Partner Agreement for Competitive Preference Priority #2:  
Partnerships Between Applicants and Supporting Community Entities**

This form is only necessary if you intend to address Competitive Preference Priority #2 – Partnerships Between Applicants and Supporting Community Entities. If you are submitting an electronic application, you must print out this form, complete it, and either (1) upload it with all signed forms to the Other Attachments or (2) fax it (along with the ED 424 and other forms) to the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools at (202) 245-7166 within 3 working days of submitting your electronic application. You must indicate your PR/Award number in the upper right corner of the form.

**Page 1 of 5 (LEA Partner)**

---

LEA Authorized Representative Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Roles and Responsibilities:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Contribution to the Project:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

This agreement is in support of \_\_\_\_\_ PEP project and was developed after timely and meaningful consultation between the required partners.

Signature of LEA's Authorized Representative: \_\_\_\_\_

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

**Sample LEA Partner Agreement for Competitive Preference Priority #2:  
Partnerships Between Applicants and Supporting Community Entities**

**Page 2 of 5 (CBO Partner)**

---

CBO Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Roles and Responsibilities:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Contribution to the Project:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

This agreement is in support of \_\_\_\_\_ PEP project and was developed after timely and meaningful consultation between the required partners.

Signature of CBO's Authorized Representative: \_\_\_\_\_

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

**Sample LEA Partner Agreement for Competitive Preference Priority #2:  
Partnerships Between Applicants and Supporting Community Entities**

**Page 3 of 5 (Public Health Entity Partner)**

---

Public Health Partner Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Roles and Responsibilities:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Contribution to the Project:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

This agreement is in support of \_\_\_\_\_ PEP project and was developed after timely and meaningful consultation between the required partners.

Signature of Public Health Entity's Authorized Representative: \_\_\_\_\_

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

**Sample LEA Partner Agreement for Competitive Preference Priority #2:  
Partnerships Between Applicants and Supporting Community Entities**

**Page 4 of 5 (LEA's Food Service or Child Nutrition Director)**

---

Food Service or Child Nutrition Director Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Roles and Responsibilities:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Contribution to the Project:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

This agreement is in support of \_\_\_\_\_ PEP project and was developed after timely and meaningful consultation between the required partners.

Signature of Public Health Entity's Authorized Representative: \_\_\_\_\_

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

**Sample LEA Partner Agreement for Competitive Preference Priority #2:  
Partnerships Between Applicants and Supporting Community Entities**

**Page 5 of 5 (Head of Local Government)**

---

Head of Local Government Name (or designee): \_\_\_\_\_

Roles and Responsibilities:

---

---

---

---

Contribution to the Project:

---

---

---

---

This agreement is in support of \_\_\_\_\_ PEP project and was developed after timely and meaningful consultation between the required partners.

Signature of Head of Local Government or Designee: \_\_\_\_\_

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

**Sample CBO Partner Agreement for Competitive Preference Priority #2:  
Partnerships Between Applicants and Supporting Community Entities**

This form is only necessary if you intend to address Competitive Preference Priority #2 – Partnerships Between Applicants and Supporting Community Entities. If you are submitting an electronic application, you must print out this form, complete it, and either (1) upload it with all signed forms to the Other Attachments or (2) fax it (along with the ED 424 and other forms) to the Office of Safe and Drug-Free Schools at (202) 245-7166 within 3 working days of submitting your electronic application. You must indicate your PR/Award number in the upper right corner of the form.

**Page 1 of 5 (CBO Partner)**

---

CBO Authorized Representative Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Roles and Responsibilities:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Contribution to the Project:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

This agreement is in support of \_\_\_\_\_ PEP project and was developed after timely and meaningful consultation between the required partners.

Signature of CBO's Authorized Representative: \_\_\_\_\_

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

**Sample CBO Partner Agreement for Competitive Preference Priority #2:  
Partnerships Between Applicants and Supporting Community Entities**

**Page 2 of 5 (Local Public Health Partner)**

---

Local Public Health Entity Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Roles and Responsibilities:

---

---

---

---

Contribution to the Project:

---

---

---

---

This agreement is in support of \_\_\_\_\_ PEP project and was developed after timely and meaningful consultation between the required partners.

Signature of Local Public Health Entity's Authorized Representative: \_\_\_\_\_

---

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

**Sample CBO Partner Agreement for Competitive Preference Priority #2:  
Partnerships Between Applicants and Supporting Community Entities**

**Page 3 of 5 (Local Organization Supporting Nutrition or Healthy Eating)** \_\_\_\_\_

Organization Supporting Nutrition or Healthy Eating Name: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Roles and Responsibilities:  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Contribution to the Project:  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

This agreement is in support of \_\_\_\_\_ PEP project and was developed after timely and meaningful consultation between the required partners.

Signature of Organization Supporting Nutrition or Healthy Eating Authorized Representative:  
\_\_\_\_\_

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

**Sample CBO Partner Agreement for Competitive Preference Priority #2:  
Partnerships Between Applicants and Supporting Community Entities**

**Page 4 of 5 (Head of Local Government)**

---

Head of Local Government Name (or designee): \_\_\_\_\_

Roles and Responsibilities:

---

---

---

Contribution to the Project:

---

---

---

This agreement is in support of \_\_\_\_\_ PEP project and was developed after timely and meaningful consultation between the required partners.

Signature of Head of Local Government or Designee: \_\_\_\_\_

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

**Sample CBO Partner Agreement for Competitive Preference Priority #2:  
Partnerships Between Applicants and Supporting Community Entities**

**Page 5 of 5 (LEA from which the largest number of students expected to participate in  
the CBO's project attend)**

---

LEA's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Roles and Responsibilities:

---

---

---

---

Contribution to the Project:

---

---

---

---

This agreement is in support of \_\_\_\_\_ PEP project and was developed after timely  
and meaningful consultation between the required partners.

Signature of LEA's Authorized Representative: \_\_\_\_\_

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_