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## Introduction

Physical fitness and health in children and youth. The term physical fitness has been defined as "the ability to perform daily tasks with vigor and alertness, without undue fatigue, and with ample energy to enjoy leisure-time pursuits and meet unforeseen emergencies." Physical fitness is typically operationalized as the composite of several components, each of which relates to the ability to perform a specific type of physical activity. A sub-set of these components comprises "health-related physical fitness," and these include cardiorespiratory endurance, muscular strength and endurance, flexibility and weight status. In children and youth, the components of health-related physical fitness have been linked to short and long-term health outcomes. FitnessGram is a physical fitness testing protocol that is widely used in schools across the United States. Included in the FitnessGram test are measures of each of the components of health-related physical fitness. For each test item, criterion-referenced standards have been established and individual test performances are rated as corresponding to the following categories: Healthy Fitness Zone, Needs Improvement, or Needs Improvement Health Risk.

Weight status and health in children and youth. In the context of public health surveillance, weight status is typically assessed using body mass index (BMI), an expression of the ratio between weight and height. In children and youth, weight status is evaluated as the age/sex-specific BMI percentile. Children and youth found to be over the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile for their age/sex group are considered overweight, and those over the $95^{\text {th }}$ percentile are rated as obese. It has been extensively documented that young persons who are overweight or obese, as compared with their normal weight counterparts, manifest less favorable cardiometabolic risk factor profiles, are more likely to be overweight as adults, and are at increased risk for future development of multiple non-communicable diseases. Over the past three decades the rates of overweight and obesity in U.S. children and youth have increased dramatically. Consequently, prevention of excessive weight gain during childhood and adolescence has become an important public health goal. In this report, weight status is assessed using BMI which is placed in the following categories: normal weight, overweight, and obese.

Fitness, weight status and academic performance in children and youth. A substantial and growing body of evidence indicates that physical activity exerts a positive effect on cognition and learning in children and youth. This research has been conducted using many different study designs and methodologies. Neuroscience research has demonstrated that
physical activity produces beneficial effects on brain function, and field research has observed that increased physical activity exerts positive effects on student learning. Several studies have observed positive associations between children's physical fitness and their academic performance. Because the primary goal of schools is to promote students' academic achievement, the observation that physical activity during the school day can promote learning has important implications for school policy and practices.

Purpose of the project. The primary purpose of the project is to determine the status of health-related physical fitness in South Carolina school children. The South Carolina FitnessGram project is supported by the BlueCross BlueShield of South Carolina Foundation, the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control, and the South Carolina Department of Education. The University of South Carolina serves as the data analysis center for the project.

## South Carolina FitnessGram

Project Description. The South Carolina (SC) FitnessGram project is a state-wide observational study to evaluate and ultimately improve health-related fitness among approximately 770,000 public school students in SC. Its primary purpose is to describe healthrelated fitness in students attending public schools across the state. The findings from this project will be used to support planning and implementation of evidence-based programs and policies to improve health-related fitness. All SC public schools serving grades K-12 were eligible to participate in the SC FitnessGram project. Each school was asked to conduct fitness testing and record health-related fitness data for students enrolled in physical education class. Physical education teachers implemented six fitness test items in grades 5, 8 and in the high school physical education course required for graduation. Height and weight only was measured for second grade students. Data collected during the 2016-2017 school year were summarized, and a detailed report was released to the public in 2018. The data summarized and presented in this report were collected during the 2017-2018 school year.

Data Collection \& Management. During school year 2017-2018, FitnessGram data was provided by nearly 700 public schools across 61 school districts in SC. These samples represent approximately $59 \%$ of public schools and $74 \%$ of school districts in SC. In participating schools, FitnessGram was administered by school staff (e.g., physical education teacher) during physical education class. Prior to administration of the FitnessGram test items, school staff received training support through the Presidential Youth Fitness Program. Staff reported students' performance on the FitnessGram components using a web-based version of the FitnessGram software. All data were loaded into the SC FitnessGram state system and a deidentified research extract file was downloaded by the SC Department of Education (SCDE). The University of South Carolina received de-identified student data from the SCDE to assess health-related fitness among SC students.

Data Cleaning. The initial dataset provided by SCDE included 217,257 unique entries. During the data cleaning process, the sample was reduced to data for the $2^{\text {nd }}, 5^{\text {th }}, 8^{\text {th }}$, and $9^{\text {th }}-$ $12^{\text {th }}$ grade students ( $\mathrm{n}=157,340$ ). 5,293 entries were removed because no fitness test item information was provided. Then, 764 entries were removed due to implausible values for age. Next, 52,881 records were deleted for students for whom data were available for more than one test administration. Only data for a student's first test administration was included in the analysis sample. This yielded a final sample of 98,402 students. In this sample implausible
values for some test items were deleted: BMI ( $\mathrm{n}=563$ ), cardiorespiratory fitness ( $\mathrm{n}=48$ ), and the other FitnessGram items ( $\mathrm{n}=423$ ). Deleted values were set to missing.

Analytic Sample. Table 1 provides student characteristics for the FitnessGram sample during school year 2017-2018. The sample was $51.5 \%$ male, $51.9 \%$ non-Hispanic White, and $37.2 \%$ of students were classified as overweight or obese. Additionally, the proportion of students across regions of SC varied considerably (Appendix A).

Table 1. SC FitnessGram sample characteristics ( $n=98,402$ students).

|  | Girls <br> (n=47,707) |  | Boys <br> (n=50,695) |  | Total <br> (n=98,402) |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\mathbf{n}$ | Percent | $\mathbf{n}$ | Percent | $\mathbf{n}$ | Percent |
| Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | 12,215 | $25.7 \%$ | 12,457 | $24.6 \%$ | 24,672 | $25.2 \%$ |
| 5 | 18,198 | $38.1 \%$ | 18,842 | $37.2 \%$ | 37,040 | $37.6 \%$ |
| 8 | 9,609 | $20.1 \%$ | 11,000 | $21.6 \%$ | 20,609 | $20.9 \%$ |
| High School | 7,685 | $16.1 \%$ | 8,396 | $16.6 \%$ | 16,081 | $16.3 \%$ |
| Weight Status | 26,779 | $62.4 \%$ | 28,754 | $63.4 \%$ | 55,533 | $62.8 \%$ |
| Normal weight | 7,490 | $17.4 \%$ | 7,209 | $15.9 \%$ | 14,699 | $16.7 \%$ |
| Overweight | 8,661 | $20.2 \%$ | 9,403 | $20.7 \%$ | 18,064 | $20.5 \%$ |
| Obese |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Race/ethnicity | 24,227 | $51.5 \%$ | 26,233 | $52.3 \%$ | 50,460 | $51.9 \%$ |
| White | 15,105 | $32.1 \%$ | 15,747 | $31.4 \%$ | 30,852 | $31.7 \%$ |
| Black | 4,826 | $10.3 \%$ | 5,102 | $10.2 \%$ | 9,928 | $10.2 \%$ |
| Hispanic | 2,922 | $6.1 \%$ | 3,044 | $6.1 \%$ | 5,966 | $6.2 \%$ |
| Other |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poverty Status ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 17,751 | $38.8 \%$ | 19,116 | $39.2 \%$ | 36,867 | $39.0 \%$ |
| No | 27,972 | $61.2 \%$ | 29,609 | $60.8 \%$ | 57.581 | $61.0 \%$ |
| Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Poverty status defined as student enrollment in Medicaid, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Foster Care Services within the past three years (February 2014 to January 2017); and/or student homelessness/migrant status during school year 2017-2018. Data sources: PowerSchool, Medicaid Eligibility, and DSS (TANF, SNAP, and Foster Care) files at day 135 of school year 2017-2018.

## Results by FitnessGram Component

## 1. Weight Status

Definition. Weight status is typically determined as the ratio between body weight and height expressed in categories based on the distribution of scores seen in a population. A common expression of weight status is BMI expressed in categories: normal weight, overweight or obese. In large samples, BMI is highly correlated with body composition. Body composition refers to the ratio between fat mass and fat free mass, the so-called "percent body fat." Accordingly, persons who are overweight or obese, based on assessment of BMI, typically have higher percentages of body fat than persons in the normal weight category.

Relationship to health. Maintenance of normal weight is an important indicator of good health in persons of all ages. Conversely, elevated levels of body weight and fatness are associated with increased risk for development of non-communicable diseases including cardiovascular disease, type 2 diabetes, and several cancers. In children and adolescents, overweight and obesity are associated with adverse status for cardiometabolic risk factors such as blood pressure, blood lipids and insulin sensitivity. In addition, in youth, excessive weight and fatness can negatively affect physical function and can have adverse psychological and social effects.

Measures. Weight status was assessed using BMI. To determine BMI, trained school staff measured height and weight. BMI was then calculated using the following standard equation: BMI = weight $(\mathrm{kg}) /$ height $\left(\mathrm{m}^{2}\right)$. For youth, BMI is typically reported as a percentile (range: o-100) relative to other individuals of the same sex and age.

Variable for analysis. Using CDC growth charts, each student's age- and sex-specific BMI percentile was determined and then categorized into one of the following weight status categories: normal weight ( $<85$ th percentile), overweight ( 85 th percentile to $<95$ th percentile), and obese ( $\geq 95$ th percentile).

## Results: Weight Status

Overall Sample. Height and weight was measured for approximately 88,296 students and BMI was calculated. In the total sample, which includes boys and girls in $2^{\text {nd }}, 5^{\text {th }}, 8^{\text {th }}$, and high school grades, approximately $62.9 \%$ of students had a BMI percentile that below the $85^{\text {th }}$ percentile (normal weight). Of the remaining students, $16.7 \%$ were overweight; and $20.5 \%$ were obese. No marked gender difference in weight status was observed. These findings indicate that nearly two out of every five SC students has an unfavorable weight status for health (Table 1a).

Table 1a. Weight Status among Total Sample and By Sex, SC FitnessGram School Year 20172018

| Weight Status Variables | Total |  | Males |  | Females |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD |
| Height, ft (mean, SD) | 88,296 | 4.9 (0.5) | 45,366 | 4.9 (0.6) | 42,930 | 4.8 (0.5) |
| Height, cm (mean, SD) | 88,296 | $\begin{aligned} & 148.6 \\ & (16.5) \end{aligned}$ | 45,366 | $\begin{aligned} & 150.1 \\ & (0.6) \end{aligned}$ | 42,930 | 147.0 (14.9) |
| Weight, lbs (mean, SD) | 88,296 | $\begin{aligned} & 104.8 \\ & (43.7) \end{aligned}$ | 45,366 | $\begin{array}{r} 106.1 \\ (45.4) \end{array}$ | 42,930 | 103.4 (41.8) |
| Weight, kg (mean, SD) | 88,296 | $\begin{array}{r} 47.5 \\ (19.8) \end{array}$ | 45,366 | $\begin{array}{r} 48.1 \\ (20.6) \end{array}$ | 42,930 | 46.9 (19.0) |
| Weight Status (CDC program) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BMI (mean, SD) | 88,296 | $\begin{aligned} & 20.7 \\ & (5.5) \end{aligned}$ | 45,366 | $\begin{aligned} & 20.5 \\ & (5.3) \end{aligned}$ | 42,930 | 21.0 (5.7) |
| Normal | 55,533 | 62.8\% | 28,754 | 63.4\% | 26,779 | 62.4\% |
| Overweight | 14,699 | 16.7\% | 7,209 | 15.9\% | 7,490 | 17.5\% |
| Obese | 18,064 | 20.5\% | 9,403 | 20.7\% | 8,661 | 20.1\% |

Weight Status in Girls. BMI was observed to increase with increasing age and grade level in girls. BMI increased from 17.8 in 2nd graders to 24.4 in high school girls. The percent of girls that were categorized as having a normal weight was $68.0 \%$ in 2nd grade. This percent then decreased in $5^{\text {th }}$ grade and was $60.7 \%$ in high school girls (Table 1b).

Table 1b. Weight Status among Females By Grade Level, SC FitnessGram School Year 20172018

| Variable | Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2^{\text {nd }}$ Grade |  | $5^{\text {th }}$ Grade |  | $8^{\text {th }}$ Grade |  | High School |  |
|  | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD |
| Height, ft (mean, SD) | 12,069 | $\begin{gathered} 4.2 \\ (0.2) \end{gathered}$ | 15,825 | $\begin{gathered} 4.8 \\ (0.3) \end{gathered}$ | 8,612 | $\begin{gathered} 5 \cdot 3 \\ (0.2) \end{gathered}$ | 6,424 | $\begin{gathered} 5 \cdot 3 \\ (0.2) \end{gathered}$ |
| Height, cm (mean, SD) | 12,069 | $\begin{aligned} & 128.6 \\ & (6.8) \end{aligned}$ | 15,825 | $\begin{aligned} & 147.5 \\ & (8.6) \end{aligned}$ | 8,612 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 160.6 \\ & (7.0) \end{aligned}$ | 6,424 | $\begin{aligned} & 162.0 \\ & (6.8) \end{aligned}$ |
| Weight, lbs (mean, SD) | 12,069 | $\begin{gathered} 65.4 \\ (17.8) \end{gathered}$ | 15,825 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 100.6 \\ & (31.2) \end{aligned}$ | 8,612 | $\begin{aligned} & 133.5 \\ & (36.5) \end{aligned}$ | 6,424 | $\begin{gathered} 141.4 \\ (38.9) \end{gathered}$ |
| Weight, kg (mean, SD) | 12,069 | $\begin{aligned} & 29.7 \\ & (8.1) \end{aligned}$ | 15,825 | $\begin{gathered} 45.6 \\ (14.2) \end{gathered}$ | 8,612 | $\begin{gathered} 60.6 \\ (16.6) \end{gathered}$ | 6,424 | $\begin{gathered} 64.2 \\ (17.6) \end{gathered}$ |
| Weight Status (CDC program) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BMI <br> (mean, SD) | 12,069 | $\begin{aligned} & 17.8 \\ & (3.7) \end{aligned}$ | 15,825 | $\begin{aligned} & 20.7 \\ & (5.1) \end{aligned}$ | 8,612 | $\begin{aligned} & 23.4 \\ & (5.8) \end{aligned}$ | 6,424 | $\begin{aligned} & 24.4 \\ & (6.3) \end{aligned}$ |
| Normal | 8,209 | 68.0\% | 9,476 | 59.9\% | 5,197 | 60.4\% | 3,897 | 60.7\% |
| Overweight | 1,789 | 14.8\% | 2,908 | 18.4\% | 1,644 | 19.0\% | 1,149 | 17.8\% |
| Obese | 2,071 | 17.2\% | 3,441 | 21.7\% | 1,771 | 20.6\% | 1,378 | 21.5\% |

As shown in Figures 1a and 1b, BMI and weight status varied across grades and race/ethnicity groups. Concerning race/ethnicity, the percentage of girls with normal weight was lower among Black and Hispanic girls compared to White girls and girls of other race/ethnicity groups (including multiracial). Additionally, the percentage of girls with a normal weight status was lower among students in poverty.

Figure 1a. Weight Status, Body Mass Index (mean), Girls


Figure 1b. Weight Status, Percent Attaining Normal Weight Status, Girls


Weight Status in Boys. Similar to girls, BMI increased with increasing age and grade level among boys. BMI increased from 17.6 in $2^{\text {nd }}$ graders to 23.4 in high school boys. The percent of boys that were normal weight was $68.8 \%$ in $2^{\text {nd }}$ grade. The percentage of normal weight boys decreased from $2^{\text {nd }}$ to $5^{\text {th }}$ grade before increasing slightly to $64.4 \%$ in high school boys (Table 1c).

Table 1c. Weight Status among Males_By Grade, SC FitnessGram School Year 2017-2018

| Variable | Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $2^{\text {nd }}$ Grade |  | $5^{\text {th }}$ Grade |  | $8^{\text {th }}$ Grade |  | High School |  |
|  | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD |
| Height, ft (mean, SD) | 12,307 | $\begin{array}{r} 4.3 \\ (0.2) \end{array}$ | 16,279 | $\begin{array}{r} 4.8 \\ (0.3) \end{array}$ | 9,873 | $\begin{array}{r} 5.5 \\ (0.3) \end{array}$ | 6,907 | $\begin{array}{r} 5 \cdot 7 \\ (\mathrm{o} 3) \end{array}$ |
| Height, cm (mean, SD) | 12,307 | $\begin{gathered} 129.6 \\ (6.6) \end{gathered}$ | 16,279 | $\begin{array}{r} 146.2 \\ (8.2) \end{array}$ | 9,873 | $\begin{gathered} 166.5 \\ (9.0) \end{gathered}$ | 6,907 | $\begin{gathered} 172.3 \\ (8.2) \end{gathered}$ |
| Weight, lbs (mean, SD) | 12,307 | $\begin{array}{r} 65.5 \\ (16.5) \end{array}$ | 16,279 | $\begin{array}{r} 96.9 \\ (30.0) \end{array}$ | 9,873 | $\begin{gathered} 138.4 \\ (39.6) \end{gathered}$ | 6,907 | $\begin{array}{r} 154.1 \\ (42.4) \end{array}$ |
| Weight, kg (mean, SD) | 12,307 | $\begin{aligned} & 29.7 \\ & (7.5) \end{aligned}$ | 16,279 | $\begin{array}{r} 43.9 \\ (13.6) \end{array}$ | 9,873 | $\begin{array}{r} 62.8 \\ (17.9) \end{array}$ | 6,907 | $\begin{array}{r} 69.9 \\ (19.2) \end{array}$ |
| Weight Status (CDC program) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BMI (mean, SD) | 12,307 | $\begin{array}{r} 17.6 \\ (3.4) \end{array}$ | 16,279 | $\begin{aligned} & 20.3 \\ & (5.0) \end{aligned}$ | 9,873 | $\begin{aligned} & 22.5 \\ & (5.5) \end{aligned}$ | 6,907 | $\begin{aligned} & 23.4 \\ & (5.8) \end{aligned}$ |
| Normal | 8,464 | 68.8\% | 9,688 | 59.5\% | 6,155 | 62.4\% | 4,447 | 64.4\% |
| Overweight | 1,731 | 14.1\% | 2,795 | 17.2\% | 1,612 | 16.3\% | 1,071 | 15.5\% |
| Obese | 2,112 | 17.1\% | 3,796 | 23.3\% | 2,106 | 21.3\% | 1,389 | 20.1\% |

BMI and weight status varied across grade, race/ethnicity, and poverty status (Figures 1c and 1d). Compared to girls, differences in BMI across race/ethnicity groups were less pronounced. The percentage of boys that were normal weight was lower among Hispanic boys compared to the remaining race/ethnicity groups. Again, the percentage of normal weight boys was lower among students in poverty.

Figure 1c. Weight Status, Body Mass Index (mean), Boys


Figure 1d. Weight Status, Percent Attaining Normal Weight Status, Boys


## Key Findings and Conclusions

A key finding was that rates of overweight and obesity among SC students are high with $37.2 \%$ failing to maintain a healthy weight status.

The following patterns were observed for weight status:

- The percentage of normal weight students was similar in girls and boys.
- The percentage of normal weight students tended to decrease with increasing age and grade level among both genders.
- The percentage of normal weight students was lower in Black and Hispanic students than in White and other race/ethnicity students. These trends were more pronounced in girls than boys.
- The percentage of normal weight students was lower among students in poverty compared to students not in poverty.


## 2. Cardiorespiratory Fitness

Definition. Cardiorespiratory fitness refers to a person's ability to perform largemuscle, whole-body physical activity for extended periods of time. Examples of physical activities that require cardiorespiratory fitness are brisk walking, running, stair-climbing, and participation in sports such as basketball and soccer. Cardiorespiratory fitness depends on the functional capacity of the body's cardiovascular, respiratory, and muscular systems. A physiological measure of this capacity is maximal aerobic power, or the maximal rate at which the body is able to take in, transport and consume oxygen (VO2max).

Relationship to Health. Maintaining good levels of cardiorespiratory fitness is important to health during childhood, adolescence, and adulthood. During all life stages, higher cardiorespiratory fitness is associated with lower risk for future development of conditions such as heart disease, type 2 diabetes, and certain cancers. Also, cardiorespiratory fitness is needed to perform physically demanding occupational tasks. Consequently, good cardiorespiratory fitness during adolescence is an important prerequisite to eligibility for occupations such as law enforcement, farming, and military service.

Measures. In the FitnessGram protocol cardiorespiratory fitness is measured with one of three optional field tests: 1) Progressive Aerobic Cardiovascular Endurance Run (PACER) test; 2) 1-mile run test; or 3) a walk test. The majority of students completing the FitnessGram protocol in SC completed the PACER test. The PACER is a multistage exercise test that involves running back and forth across a 15 or 20-meter space at a progressively increasing pace. The PACER is scored as the number of laps that are completed before fatigue causes the student to fall behind the prescribed pace. Some students completed the 1-mile run test. Performance on the 1-mile run test is scored as the time required to run and/or walk the 1-mile distance.

Variable for analysis. Performance on each of the cardiorespiratory fitness tests can be used to estimate the student's maximal aerobic power (VO2max). Each student's performance is scored as the corresponding VO2max value, and that score is placed in one of three categories that are based on age- and sex-specific criteria. The categories are: 1) Healthy Fitness Zone; 2) Needs improvement; 3) Needs Improvement - Health Risk.

## Results: Cardiorespiratory Fitness

Overall Sample. Over 66,000 students completed tests of cardiorespiratory fitness, and most of them completed the PACER test. In the total sample, which includes boys and girls in 5th, 8th and high school grades, 33,357 scored in the Healthy Fitness Zone. The remainder was approximately equally divided between those who scored in the Needs Improvement and Needs Improvement - Health Risk categories. Because cardiorespiratory fitness is a powerful predictor of long-term health, it is a great concern that nearly one-half of SC's students tested did not attain the Healthy Fitness Zone and that approximately one quarter scored in the Needs Improvement - Health Risk category.

A clear gender difference was observed. Estimated VO2max was higher in boys than girls, and a greater percentage of boys than girls ( $58.0 \%$ vs. $41.3 \%$ ) scored in the Healthy Fitness Zone for the test of cardiorespiratory fitness. Additionally, among those failing to attain the Healthy Fitness Zone, a larger percentage of girls than boys scored in the Needs Improvement - Health Risk category ( $27.3 \%$ vs. 23.2\%) (Table 2a). These findings indicate that low cardiorespiratory fitness is a particular concern in girls, but that a substantial percentage of boys also performed at a very low level on this test.

Table 2a. Cardiorespiratory Fitness for Total Sample and By Sex; SC FitnessGram School Year 2017-2018

| Cardiorespiratory <br> Fitness Variables <br>   <br>  <br>  n | Mean, SD |  | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 66,727 | $41.8(6.5)$ | 31,839 | $40.0(5.1)$ | 34,888 | $43.5(7.1)$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PACER | 3,508 | $44.3(6.3)$ | 1,323 | $41.1(5.0)$ | 2,185 | $46.3(6.2)$ |
| Walk | 63,205 | $41.7(6.4)$ | 30,511 | $39.9(5.1)$ | 32,694 | $43.4(7.1)$ |
| Fitness Zone Categories | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent |
| Healthy Fitness Zone | 33,357 | $50.0 \%$ | 13,132 | $41.3 \%$ | 20,225 | $58.0 \%$ |
| Needs Improvement | 16,542 | $24.8 \%$ | 9,988 | $31.4 \%$ | 6,554 | $18.8 \%$ |
| Needs Improvement - | 16,828 | $25.2 \%$ | 8,719 | $27.3 \%$ | 8,109 | $23.2 \%$ |

[^0]Cardiorespiratory Fitness in Girls. Cardiorespiratory fitness declined with increasing age and grade level in girls. VO2max decreased from 40.9 in 5 th graders to 38.2 in high school girls. The percentage of girls attaining the Healthy Fitness Zone decreased from 44.7\% in fifth graders to $36.5 \%$ in high school girls (Table 2b).

As shown in Figures 2a and 2b, cardiorespiratory fitness was associated with weight status such that poorer performance was observed in those who were overweight and obese than in those who were normal weight. The percentage of girls in the Healthy Fitness Zone was $54.4 \%$ in normal weight girls but decreased to $31.2 \%$ in those who were overweight and to $13.0 \%$ in those who were obese. Also, performance on the cardiorespiratory fitness test was associated with race/ethnicity and poverty status. The percentage of girls in the Healthy Fitness Zone for cardiorespiratory fitness was lower among Black students and students living in poverty.

Table 2b. Cardiorespiratory Fitness Among Females by Grade; SC FitnessGram School Year 2017-2018

| Cardiorespiratory <br> Fitness Variables | Grade $^{\text {* }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{5}^{\text {th }}$ Grade |  | $\mathbf{8}^{\text {th }}$ Grade |  | High School |  |
|  | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD |
| Estimated $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max | 16,880 | $40.9(5.6)$ | 8,736 | $39.3(5 \cdot 5)$ | 6,223 | $38.2(5.4)$ |
| Field Test |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-Mile Run | 371 | $43.2(5 \cdot 3)$ | 108 | $41.4(4.7)$ | 844 | $40.2(4.5)$ |
| PACER | 16,509 | $40.9(4.5)$ | 8,628 | $39.3(5.5)$ | 5,374 | $37.9(5.4)$ |
| Walk | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 5 | $50.5(14.7)$ |
| Fitness Zone Categories | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent |
| Healthy Fitness Zone | 7,548 | $44.7 \%$ | 3,312 | $37.9 \%$ | 2,272 | $36.5 \%$ |
| Needs Improvement | 6,222 | $36.9 \%$ | 2,359 | $27.0 \%$ | 1,407 | $22.6 \%$ |
| Needs Improvement: <br> Health Risk | 3,110 | $18.4 \%$ | 3,065 | $35.1 \%$ | 2,544 | $40.9 \%$ |

*cardiorespiratory fitness was not assessed for $2^{\text {nd }}$ grade students

Figure 2a. Cardiorespiratory Fitness, Estimated VO2max (mean), Girls


Figure 2b. Cardiorespiratory Fitness, Percent Attaining Healthy Fitness Zone, Girls


Cardiorespiratory Fitness in Boys. In boys, cardiorespiratory fitness as reflected by VO2max increased modestly with increasing age and grade levels. However, the percentage of boys attaining the Healthy Fitness Zone decreased from $60.2 \%$ in 5th graders to $57.6 \%$ in 8 th graders and to $53.0 \%$ in high school students (Table 2c).

The same association between cardiorespiratory fitness and weight status was observed in boys as in girls. Over $71.0 \%$ of normal weight boys scored in the Healthy Fitness Zone, but much smaller percentages of overweight and obese boys attained the Healthy Fitness Zone. The association between race/ethnicity and cardiorespiratory fitness was less pronounced in boys than girls (Figures 2c \& 2d). A similar pattern between cardiorespiratory fitness and poverty status was also observed. Specifically, a smaller percentage of boys in poverty attained the Healthy Fitness Zone for cardiorespiratory fitness compared to boys not living in poverty.

Table 2c. Cardiorespiratory Fitness Among Males By Grade, SC FitnessGram; School Year 2017-2018

| Cardiorespiratory Fitness Variables | Grade* |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $5^{\text {th }}$ Grade |  | $8^{\text {th }}$ Grade |  | High School |  |
|  | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD |
| Estimated $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max | 17,583 | 43.0 (6.1) | 10,101 | 44.1 (7.8) | 7,204 | 44.1 (8.00 |
| Field Test |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1-Mile Run | 443 | 47.4 (6.3) | 210 | 46.0 (6.1) | 1,532 | 46.1 (6.2) |
| PACER | 17,140 | 42.9 (6.1) | 9,891 | 44.1 (7.8) | 5,663 | 43.6 (8.3) |
| Walk | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 47.7 (14.7) |
| Fitness Zone Categories | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent |
| Healthy Fitness Zone | 10,587 | 60.2\% | 5,818 | 57.6\% | 3,820 | 53.0\% |
| Needs Improvement | 4,406 | 25.1\% | 1,212 | 12.0\% | 936 | 13.0\% |
| Needs Improvement: Health Risk | 2,590 | 14.7\% | 3,071 | 30.4\% | 2,448 | 34.0\% |

*cardiorespiratory fitness was not assessed for 2nd grade students

Figure 2c. Cardiorespiratory Fitness, Estimated VO2max (mean), Boys


Figure 2d. Cardiorespiratory Fitness, Percent Attaining Healthy Fitness Zone, Boys


## Key Findings and Conclusions

A key finding was that half of SC students attained the Healthy Fitness Zone for cardiorespiratory fitness.

The following patterns were observed:

- A smaller percentage of girls than boys attained the Healthy Fitness Zone.
- The percentage of students attaining the Healthy Fitness Zone decreased with increasing age and grade level, and this trend was particularly pronounced in girls.
- The percentage of students attaining the Healthy Fitness Zone was lower in Black students than in White students, and these trends were more pronounced in girls than boys.
- Performance on the cardiorespiratory fitness test was associated with weight status such that a higher percentage of normal weight students attained the Healthy Fitness Zone than did those in the overweight or obese categories.
- Among girls and boys, the percentage of students attaining the Healthy Fitness Zone for cardiorespiratory fitness was lower among students in poverty.


## 3. Upper Body Strength and Endurance - Push Ups

Definition. Muscular strength is the ability to generate force through contraction of the skeletal muscles and to apply that force to the body or to external objects. Muscular endurance refers to the ability to perform repeated muscle contractions or to sustain a muscle contraction against external resistance. Upper body muscular strength and endurance is a person's ability to generate force and to perform repeated muscular contractions against resistance using the musculature of the upper arm girdle.

Relationship to Health. Upper body muscular strength and endurance is related to health through its impact on daily function. Persons with adequate upper body muscular strength and endurance can perform household and occupational tasks safely, appropriately and without undue stress. Further, they are able to support their body weight with the upper body musculature as may be necessary in performance of leisure activities and in cases of emergency.

Measures. The $90^{\circ}$ push-up is the recommended test item to assess upper body strength and endurance in the FitnessGram protocol. Alternate assessment tests include the modified pull-up, pull-up, and the flexed arm hang. The majority of the students completing the FitnessGram protocol in SC completed the $90^{\circ}$ push-up test. The objective of the test is to complete as many push-ups as possible at a rhythmic pace (cadence $=20$ push-ups per minute or 1 push-up every 3 seconds). The test ceases when the student can no longer perform a pushup or when a second form correction is made (e.g., not maintaining pace; not achieving $90^{\circ}$ angle with elbows).

Variable for analysis. Performance on the push-up test for upper body strength and endurance is scored by counting the number of $90^{\circ}$ push-ups performed. Each student's score is then placed in one of two Healthy Fitness Zone categories using age- and sex-specific criteria. The categories are: 1) Healthy Fitness Zone; 2) Needs Improvement.

## Results: Upper Body Strength and Endurance

Overall Sample. Approximately 66,000 students completed the push-up test of upper body strength and endurance. For the total sample of students, which included boys and girls in grades 5,8 , and high school, the mean number of push-ups completed was $10.6 .57 .2 \%$ of the
total sample scored in the Healthy Fitness Zone while the remaining 42.8\% scored in the Needs Improvement category. In general, boys performed slightly better than girls on the upper body strength and endurance test component. On average, boys performed nearly five more push-ups than girls. Additionally, slightly more boys scored in the Healthy Fitness Zone compared to girls ( $59.0 \%$ vs. $55.2 \%$ ) (Table 3a). These findings suggest that nearly three in every five SC students have adequate levels of upper body strength and endurance for health.

Table 3a. Upper Body Strength/Endurance - Push Ups; Total Sample and By Sex, SC
FitnessGram School Year 2017-2018

| Upper Body Strength <br> and Endurance <br> Variables | Total |  | Males |  | Females |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n |  | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD | n |
| Mean, SD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Push-Ups | 66,267 | $10.6(7.8)$ | 34,298 | $12.8(8.2)$ | 31,969 | $8.3(6.6)$ |
| Fitness Zone Categories | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent |
| Healthy Fitness Zone | 37,881 | $57.2 \%$ | 20,251 | $59.0 \%$ | 17,630 | $55.2 \%$ |
| Needs Improvement | 28,386 | $42.8 \%$ | 14,047 | $41.0 \%$ | 14,339 | $44.8 \%$ |

Upper Body Strength and Endurance in Girls. In girls, upper body strength and endurance increased from $5^{\text {th }}$ grade to $8^{\text {th }}$ grade and then were maintained in high school. Specifically, the number of push-ups performed increased from 7.4 in $5^{\text {th }}$ grade to 9.2 in both $8^{\text {th }}$ grade and in high school (Table 3b). The percentage of girls attaining the Healthy Fitness Zone increased from $47.6 \%$ in fifth graders to $64.4 \%$ in high school girls.

As shown in Figures 3a and 3b, upper body strength and endurance was associated with weight status such that poorer performance was observed in those who were overweight and obese compared to those who were normal weight. The percentage of girls in the Healthy Fitness Zone was $64.5 \%$ in normal weight girls but decreased to $49.9 \%$ in those who were overweight and to $32.8 \%$ in those who were obese. Also, performance on the upper body strength and endurance test varied across race/ethnicity groups and poverty status. Push-up performance was poorer in Black and Hispanic girls than in White girls and girls from other races/ethnicities backgrounds; and poorer among girls living in poverty.

Table 3b. Upper Body Strength/Endurance - Push Ups; Females By Grade, SC FitnessGram School Year 2017-2018

| Upper Body Strength | Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{5}^{\text {th }}$ Grade |  | $\mathbf{8}^{\text {th }}$ Grade |  | High School |  |  |
| Push-Ups | 16,323 | $7.4(6.4)$ | 8,790 | $9.2(6.7)$ | 6,856 | $9.2(6.7)$ |  |
| Fitness Zone Categories | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent |  |
|  | 7,762 | $47.6 \%$ | 5,452 | $62.0 \%$ | 4,416 | $64.4 \%$ |  |
| \% Needs Improvement | 8,561 | $52.4 \%$ | 3,338 | $38.0 \%$ | 2,440 | $35.6 \%$ |  |

*upper body strength and endurance was not assessed for 2nd grade students
Figure 3a. Upper Body Strength/Endurance, Push-Ups (mean), Girls


Figure 3b. Upper Body Strength/Endurance - Push-Ups, Percent Attaining Healthy Fitness Zone, Girls


Upper Body Strength and Endurance in Boys. Among boys, upper body strength and endurance increased with increasing age and grade levels. However, the percentage of boys attaining the Healthy Fitness Zone decreased modestly from $61.7 \%$ in 5 th graders to $56.4 \%$ in high school students (Table 3c).

The same association between upper body strength and endurance and weight status was observed in boys as in girls. Over 68\% of normal weight boys scored in the Healthy Fitness Zone, but much smaller percentages of overweight and obese boys attained the Healthy Fitness Zone. The association between race/ethnicity and upper body strength and endurance was less pronounced in boys than girls, with Hispanic students performing slightly worse than other race/ethnicity groups. Similar to girls, the percentage of boys attaining the Healthy Fitness Zone for upper body strength was poorer among students in poverty (Figures 3c and 3d).

Table 3c. Upper Body Strength/Endurance - Push-Ups; Males By Grade, SC FitnessGram; School Year 2017-2018

| Upper Body Strength <br> and Endurance <br> Variables | Grade |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $5^{\text {th }}$ Grade |  | $8^{\text {th }}$ Grade |  | High School |  |
|  | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD |
| Push-Ups (mean, SD) | 16,809 | 10.3 (7.6) | 10,021 | 14.3 (7.9) | 7,468 | 16.3 (8.1) |
| Fitness Zone Categories | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent |
| \% Healthy Fitness Zone | 10,366 | 61.7\% | 5,670 | 56.6\% | 4,215 | 56.4\% |
| \% Needs Improvement | 6,443 | 38.3\% | 4,351 | 43.4\% | 3,253 | 43.6\% |

[^1]Figure 3c. Upper Body Strength/Endurance, Push-Ups (mean), Boys


Figure 3d. Upper Body Strength/Endurance - Push-Ups, Percent Attaining Healthy Fitness Zone, Boys


## Key Findings and Conclusions

A key finding of the assessment of upper body strength and endurance was that $57.1 \%$ of SC students attained the Healthy Fitness Zone for push-ups.

The following patterns were observed:

- Overall, the percentage of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone category for push-ups was similar for boy and girls.
- Across grade levels, the percentage of girls attaining the Healthy Fitness Zone increased with increasing grade level while the percentage of boys decreased with increasing grade level.
- In $5^{\text {th }}$ grade, a smaller percentage of girls than boys attained the Healthy Fitness Zone for push-ups ( $47.6 \%$ vs. 61.7\%).
- In high school, a larger percentage of girls than boys attained the Healthy Fitness Zone for push-ups (64.4 vs. 56.4\%).
- Among girls, the percentage of students attaining the Healthy Fitness Zone was lower in Black and Hispanic students than in White students. In boys, the percentage attaining the Healthy Fitness Zone was lower in Hispanic students compared to White and Black students.
- Performance on the upper body strength and endurance test was associated with weight status such that a higher percentage of normal weight students attained the Healthy Fitness Zone than did those in the overweight or obese categories.
- Concerning poverty status, the percentage of students attaining Healthy Fitness Zone for upper body strength was lower among students in poverty compared to those not living in poverty.


## 4. Abdominal Muscular Strength and Endurance - Curl-Ups

Definition. Muscular strength is the ability to generate force through contraction of the skeletal muscles and to apply that force to the body or to external objects. Muscular endurance refers to the ability to perform repeated muscle contractions or to sustain a muscle contraction against external resistance. Abdominal muscular strength and endurance is a person's ability to generate force and to perform repeated muscular contractions against resistance using the musculature of the abdomen.

Relationship to Health. Abdominal muscular strength and endurance is important in promoting good posture and alignment of the pelvis and spine. An adequate level of abdominal strength and endurance is important and impacts health through maintenance of lower back health.

Measures. The curl-up is the recommended test item to assess abdominal muscular strength and endurance in the FitnessGram protocol. Students lie on their backs with knees bent, feet flat on the floor, and arms parallel to the body with palms facing down. To perform a curl-up, students lift their head and shoulders off the mat and stretch their fingers across a measuring strip and then lower back down to the floor. The objective of the curl-up test is to complete as many curl-ups as possible at a specified pace of one curl-up every three seconds (max 75 curl-ups). The test ceases when 1) the student can no longer perform a curl-up, 2) the second form correction is made, or 3 ) the student completes 75 curl-ups.

Variable for analysis. Performance on the curl-up test for abdominal muscular strength and endurance is scored by counting the number of curl-ups performed with correct form. Each student's score is then categorized into one of two Healthy Fitness Zone categories using ageand sex-specific criteria. The categories are: 1) Healthy Fitness Zone; 2) Needs Improvement.

## Results: Abdominal Muscular Strength and Endurance

Overall Sample. Approximately 68,000 students completed the curl-up test for abdominal muscular strength and endurance. The average number of curl-ups completed was 26.9 for the total sample, which included boys and girls from grades 5,8 and high school. A majority of the students (68.4\%) in the total sample scored in the Healthy Fitness Zone category for abdominal
muscular strength and endurance; the remaining $31.6 \%$ scored in the Needs Improvement category. On average, boys performed slightly better on the abdominal muscular strength and endurance test than girls (Table 4a).

Table 4a. Abdominal muscular Strength and Endurance -Curl-Ups; SC FitnessGram; Total Sample and By Sex, School Year 2017-2018

| Abdominal Strength <br> and Endurance <br> Variables | Total |  |  | Males |  | Females |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD |  |
| Curl-Ups (mean, SD) | 67,570 | 26.9 <br> $(19.6)$ | 35,102 | 29.5 <br> $(20.4)$ | 32,468 | 24.0 <br> $(18.4)$ |  |
| Healthy Fitness Zone <br> Category | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent |  |
| Healthy Fitness Zone | 46,225 | $68.4 \%$ | 24,819 | $70.7 \%$ | 21,406 | $65.9 \%$ |  |
| Needs Improvement | 21,345 | $31.6 \%$ | 10,283 | $29.3 \%$ | 11,062 | $34.1 \%$ |  |

Abdominal Muscular Strength and Endurance in Girls. Among girls, the number of curl-ups completed during the muscular strength and endurance test increased from $5^{\text {th }}$ grade to $8^{\text {th }}$ grade and then decreased slightly in high school. However, the percentage of girls attaining the Healthy Fitness Zone increased from $61.3 \%$ in fifth graders to $70.7 \%$ in high school girls (Table 4b).

Across demographic subgroups, differences in performance on the curl-up test for abdominal muscular strength and endurance emerged (Figures 4a and 4b). Similar to other FitnessGram test components, poorer performance on the abdominal muscular strength and endurance test was observed in overweight and obese students compared to normal weight students. Comparing race/ethnicity groups, performance on the abdominal muscular strength and endurance test was poorer in Black and Hispanic girls compared to White girls and girls from other races/ethnicities. Poorer performance on the abdominal muscular strength and endurance test was also observed among students in poverty.

Table 4b. Abdominal Muscular Strength and Endurance - Curl-Ups; SC FitnessGram; Females By Grade, School Year 2017-2018

| Abdominal Muscular <br> Strength and <br> Endurance <br> Variables | Grade |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $5^{\text {th }}$ Grade |  | $\mathbf{8}^{\text {th }}$ Grade |  | High School |  |
|  | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD |
| Curl-Ups (mean, SD) | 16,594 | 20.1 <br> $(16.8)$ | 8,965 | 29.8 <br> $(20.5)$ | 6,910 | 25.8 <br> $(16.5)$ |
| Healthy Fitness Zone <br> Category | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent |
| Healthy Fitness <br> Zone | 10,171 | $61.3 \%$ | 6,349 | $70.8 \%$ | 4,886 | $70.7 \%$ |
| Needs Improvement | 6,423 | $38.7 \%$ | 2,615 | $29.2 \%$ | 2,024 | $29.3 \%$ |

Figure 4a. Abdominal Muscular Strength/Endurance, Curl-Ups (mean), Girls


Figure 4b. Abdominal Muscular Strength/Endurance - Curl-Ups, Percent Attaining Healthy Fitness Zone, Girls


Abdominal Muscular Strength and Endurance in Boys. Similar to girls, the number of curl-ups completed during the abdominal muscular strength and endurance test increased from $5^{\text {th }}$ to $8^{\text {th }}$ grade, and then decreased slightly in high school. The percentage of boys attaining the Healthy Fitness Zone for abdominal muscular strength and endurance followed a similar trend (Table 4c).

The same association between abdominal muscular strength and endurance and weight status was observed in boys as in girls. Approximately $78 \%$ of normal weight boys scored in the Healthy Fitness Zone while only $70.7 \%$ of overweight and $52.0 \%$ of obese boys attained the Healthy Fitness Zone. While a similar pattern between race/ethnicity and abdominal muscular strength and endurance was observed, it was less pronounced in boys than girls. Again, poorer performance on the abdominal muscular strength and endurance test was also observed among students in poverty (Figures 4 c and 4 d ).

Table 4c. Abdominal Muscular Strength and Endurance - SC FitnessGram; Males By Grade, School Year 2017-2018

| Abdominal Strength and <br> Endurance Variables | $\mathbf{G r a d e}^{\text {th }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | Mean, SD | n | $\mathbf{8}^{\text {th }}$ Grade | High School, SD |  |  |
|  | n | Mean, SD |  |  |  |  |  |
| Curl-Ups (mean, SD) | $\mathbf{1 7 , 2 2 4}$ | 22.2 <br> $(18.0)$ | $\mathbf{1 0 , 2 5 9}$ | 38.2 <br> $(21.2)$ | 7,619 | 34.4 <br> $(18.3)$ |  |
| Healthy Fitness Zone <br> Category | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent |  |
| Healthy Fitness Zone | 11,292 | $65.6 \%$ | 7,862 | $76.6 \%$ | 5,665 | $74.4 \%$ |  |
| Needs Improvement | 5,932 | $34.4 \%$ | 2,397 | $23.4 \%$ | 1,954 | $25.6 \%$ |  |

Figure 4c. Abdominal Muscular Strength/Endurance, Curl-Ups (mean), Boys


Figure 4d. Abdominal Muscular Strength/Endurance - Curl-Ups, Percent Attaining Healthy Fitness Zone, Boys


## Key Findings and Conclusions

A key finding of the assessment of abdominal muscular strength and endurance was that 68.4\% of SC students attained the Healthy Fitness Zone for curl-ups.

The following patterns were observed:

- Overall, the percentage of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone category for curlups was slightly higher among boys compared to girls.
- Across grade levels, the percentage of girls and boys attaining the Healthy Fitness Zone increased from elementary to middle school and then decreased in high school.
- The percentage of students attaining the Healthy Fitness Zone was lower in Black and Hispanic students than in White students. This difference was slightly more pronounced in girls than boys.
- Performance on the abdominal muscular strength and endurance test was associated with weight status such that a higher percentage of normal weight students attained the Healthy Fitness Zone than did those in the overweight or obese categories.
- The percentage of students attaining the Healthy Fitness Zone for abdominal strength and endurance was lower among students in poverty.


## 5. Trunk Extensor Strength and Flexibility - Trunk Lift

Definition. Muscular strength is the ability to generate force through contraction of the skeletal muscles and to apply that force to the body or to external objects. Muscular flexibility refers to the range of motion in a joint or series of joints and is influenced by the length and extensibility of the muscles that cross the joint. Trunk extensor strength and flexibility is a person's ability to contract the musculature of the low back and hamstrings while having adequate flexibility in the abdominal and hip flexor muscles to extend the torso.

Relationship to Health. Trunk extensor strength and flexibility is important in maintaining correct posture and lower back health. To maintain good low back health, individuals must have adequate strength in back extensor muscles and sufficient, but not excessive, flexibility of the low back, hamstrings, and hip flexor muscles. The strength and flexibility of the trunk extensor muscles affect an individual's ability to perform activities of daily living such as picking up and carrying objects.

Measures. The trunk lift is the recommended test item to assess trunk extensor strength and flexibility in the FitnessGram protocol. The objective of the trunk lift is to use the muscles of the back to lift the upper body off the floor in a controlled manner while keeping the neck in a neutral position. A ruler is then used to measure the distance from the floor to the student's chin. The test is scored in inches, with a maximum score of 12 .

Variable for analysis. Performance on the trunk lift test for trunk extensor strength and flexibility is scored by measuring in inches the distance the student lifts her/his chin from the floor. Each student's score is then categorized into one of two Healthy Fitness Zone categories using age- and sex-specific criteria. The categories are: 1) Healthy Fitness Zone; 2) Needs Improvement.

## Results: Trunk Extensor Strength and Endurance

Overall Sample. Approximately 59,000 students completed the trunk extensor strength and flexibility component of the FitnessGram protocol. In the total sample, which included girls and boys in grades 5, 8 and high school, the average distance that students were able to lift the upper body was 10.1 inches. Performance was similar among boys and girls, with girls
performing slightly better than boys. The total percentage of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone for trunk extensor strength and endurance was $76.9 \%$ with more girls scoring in this zone than boys ( $79.4 \%$ vs. $69.4 \%$, respectively) (Table 5a). Compared to the other FitnessGram test components, a greater percentage of students scored in the Healthy Fitness Zone. These findings suggest that three in every four SC students has adequate trunk extensor strength and flexibility to maintain good health.

Table 5a. Trunk Extensor Strength - Trunk Lift, Total Sample and By Sex, SC FitnessGram School Year 2017-2018

| Trunk Extensor <br> Strength Variables | Total |  | Males |  | Females |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD |
| Trunk Lift (mean, SD) | 59,459 | $\begin{gathered} 10.1 \\ (2.2) \end{gathered}$ | 30,674 | 9.9 (2.3) | 28,785 | 10.2 (2.2) |
| Healthy Fitness Zone Category | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent |
| Healthy Fitness Zone | 45,710 | 76.9\% | 22,867 | 74.5\% | 22,843 | 79.4\% |
| Needs Improvement | 13,749 | 23.1\% | 7,807 | 25.5\% | 5,942 | 20.6\% |

Trunk Extensor Strength and Endurance in Girls. In girls, scores on the trunk lift were observed to increase from $5^{\text {th }}$ grade to $8^{\text {th }}$ grade and then were maintained in high school. Overall, the percentage of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone increased from $5^{\text {th }}$ grade to high school ( $75.8 \%$ vs. $83.5 \%$, respectively) (Table 5b).

Across demographic groups, some differences in performance on the trunk lift test for trunk extensor strength and flexibility were observed (Figures 5a and 5b). Unlike results from the other FitnessGram test components, poorer performance on the trunk extensor strength and flexibility test was not observed in overweight and obese students compared to normal weight students. By race/ethnicity, achievement of the Healthy Fitness Zone for trunk lift was slightly lower in Black and Hispanic girls compared to White girls. Additionally, girls in poverty performed slightly worse compared to girls not living in poverty (Figures 5a and 5b).

Table 5b. Trunk Extensor Strength - Trunk Lift, Females By Grade, SC FitnessGram School Year 2017-2018

| Trunk Extensor <br> Strength Variables | Grade |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{5}^{\text {th }}$ Grade |  | $\mathbf{8}^{\text {th }}$ Grade |  | High School |  |
|  | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD |
| Trunk Lift (mean, SD) | $\mathbf{1 4 , 9 7 4}$ | $\mathbf{1 0 . 0}(2.2)$ | 7,876 | $10.5(2.0)$ | 5,937 | $10.5(2.1)$ |
| Healthy Fitness Zone | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent |
| Healthy Fitness Zone | 11,358 | $75.8 \%$ | 6,530 | $82.9 \%$ | 4,955 | $83.5 \%$ |
| Needs Improvement | 3,616 | $24.2 \%$ | 1,344 | $17.1 \%$ | 982 | $16.5 \%$ |

Figure 5a. Trunk Strength/Endurance, Trunk Lift (mean), Girls


Figure 5b. Trunk Strength/Endurance - Trunk Lift, Percent Attaining Healthy Fitness Zone, Girls


Trunk Extensor and Endurance in Boys. Among boys, scores on the trunk lift were observed to increase from $5^{\text {th }}$ grade to $8^{\text {th }}$ grade and then were maintained in high school. The percentage of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone increased from $69.9 \%$ in $5^{\text {th }}$ grade to $79.7 \%$ in high school (Table 5c).

Similar patterns across demographic groups were observed in boys and girls. Concerning weight status, poorer performance on the trunk extensor strength and flexibility test was not observed in overweight and obese students compared to normal weight students. By race/ethnicity, performance on the trunk lift test was slightly better in White boys compared to other race/ethnicity groups. While less pronounced compared to other test components, poorer performance on the trunk extensor and endurance test was observed among male students in poverty (Figures 5 c and 5 d ).

Table 5c. Trunk Extensor Strength - Trunk Lift, Males By Grade, SC FitnessGram School Year 2017-2018

| Trunk Extensor <br> Strength Variables | Grade |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{5}^{\text {th }}$ Grade |  | $\mathbf{8}^{\text {th }}$ Grade |  | High School |  |
|  | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD |
| Trunk Lift (mean, SD) | 15,421 | $9.6(2.3)$ | 8,880 | $10.2(2.2)$ | 6,373 | $10.3(2.2)$ |
| Healthy Fitness Zone | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent |
| \% Healthy Fitness Zone | 10,785 | $69.9 \%$ | 7,001 | $78.8 \%$ | 5,081 | $79.7 \%$ |
| \% Needs Improvement | 4,636 | $30.1 \%$ | 1,879 | $21.2 \%$ | 1,292 | $20.3 \%$ |

Figure 5c. Trunk Strength/Endurance, Trunk Lift (mean), Boys


Figure 5d. Trunk Strength/Endurance - Trunk Lift, Percent Attaining Healthy Fitness Zone, Boys


## Key Findings and Conclusions

A key finding of the assessment of trunk extensor strength and flexibility was that 76.9\% of SC students attained the Healthy Fitness Zone for trunk lift.

The following patterns were observed:

- Overall, the percentage of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone category for the trunk lift was slightly greater for girls than boys.
- Across grade levels, the percentage of girls and boys attaining the Healthy Fitness Zone tended to increase with increasing grade level.
- The percentage of students attaining the Healthy Fitness Zone was lower in Black and Hispanic students than in White students. This difference was more pronounced in girls than boys.
- Performance on the trunk extensor strength and flexibility test was not associated with weight status; normal weight students tended to perform worse than overweight or obese students.
- Poorer performance on the trunk extensor and endurance test was observed among students in poverty. This pattern was less pronounced in the trunk extensor and endurance test component compared to the other test components.


## 6. Flexibility - Sit and Reach

Definition. Muscular flexibility refers to the range of motion in a joint or series of joints and is influenced by the length and extensibility of the muscles that cross the joint. The back-saver sit and reach test predominately is a measure of the hamstring muscles.

Relationship to Health. Maintaining an adequate level of flexibility is important for functional health and mobility. Some major benefits of adequate flexibility include reduced risk of injury and improved performance of daily activities. Normal hamstring flexibility allows for 1 ) proper rotation of the pelvis in forward bending movements; and 2) posterior tilting of the pelvis for proper sitting.

Measures. The back-saver sit and reach is the recommended test item to assess flexibility in the FitnessGram protocol. An alternate assessment test is the shoulder stretch. The majority of the students completing the FitnessGram protocol in SC completed the sit and reach test. To perform the test, a student sits down at the test apparatus with one leg bent and the other fully extended. The arms are then extended forward over the measuring scale. The student then extends the opposite leg and repeats the test for the other side of the body. The objective of the test is to be able to reach the specified distance on both sides of the body. The test is scored in inches, with a maximum score of 12 .

Variable for analysis. Performance on the sit and reach test for flexibility is scored by measuring in inches the distance the student is able to reach forward towards the extended foot.

Two scores are taken; one for the right side of the body and one for the left side of the body. Each student's scores are then categorized into one of two Healthy Fitness Zone categories using age- and sex-specific criteria. The categories are: 1) Healthy Fitness Zone; 2) Needs Improvement. In order to be classified in the Healthy Fitness Zone category, a student must meet the standard on both the right and left side of the body.

## Results: Flexibility

Overall Sample. Approximately 66,000 students completed the sit and reach test for flexibility. In the total sample, which included girls and boys in grades 5,8 and high school, the average distance that students were able to reach forward was 9.8 inches. Performance was better among girls than boys. The total percentage of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone for sit and reach was 71.6 \% and was similar among girls and boys (Table 6a).

Table 6a. Flexibility - Sit and Reach, Total Sample and By Sex, SC FitnessGram School Year 2017-2018

|  | Total |  | Males |  | Females |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |$|$| Flexibility Variables |
| :---: |

Flexibility in Girls. Among girls, raw scores on the sit and reach test increased with increasing age and grade level. The percentage of girls scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone
increased from $5^{\text {th }}$ grade to $8^{\text {th }}$ grade then decreased slightly in high school ( $67.7 \%$ vs. $79.0 \%$ vs. $71.5 \%$, respectively) (Table 6b).

Table 6b. Flexibility - Sit and Reach, Females By Grade, SC FitnessGram School Year 20172018

|  | Grade |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathbf{5}^{\text {th }}$ Grade |  | $\mathbf{8}^{\text {th }}$ Grade |  | High School |  |
|  | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD |
| Sit and Reach, Left | 16,274 | $10.1(2.1)$ | 8,672 | $10.9(1.8)$ | 6,988 | $11.0(1.9)$ |
| Sit and Reach, Right | 16,130 | $10.1(2.2)$ | 8,631 | $10.9(1.8)$ | 6,930 | $11.0(1.9)$ |
| Healthy Fitness Zone <br> Category | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent |
| Healthy Fitness Zone | 10,920 | $67.7 \%$ | 6,817 | $79.0 \%$ | 4,956 | $71.5 \%$ |
| Needs Improvement | 5,202 | $32.3 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 , 8 0 9}$ | $21.0 \%$ | 1,974 | $28.5 \%$ |

Across demographic groups, slight differences in performance on the sit and reach test were observed (Figures 6a and 6b). Slightly poorer performance on the sit and reach test for flexibility test was observed in overweight and obese students compared to normal weight students; Black and Hispanic girls compared to White girls; and students in poverty.

Figure 6a. Flexibility, Sit and Reach (mean), Girls


Figure 6b. Flexibility- Sit and Reach, Percent Attaining Healthy Fitness Zone, Girls


Flexibility in Boys. The percentage of boys attaining the Healthy Fitness Zone for flexibility increased with increasing age and grade level ( $65.3 \%$ to $75.2 \%$ to $81.9 \%$, respectively) (Table 6c). Additionally, similar patterns across demographic groups were observed in boys and girls. Concerning weight status, a lower percentage of overweight and obese boys compared to normal weight boys attained the Healthy Fitness Zone for flexibility. By race/ethnicity, there was no discernable difference in the sit and reach test performance (Figures 6 c and 6 d ).

Table 6c. Flexibility - Sit and Reach; SC FitnessGram; Males By Grade, School Year 2017-2018

| Flexibility Variables | Grade |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $5^{\text {th }}$ Grade |  | 8 $^{\text {th }}$ Grade |  | High School |  |
|  | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD |
| Sit and Reach, Left | 16,788 | $8.7(2.4)$ | 9,818 | $9.4(2.5)$ | 7,503 | $9.9(2.4)$ |
| Sit and Reach, Right | 16,640 | $8.7(2.4)$ | 9,782 | $9.4(2.5)$ | 7,458 | $9.9(2.4)$ |
| Healthy Fitness Zone Category | n | Percent | n | Percent | n | Percent |
| \% Healthy Fitness Zone | 10,859 | $65.3 \%$ | 7,356 | $75.2 \%$ | 6,109 | $81.9 \%$ |
| \% Needs Improvement | 5,770 | $34.7 \%$ | 2,422 | $24.8 \%$ | 1,348 | $18.1 \%$ |

*flexibility was not assessed for $2^{\text {nd }}$ grade students

Figure 6c. Flexibility, Sit and Reach (mean), Boys


Figure 6d. Flexibility - Sit and Reach, Percent Attaining Healthy Fitness Zone, Boys


## Key Findings and Conclusions

A key finding of the assessment of flexibility as measured by the sit and reach test was that $71.7 \%$ of SC students attained the Healthy Fitness Zone for flexibility.

The following patterns were observed:

- Overall, the percentage of students scoring in the Healthy Fitness Zone category for flexibility was similar among girls and boys.
- Across grade levels, the percentage of boys attaining the Healthy Fitness Zone increased with increasing grade level, while girls increased from $5^{\text {th }}$ grade to $8^{\text {th }}$ grade and then decreased in high school.
- The percentage of students attaining the Healthy Fitness Zone varied slightly across race/ethnicity groups and was different among girls and boys.
- Performance on the sit and reach test was associated with weight status; normal weight students tended to perform slightly better than overweight or obese students.
- Poorer performance on the sit and reach test for flexibility was observed among students in poverty. This pattern was more pronounced in boys compared to girls.


## APPENDICES

## Appendix A. Sample Distribution

Figure 1. Number of schools and school districts participating in the SC FitnessGram project by DHEC Public Health Region during school year 2017-2018.


2 schools from South Carolina Public Charter School District TOTAL $=61$ Districts, 697 Schools

Table 1. Number of students, schools, and school districts participating in the SC FitnessGram project by DHEC Public Health Region during school year 2017-2018.

| Health Region | Districts (n) | Schools (n) | Students $^{*}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lowcountry | 8 | 96 | 12841 |
| Midlands | 17 | 231 | 32272 |
| Pee Dee | 12 | 114 | 12706 |
| Upstate | 23 | 254 | 40510 |
| Public Charter School District | 1 | 2 | 73 |
| TOTAL | $\mathbf{6 1}$ | $\mathbf{6 9 7}$ | $\mathbf{9 8 , 4 0 2}$ |

Table 2. Number of students and schools participating in South Carolina FitnessGram project by school district and DHEC health district during school year 2017-2018

| Region | District | Schools in District (n) | Schools Participating in Study <br> (n) | Students Participating in Study <br> (n) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOW <br> COUNTRY | Allendale Co School District | 4 | 3 | 251 |
|  | Bamberg School District 1 | 3 | 3 | 203 |
|  | Beaufort Co School District | 32 | 25 | 2971 |
|  | Charleston Co School District | 82 | 27 | 3578 |
|  | Dorchester Co School District 2 | 24 | 21 | 4510 |
| 8 of 19 Districts | Hampton Co School District 1 | 7 | 1 | 116 |
| Participating | Orangeburg School District 4 | 8 | 4 | 323 |
|  | Orangeburg School District 5 | 14 | 12 | 889 |
|  | Total | 174 | 96 | 12841 |
| MIDLANDS | Aiken Co School District | 40 | 39 | 4980 |
|  | Barnwell School District 45 | 4 | 3 | 389 |
|  | Chester Co School District | 12 | 3 | 288 |
|  | Clover School District 2 | 10 | 9 | 1492 |
|  | Fairfield Co School District | 7 | 5 | 338 |
|  | Kershaw Co School District | 18 | 14 | 1751 |
|  | Lancaster Co School District | 20 | 16 | 2455 |
| 17 of 23 Districts | Lexington Co School District 1 | 29 | 24 | 4241 |
| Participating | Lexington Co School District 2 | 13 | 2 | 156 |
|  | Lexington Co School District 3 | 4 | 4 | 422 |
|  | Newberry Co School District | 13 | 11 | 1138 |
|  | Richland Co School District 1 | 46 | 36 | 4041 |
|  | Richland Co School District 2 | 37 | 36 | 6396 |
|  | Rock Hill School District 3 | 26 | 21 | 3377 |
|  | Saluda Co School District 1 | 5 | 2 | 191 |


|  | Williston School District 29 | 3 | 1 | 56 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | York School District 1 | 8 | 5 | 561 |
|  | Total | 295 | 231 | 32272 |
| PEE DEE | Chesterfield Co School District | 16 | 14 | 1459 |
|  | Clarendon School District 3 | 2 | 2 | 322 |
|  | Darlington Co School District | 21 | 9 | 854 |
|  | Florence School District 1 | 23 | 12 | 2028 |
| 12 of 17 Districts | Florence School District 2 | 2 | 1 | 29 |
|  | Georgetown Co School District | 19 | 17 | 1546 |
| Participating | Horry Co School District | 53 | 25 | 3271 |
|  | Lee Co School District | 5 | 4 | 244 |
|  | Marion County School District | 19 | 5 | 348 |
|  | Marlboro Co School District | 8 | 3 | 279 |
|  | Sumter School District | 25 | 18 | 2117 |
|  | Williamsburg Co School District | 11 | 4 | 209 |
|  | Total | 204 | 114 | 12706 |
| UPSTATE | Abbeville Co School District | 8 | 3 | 245 |
|  | Anderson School District 1 | 14 | 14 | 2228 |
|  | Anderson School District 2 | 7 | 6 | 794 |
|  | Anderson School District 3 | 5 | 5 | 537 |
|  | Anderson School District 4 | 6 | 5 | 575 |
|  | Anderson School District 5 | 18 | 12 | 1924 |
|  | Cherokee Co School District 1 | 13 | 10 | 845 |
|  | Greenville Co School District | 85 | 79 | 16623 |
|  | Greenwood School District 50 | 13 | 10 | 1378 |
|  | Laurens Co School District 55 | 9 | 6 | 563 |
|  | Laurens Co School District 56 | 5 | 5 | 676 |
|  | McCormick Co School District | 3 | 2 | 177 |
|  |  | 47 |  |  |


| 23 of 25 Districts <br> Participating | Oconee Co School District | 16 | 13 | 1355 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Pickens Co School District | 23 | 20 | 3039 |
|  | Spartanburg School District 1 | 10 | 8 | 735 |
|  | Spartanburg School District 2 | 15 | 13 | 2226 |
|  | Spartanburg School District 3 | 7 | 3 | 321 |
|  | Spartanburg School District 4 | 4 | 4 | 641 |
|  | Spartanburg School District 5 | 12 | 4 | 818 |
|  | Spartanburg School District 6 | 14 | 13 | 2540 |
|  | Spartanburg School District 7 | 12 | 10 | 1155 |
|  | Union Co School District | 7 | 6 | 796 |
|  | Ware Shoals School District 51 | 3 | 3 | 319 |
|  | Total | 309 | 254 | 40510 |
| NA | SC Public Charter School District | 39 | 2 | 73 |
|  | Total | 39 | 2 | 73 |
| Total |  | 1021 | 697 | 98402 |

## Appendix B. Summary Tables for FitnessGram Results

Table 1. Summary of SC FitnessGram Scores; Males \& Females, School Year 2017-2018

| Variable | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{n}=\mathbf{9 8}, 402) \end{gathered}$ |  | Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { 2 }^{\text {nd }} \text { Grade } \\ & \text { (n=24,672) } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 5^{\text {th }} \text { Grade } \\ & (\mathrm{n}=37,040) \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 8^{\text {th }} \text { Grade } \\ (\mathrm{n}=\mathbf{2 0 , 6 0 9 )} \end{gathered}$ |  | High School ( $\mathrm{n}=16,081$ ) |  |
|  | n | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mean, SD / } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | n | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mean, SD } \\ / \% \end{gathered}$ | n | Mean, SD / \% | n | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mean, SD / } \\ \% \end{gathered}$ | n | $\begin{gathered} \text { Mean, SD / } \\ \% \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Age (mean, SD) | 98,402 | 11.1 (2.7) | 24,672 | 7.6 (0.5) | 37,040 | 10.5 (0.6) | 20,609 | 13.5 (0.6) | 16,081 | 14.8 (1.0) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Race/Ethnicity (\%) | 97,206 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian (I) | 272 | 0.3\% | 79 | 0.3\% | 91 | 0.3\% | 67 | 0.3\% | 35 | 0.2\% |
| Asian (A) | 1,664 | 1.7\% | 429 | 1.8\% | 609 | 1.7\% | 396 | 1.9\% | 230 | 1.5\% |
| Black or African American (B) | 30,852 | 31.7\% | 7,624 | 31.2\% | 11,714 | 32.0\% | 6,002 | 29.5\% | 5,512 | 35.0\% |
| Hispanic or Latino (H) | 9,928 | 10.2\% | 2,576 | 10.5\% | 3,948 | 10.8\% | 1,965 | 9.7\% | 1,439 | 9.2\% |
| Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (P) | 122 | 0.1\% | 26 | 0.1\% | 41 | 0.1\% | 34 | 0.2\% | 21 | 0.1\% |
| White (W) | 50,460 | 51.9\% | 12,622 | 51.6\% | 18,710 | 51.1\% | 11,120 | 54.6\% | 8,008 | 50.9\% |
| Other/Unknown (M) | 3,908 | 4.0\% | 1,100 | 4.5\% | 1,533 | 4.2\% | 785 | 3.9\% | 490 | 3.1\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poverty Status (\%) | 94,448 |  | 23,671 |  | 35,611 |  | 19,876 |  | 15,290 |  |
| No | 36,867 | 39.0\% | 8,535 | 36.1\% | 13,269 | 37.3\% | 8,490 | 42.7\% | 6,573 | 43.0\% |
| Yes | 57.581 | 61.0\% | 15,136 | 63.9\% | 22,342 | 26.75 | 11,386 | 57.3\% | 8,717 | 57.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Height, ft (mean, SD) | 88,296 | 4.9 (0.5) | 24,376 | 4.2 (0.2) | 32,104 | 4.8 (0.3) | 18,485 | 5.4 (0.3) | 13,331 | 5.5 (0.3) |
| Height, cm (mean, SD) | 88,296 | 148.6 (16.5) | 24,376 | 129.1 (6.7) | 32,104 | $\begin{array}{r} 146.8 \\ (8.4) \end{array}$ | 18,485 | 163.7 (8.6) | 13,331 | 167.4 (9.1) |
| Weight, lbs (mean, SD) | 88,296 | 104.8 (43.7) | 24,376 | 65.5 (17.1) | 32,104 | $\begin{array}{r} 98.7 \\ (30.7) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 18,485 | 136.1 (38.2) | 13,331 | 148.0 (41.2) |
| Weight, kg (mean, SD) | 88,296 | 47.5 (19.8) | 24,376 | 29.7 (7.8) | 32,104 | $\begin{array}{r} 44.8 \\ (13.9) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 18,485 | 61.7 (17.3) | 13,331 | 67.1 (18.7) |
| Body Mass Index (CDC program) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BMI (mean, SD) | 88,296 | 20.7 (5.5) | 24,376 | 17.7 (3.6) | 32,104 | 20.5 (5.1) | 18,485 | 22.9 (5.7) | 13,331 | 23.9 (6.1) |
| Normal | 55,533 | 62.8\% | 16,673 | 68.4\% | 19,164 | 59.7\% | 11,352 | 61.4\% | 8,344 | 62.6\% |
| Overweight | 14,699 | 16.7\% | 3,520 | 14.4\% | 5,703 | 17.8\% | 3,256 | 17.6\% | 2,220 | 16.7\% |


| Obese | 18,064 | 20.5\% | 4,183 | 17.2\% | 7,237 | 22.5\% | 3,877 | 21.0\% | 2,767 | 20.7\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cardiorespiratory Fitness |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Estimated $\mathrm{VO}_{2}$ max (mean, SD) | 66,727 | 41.8 (6.5) | -- | -- | 34,463 | 42.0 (5.5) | 18,837 | 41.9 (7.2) | 13,427 | 41.4 (7.5) |
| \% Healthy Fitness Zone | 33,357 | 50.0\% | -- | -- | 18,135 | 52.6\% | 9,130 | 48.5\% | 6,092 | 45.4\% |
| \% Needs Improvement | 16,542 | 24.8\% | -- | -- | 10,628 | 30.8\% | 3,571 | 19.0\% | 2,343 | 17.5\% |
| \% Needs Improvement - Health Risk | 16,828 | 25.2\% | -- | -- | 5,700 | 16.6\% | 6,136 | 32.5\% | 4,992 | 37.1\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mile - Estimated $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{max}$ (mean, SD) | 3,508 | 44.3 (6.3) | -- | -- | 814 | 45.5 (6.2) | 318 | 44.4 (6.0) | 2,376 | 44.0 (6.3) |
| Pacer - Estimated $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{max}$ (mean, SD) | 63,205 | 41.7 (6.4) | -- | -- | 33,649 | 41.9 (5.5) | 18,519 | 41.8 (7.2) | 11,037 | 40.8 (7.6) |
| Walk - Estimated $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \mathrm{max}$ (mean, SD) | 14 | 48.7 (14.2) | -- | -- | 0 | 0.0 | 0 | 0.0 | 14 | 48.7 (28.3) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upper Body Strength/Endurance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Push Ups (mean, SD) | 66,267 | 10.6 (7.8) | -- | - | 33,132 | 8.9 (7.2) | 18,811 | 11.9 (7.8) | 14,324 | 12.9 (8.2) |
| \% Healthy Fitness Zone | 37,881 | 57.2\% | -- | -- | 18,128 | 54.7\% | 11,122 | 59.1\% | 8,631 | 60.35 |
| \% Needs Improvement | 28,386 | 42.8\% | -- | -- | 15,004 | 45.3\% | 7,689 | 40.9\% | 5,693 | 39.7\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Modified Pull Up (mean, SD) | 272 | 2.9 (3.3) | -- | -- | 229 | 2.9 (3.2) | 43 | 3.3 (4.0) | 0 | 0.0\% |
| \% Healthy Fitness Zone | 57 | 21.0\% | -- | -- | 52 | 22.7\% | 5 | 11.6\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| \% Needs Improvement | 215 | 79.0\% | -- | -- | 177 | 77.3\% | 38 | 88.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% |
| \% Exempt | 0 | 0.0\% | -- | -- |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flexed Arm Hang (mean, SD) | 1021 | 13.0 (16.0) | -- | -- | 870 | $\begin{gathered} 13.0 \\ (16.7) \end{gathered}$ | 151 | 13.4 (11.1) | 0 |  |
| \% Healthy Fitness Zone | 870 | 85.2\% |  |  | 520 | 59.8\% | 81 | 53.6\% |  |  |
| \% Needs Improvement | 151 | 14.8\% |  |  | 350 | 40.2\% | 70 | 46.4\% |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Upper Body Strength HFZ | 72481 |  |  |  | 36,816 |  | 20,143 |  | 15,522 |  |
| \% Healthy Fitness Zone | 38,606 | 53.3\% | -- | -- | 18,598 | 50.5\% | 11,244 | 55.8\% | 8,764 | 56.5\% |
| \% Needs Improvement | 28,394 | 39.2\% | -- | -- | 15,009 | 40.8\% | 7,692 | 38.2\% | 5,693 | 36.6\% |
| \% Incomplete | 4,573 | 6.2\% | -- | -- | 2,725 | 7.4\% | 980 | 4.9\% | 868 | 5.6\% |
| \% Exempt | 908 | 1.3\% | -- | -- | 484 | 1.3\% | 227 | 1.1\% | 197 | 1.3\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Abdominal Strength/Endurance |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Curl Ups (mean, SD) | 67,570 | 26.9 (19.6) | -- | -- | 33,818 | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 21.2 \\ & (17.4) \end{aligned}$ | 19,223 | 34.3 (21.3) | 14,529 | 30.3 (18.0) |
| \% Healthy Fitness Zone | 46,225 | 68.4\% | -- | -- | 21,463 | 63.5\% | 14,211 | 73.9\% | 10,551 | 72.6\% |
| \% Needs Improvement | 21,345 | 31.6\% | -- | -- | 12,355 | 26.5\% | 5,012 | 26.1\% | 3,978 | 27.4\% |
| Trunk Extensor Strength |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Trunk Lift (mean, SD) | 59,459 | 10.1 (2.2) | -- | -- | 30,395 | 9.8 (2.3) | 16,754 | 10.4 (2.1) | 12,310 | 10.4 (2.2) |
| \% Healthy Fitness Zone | 45,710 | 76.9\% | -- | -- | 22,143 | $72.9 \%$ | 13,531 | 80.8\% | 10,036 | 81.5\% |
| \% Needs Improvement | 13,749 | 23.1\% | -- | -- | 8,252 | 27.1\% | 3,223 | 19.2\% | 2,274 | 18.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Flexibility |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sit and Reach, Left (mean, SD) | 66,043 | 9.8 (2.4) | -- | -- | 33,062 | 9.4 (2.4) | 18,490 | 10.1 (2.3) | 14,491 | 10.4 (2.2) |
| Sit and Reach, Right (mean, SD) | 65,571 | 9.8 (2.4) | -- | -- | 32,770 | 9.4 (2.4) | 18,413 | 10.1 (2.3) | 14,388 | 10.4 (2.3) |
| \% Healthy Fitness Zone | 47,017 | 71.7\% | -- | -- | 21,779 | 66.5\% | 14,173 | 77.0\% | 11,065 | 76.9\% |
| \% Needs Improvement | 18,525 | 28.3\% | -- | -- | 10,972 | 33.5\% | 4,231 | 23.0\% | 3,322 | 23.1\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shoulder Stretch, Right (mean, SD) | 1,835 | 0.8 (0.4) | -- | -- | 975 | 0.8 (0.4) | 374 | 0.8 (0.4) | 486 | 0.8 (0.4) |
| Shoulder Stretch, Left (mean, SD) | 1,835 | 0.9 (0.3) | -- | -- | 973 | 0.9 (0.3) | 376 | 0.9 (0.3) | 486 | 0.9 (0.3) |
| \% Healthy Fitness Zone | 1,418 | 69.9\% | -- | -- | 743 | 66.2\% | 302 | 75.3\% | 373 | 73.8\% |
| \% Needs Improvement | 415 | 20.5\% | -- | -- | 230 | 20.5\% | 72 | 18.0\% | 113 | 22.4\% |
| \% Incomplete | 187 | 9.2\% | -- | -- | 144 | 12.8\% | 25 | 6.2\% | 18 | 3.6\% |
| \% Exempt | 8 | 0.4\% | -- | -- | 5 | 0.5\% | 2 | 0.5\% | 1 | 0.2\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 2. Summary of SC FitnessGram Scores; Males, School Year 2017-2018

| Variable | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ (\mathbf{n}=\mathbf{5 0 , 6 9 5}) \end{gathered}$ |  | Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }} \text { Grade } \\ & (\mathrm{n}=\mathbf{1 2 , 4 5 7 )} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 5^{\text {th }} \text { Grade } \\ (\mathrm{n}=18,842) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \mathbf{8}^{\text {th }} \text { Grade } \\ (\mathrm{n}=11,000) \end{gathered}$ |  | High School ( $\mathrm{n}=\mathbf{8 , 3 9 6}$ ) |  |
|  | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD |
| Age (mean, SD) | 50,695 | 11.2 (2.7) | 12,457 | 7.6 (0.5) | 18,842 | 10.6 (0.6) | 11,000 | 13.6 (0.6) | 8,396 | 14.9 (1.0) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Race/Ethnicity (\%) | 50,126 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian (I) | 159 | 0.3\% | 49 | 0.4\% | 52 | 0.3\% | 39 | 0.4\% | 19 | 0.2\% |
| Asian (A) | 831 | 1.7\% | 211 | 1.7\% | 293 | 1.6\% | 208 | 1.9\% | 199 | 1.4\% |
| Black or African American (B) | 15,747 | 31.4\% | 3,784 | 30.7\% | 5,928 | 31.8\% | 3,078 | 28.3\% | 2,957 | 35.8\% |
| Hispanic or Latino (H) | 5,102 | 10.2\% | 1,303 | 10.6\% | 2,003 | 10.7\% | 1,044 | 9.6\% | 752 | 9.1\% |
| Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (P) | 67 | 0.1\% | 16 | 0.1\% | 22 | 0.1\% | 16 | 0.2\% | 13 | 0.2\% |
| White (W) | 26,233 | 52.3\% | 6,435 | 52.1\% | 9,596 | 51.4\% | 6,058 | 55.8\% | 4,144 | 50.2\% |
| Other/Unknown (M) | 1,987 | 4.0\% | 546 | 4.4\% | 766 | 4.1\% | 424 | 3.9\% | 251 | 3.0\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poverty Status (\%) | 48,725 |  | 11,947 |  | 18,155 |  | 10,609 |  | 8,014 |  |
| No | 19,116 | 39.2\% | 4,350 | 36.4\% | 6,727 | 37.1\% | 4,586 | 43.2\% | 3,453 | 43.1\% |
| Yes | 29,609 | 60.8\% | 7,597 | 63.6\% | 11,428 | 62.9\% | 6,023 | 56.8\% | 4,561 | 56.9\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Height, ft (mean, SD) | 45,366 | 4.9 (0.6) | 12,307 | 4.3 (0.2) | 16,279 | 4.8 (0.3) | 9,873 | 5.5 (0.3) | 6,907 | 5.7 (03) |
| Height, cm (mean, SD) | 45,366 | 150.1 (0.6) | 12,307 | $\begin{array}{r} 129.6 \\ (6.6) \end{array}$ | 16,279 | 146.2 (8.2) | 9,873 | 166.5 (9.0) | 6,907 | 172.3 (8.2) |
| Weight, lbs (mean, SD) | 45,366 | 106.1 (45.4) | 12,307 | $\begin{array}{r} 65.5 \\ (16.5) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 16,279 | 96.9 (30.0) | 9,873 | $\begin{array}{r} 138.4 \\ (39.6) \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 6,907 | 154.1 (42.4) |
| Weight, kg (mean, SD) | 45,366 | 48.1 (20.6) | 12,307 | 29.7 (7.5) | 16,279 | 43.9 (13.6) | 9,873 | 62.8 (17.9) | 6,907 | 69.9 (19.2) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Body Mass Index (CDC program) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BMI (mean, SD) | 45,366 | 20.5 (5.3) | 12,307 | 17.6 (3.4) | 16,279 | 20.3 (5.0) | 9,873 | 22.5 (5.5) | 6,907 | 23.4 (5.8) |
| Normal | 28,754 | 63.4\% | 8,464 | 68.7\% | 9,688 | 59.5\% | 6,155 | 62.4\% | 4,447 | 64.4\% |
| Overweight | 7,209 | 15.9\% | 1,731 | 14.1\% | 2,795 | 17.2\% | 1,612 | 16.3\% | 1,071 | 15.5\% |
| Obese | 9,403 | 20.7\% | 2,112 | 17.2\% | 3,796 | 23.3\% | 2,106 | 21.3\% | 1,389 | 20.1\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cardiorespiratory Fitness |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Estimated $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \max$ (mean, SD) | 34,888 | 43.5 (7.1) | -- | -- | 17,583 | 43.0 (6.1) | 10,101 | 44.1 (7.8) | 7,204 | 44.1 (8.00 |
| \% Healthy Fitness Zone | 20,225 | 58.0\% | -- | -- | 10,587 | 60.2\% | 5,818 | 57.6\% | 3,820 | 53.0\% |
|  |  |  |  | 52 |  |  |  |  |  |  |



| \% Needs Improvement | 7,807 | 25.5\% | -- | -- | 4,636 | 30.1\% | 1,879 | 21.2\% | 1,292 | 20.3\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Flexibility |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sit and Reach, Left (mean, SD) | 34,109 | 9.2 (2.5) | -- | -- | 16,788 | 8.7 (2.4) | 9,818 | 9.4 (2.5) | 7,503 | 9.9 (2.4) |
| Sit and Reach, Right (mean, SD) | 33,880 | 9.2 (2.5) | -- | -- | 16,640 | 8.7 (2.4) | 9,782 | 9.4 (2.5) | 7,458 | 9.9 (2.4) |
| \% Healthy Fitness Zone | 24,324 | 71.8\% | -- | -- | 10,859 | 65.3\% | 7,356 | $75.2 \%$ | 6,109 | 81.9\% |
| \% Needs Improvement | 9,540 | 28.2\% | -- | -- | 5,770 | 34.7\% | 2,422 | 24.8\% | 1,348 | 18.1\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shoulder Stretch, Right (mean, SD) | 859 | 0.8 (0.4) | -- | -- | 491 | 0.8 (0.4) | 148 | 0.8 (0.4) | 220 | 0.8 (0.4) |
| Shoulder Stretch, Left (mean, SD) | 857 | 0.8 (0.4) | -- | -- | 489 | 0.8 (0.4) | 148 | 0.8 (0.4) | 220 | 0.8 (0.4) |
| \% Healthy Fitness Zone | 617 | 64.9\% | -- | -- | 349 | 62.1\% | 115 | $71.0 \%$ | 153 | 67.4\% |
| \% Needs Improvement | 240 | 25.2\% | -- | -- | 140 | 24.9\% | 33 | 20.4\% | 67 | 29.5\% |
| \% Incomplete | 91 | 9.6\% | -- | -- | 71 | 12.6\% | 14 | 8.6\% | 6 | 2.6\% |
| \% Exempt | 3 | 0.3\% | -- | -- | 2 | 0.4\% | 0 | 0.0\% | 1 | 0.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 3. Summary of SC FitnessGram Scores; Females, School Year 2017-2018

| Variable | $\begin{gathered} \text { Total } \\ (\mathrm{n}=47,707) \end{gathered}$ |  | Grade |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{2}^{\text {nd }} \text { Grade } \\ & (\mathrm{n}=\mathbf{1 2 , 2 1 5 )} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} 5^{5^{\text {th }} \text { Grade }} \\ (\mathrm{n}=18,198) \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 8^{\text {th }} \text { Grade } \\ & (\mathrm{n}=9,609) \end{aligned}$ |  | High School ( $\mathrm{n}=7,685$ ) |  |
|  | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD | n | Mean, SD |
| Age (mean, SD) | 47,707 | 11.0 (2.6) | 12,215 | 7.6 (0.5) | 18,198 | 10.5 (0.5) | 9,609 | 13.5 (0.6) | 7,685 | 14.7 (0.9) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Race/Ethnicity (\%) | 47,080 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| American Indian (I) | 113 | 0.2\% | 30 | 0.3\% | 39 | 0.2\% | 28 | 0.3\% | 16 | 0.2\% |
| Asian (A) | 833 | 1.8\% | 218 | 1.8\% | 316 | 1.8\% | 188 | 2.0\% | 111 | 1.5\% |
| Black or African American (B) | 15,105 | 32.1\% | 3,840 | 31.7\% | 5,786 | 32.2\% | 2,924 | 30.8\% | 2,555 | 34.2\% |
| Hispanic or Latino (H) | 4,826 | 10.3\% | 1,273 | 10.5\% | 1,945 | 10.8\% | 921 | 9.7\% | 687 | 9.2\% |
| Hawaiian or Pacific Islander (P) | 55 | 0.1\% | 10 | 0.1\% | 19 | 0.1\% | 18 | 0.2\% | 8 | 0.1\% |
| White (W) | 24,227 | 51.5\% | 6,187 | 51.1\% | 9,114 | 50.7\% | 5,062 | 53.3\% | 3,864 | 51.7\% |
| Other/Unknown (M) | 1,921 | 4.1\% | 554 | 4.6\% | 767 | 4.3\% | 361 | 3.8\% | 239 | 3.2\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Poverty Status (\%) | 45,723 |  | 11,724 |  | 17,456 |  | 9,267 |  | 7,276 |  |
| No | 17,751 | 38.8\% | 4,185 | 35.7\% | 6,542 | 37.5\% | 3,904 | 42.1\% | 3,120 | 42.9\% |
| Yes | 27,972 | 61.2\% | 7,539 | 64.3\% | 10,914 | 62.5\% | 5,363 | 57.9\% | 4,156 | 57.1\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Height, ft (mean, SD) | 42,930 | 4.8 (0.5) | 12,069 | 4.2 (0.2) | 15,825 | 4.8 (0.3) | 8,612 | 5.3 (0.2) | 6,424 | 5.3 (0.2) |
| Height, cm (mean, SD) | 42,930 | 147.0 (14.9) | 12,069 | 128.6 (6.8) | 15,825 | 147.5 (8.6) | 8,612 | 160.6 (7.0) | 6,424 | 162.0 (6.8) |
| Weight, lbs (mean, SD) | 42,930 | 103.4 (41.8) | 12,069 | 65.4 (17.8) | 15,825 | 100.6 (31.2) | 8,612 | 133.5 (36.5) | 6,424 | 141.4 (38.9) |
| Weight, kg (mean, SD) | 42,930 | 46.9 (19.0) | 12,069 | 29.7 (8.1) | 15,825 | 45.6 (14.2) | 8,612 | 60.6 (16.6) | 6,424 | 64.2 (17.6) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Body Mass Index (CDC program) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BMI (mean, SD) | 42,930 | 21.0 (5.7) | 12,069 | 17.8 (3.7) | 15,825 | 20.7 (5.1) | 8,612 | 23.4 (5.8) | 6,424 | 24.4 (6.3) |
| Normal | 26,779 | 62.4\% | 8,209 | 68.0\% | 9,476 | 59.9\% | 5,197 | 60.4\% | 3,897 | 60.7\% |
| Overweight | 7,490 | 17.5\% | 1,789 | 14.8\% | 2,908 | 18.4\% | 1,644 | 19.1\% | 1,149 | 17.8\% |
| Obese | 8,661 | 20.1\% | 2,071 | 17.2\% | 3,441 | 21.7\% | 1,771 | 20.5\% | 1,378 | 21.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cardiorespiratory Fitness |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Estimated $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \max$ (mean, SD) | 31,839 | 40.0 (5.1) | -- | -- | 16,880 | 40.9 (5.6) | 8,736 | 39.3 (5.5) | 6,223 | 38.2 (5.4) |
| \% Healthy Fitness Zone | 13,132 | 41.3\% | -- | -- | 7,548 | 44.7\% | 3,312 | 37.9\% | 2,272 | 36.5\% |
| \% Needs Improvement | 9,988 | 31.4\% | -- | -- | 6,222 | 36.9\% | 2,359 | 27.0\% | 1,407 | 22.6\% |



| Flexibility |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Sit and Reach, Left (mean, SD) | 31934 | 10.5 (2.1) | -- | -- | 16,274 | 10.1 (2.1) | 8,672 | 10.9 (1.8) | 6,988 | 11.0 (1.9) |
| Sit and Reach, Right (mean, SD) | 31,691 | 10.5 (2.1) | -- | -- | 16,130 | 10.1 (2.2) | 8,631 | 10.9 (1.8) | 6,930 | 11.0 (1.9) |
| \% Healthy Fitness Zone | 22,693 | 71.6\% | -- | -- | 10,920 | 67.7\% | 6,817 | 79.0\% | 4,956 | 71.5\% |
| \% Needs Improvement | 8,985 | 28.4\% | -- | -- | 5,202 | 32.3\% | 1,809 | 21.0\% | 1,974 | 28.5\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Shoulder Stretch, Right (mean, SD) | 976 | 0.8 (0.4) | -- | -- | 484 | 0.8 (0.4) | 226 | 0.8 (0.4) | 266 | 0.9 (0.3) |
| Shoulder Stretch, Left (mean, SD) | 978 | 0.9 (0.3) | -- | -- | 484 | 0.9 (0.3) | 228 | 0.9 (0.3) | 266 | 0.9 (0.3) |
| \% Healthy Fitness Zone | 801 | 74.4\% | -- | -- | 394 | 70.4\% | 187 | 78.2\% | 220 | $79.1 \%$ |
| \% Needs Improvement | 175 | 16.3\% | -- | -- | 90 | 16.1\% | 39 | 16.2\% | 46 | 16.6\% |
| \% Incomplete | 96 | 8.9\% | -- | -- | 73 | 13.0\% | 11 | 4.6\% | 12 | 4.3\% |
| \% Exempt | 5 | 0.4\% | -- | -- | 3 | 0.5\% | 2 | 0.8\% | 0 | 00\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Appendix C. FitnessGram Significance Tables

Table 1. Weight Status - Statistical significance of Inter-Group Differences

| Figure | Comparison | Girls | Boys |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{P}<. \mathrm{O} 5=* / \\ & \text { NOT } \\ & \text { DIFFERENT=NS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mid \mathrm{P}<. \mathrm{O} 5=* / \\ & \text { NOT } \\ & \text { DIFFERENT=NS } \end{aligned}$ |
| BMI by grade | $\begin{aligned} & 2 / 5 \\ & 2 / 8 \\ & 2 / 9 \\ & 5 / 8 \\ & 5 / 9 \\ & 8 / 9 \end{aligned}$ |  | $\left.\right\|_{*} ^{*}{ }^{*}$ |
| Weight Status by grade | $\begin{aligned} & 2 / 5 \\ & 2 / 8 \\ & 2 / 9 \\ & 5 / 8 \\ & 5 / 9 \\ & 8 / 9 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * \\ & * \\ & * \\ & \text { NS } \\ & \text { NS } \\ & \text { NS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & * \\ & * \\ & * \\ & * \\ & * \\ & * \\ & \text { NS } \end{aligned}$ |
| BMI by Race | Black/Hispanic Black/ Other Black / White Hispanic / Other Hispanic/White Other/White | * | $\begin{aligned} & * \\ & * \\ & * \\ & * \\ & * \\ & * \end{aligned}$ |
| Weight Status by Race | Black/Hispanic Black/ Other Black / White Hispanic / Other Hispanic/White Other/White | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NS } \\ & * \\ & * \\ & * \\ & * \\ & * \end{aligned}$ | \|* |
| BMI by Poverty | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | * | * |
| Weight Status by Poverty | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{No} \\ & \text { Yes } \end{aligned}$ | * | * |

Table 2. Cardiorespiratory Fitness (CRF) - Statistical Significance of Inter-Group Differences

| Figure | Comparison | Girls | Boys |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{P}<.05=* / \\ & \text { NOT } \\ & \text { DIFFERENT=NS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{P}<. \mathrm{O} 5=* / \\ & \text { NOT } \\ & \text { DIFFERENT=NS } \end{aligned}$ |
| CRF by grade | 5/8 | * | * |
|  | 5/9 | * | * |
|  | 8/9 | * | NS |
| CRF HFZ by <br> grade | 5/8 | * | * |
|  | 5/9 | * | * |
|  | 8/9 | * | * |
| CRF by Weight status | Normal/Overweight |  |  |
|  | Normal/Obese Overweight/Obese |  |  |
| CRF HFZ by Weight status | Normal/Overweight |  |  |
|  | Normal/Obese <br> Overweight/Obese |  |  |
| CRF by Race | Black/Hispanic | * | * |
|  | Black/ Other | * | * |
|  | Black / White | * | * |
|  | Hispanic / Other | NS | * |
|  | Hispanic/White | * | * |
|  | Other/White |  | NS |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { CRF HFZ by } \\ & \text { Race } \end{aligned}$ | Black/Hispanic | * | * |
|  | Black/ Other | * | * |
|  | Black / White | * | * |
|  | Hispanic / Other | NS | NS |
|  | Hispanic/White | * | * |
|  | Other/White |  |  |
| CRF by poverty | No | * | * |
|  | Yes |  |  |
| CRF HFZ by poverty | No | * | * |
|  | Yes |  |  |

[^2]Table 3. Upper Body Strength (Push-ups) - Statistical Significance of Inter-Group Differences

| Figure | Comparison | Girls | Boys |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{P}<. \mathrm{O} 5=* / \\ & \text { NOT DIFFERENT=NS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{P}<. \mathrm{O5}=* / \\ & \text { NOT } \\ & \text { DIFFERENT=NS } \end{aligned}$ |
| Pushup by grade | 5/8 | * | * |
|  | 5/9 | * | * |
|  | 8/9 | NS | * |
| HFZ by grade | 5/8 | * | * |
|  | 5/9 | * | * |
|  | 8/9 | * | NS |
| Pushup by Weight status | Normal/Overweight | * | * |
|  | Normal/Obese | * | * |
|  | Overweight/Obese | * | * |
| HFZ by Weight status | Normal/Overweight | * | * |
|  | Normal/Obese | * | * |
|  | Overweight/Obese | * | * |
| Pushup by race | Black/Hispanic | NS | * |
|  | Black/ Other | * | NS |
|  | Black / White | * | NS |
|  | Hispanic / Other | * | * |
|  | Hispanic/White | * | * |
|  | Other/White | NS | NS |
| HFZ by race | Black/Hispanic | NS | * |
|  | Black/ Other | * | NS |
|  | Black / White | * | NS |
|  | Hispanic / Other | * | * |
|  | Hispanic/White | * | * |
|  | Other/White | NS | NS |
| Pushup by | No | * | * |
| poverty | Yes |  |  |
| HFZ by poverty | No Yes | * | * |

[^3]Table 4. Trunk Extensor Strength- Statistical Significance of Inter-Group Differences

| Figure | Comparison | Girls | Boys |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{P}<. \mathrm{O} 5=* / \\ & \text { NOT DIFFERENT=NS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{P}<. \mathrm{O5}={ }^{*} / \mathrm{l} \\ & \text { NOT } \\ & \text { DIFFERENT=NS } \end{aligned}$ |
| By grade | 5/8 | * | * |
|  | 5/9 | * |  |
|  | 8/9 | NS | NS |
| HFZ by grade | 5/8 | * |  |
|  | 5/9 | * | * |
|  | 8/9 | NS | NS |
| By Weight status | Normal/Overweight | NS | NS |
|  | Normal/Obese | * | NS |
|  | Overweight/Obese | * | NS |
| HFZ by Weight status | Normal/Overweight | NS | * |
|  | Normal/Obese | * | NS |
|  | Overweight/Obese | NS | NS |
| By race | Black/Hispanic | * | * |
|  | Black/ Other | * | * |
|  | Black / White | * | * |
|  | Hispanic / Other | NS | NS |
|  | Hispanic/White | * | * |
|  | Other/White | * | * |
| HFZ by race | Black/Hispanic | * | * |
|  | Black/ Other | * | * |
|  | Black / White | * | * |
|  | Hispanic / Other | NS | NS |
|  | Hispanic/White | * | * |
|  | Other/White | * | NS |
| By poverty | No | * | * |
|  | Yes |  |  |
| HFZ by poverty | No Yes | * | * |

[^4]Table 5. Flexibility (Sit and Reach) - Statistical Significance of Inter-Group Differences

|  | Comparison | Girls |  | Boys |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{P}<.05=* / \mathrm{NOT} \\ & \mathrm{DIFFERENT}=\mathrm{NS} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{P}<.05=* / \mathrm{NOT} \\ & \mathrm{DIFFERENT}=\mathrm{NS} \end{aligned}$ |  |
|  |  | L | R | L | R |
| By grade | 5/8 | * | * | * | * |
|  | 5/9 | * | * | * | * |
|  | 8/9 | * | * | * | * |
| HFZ by grade | 5/8 | * |  | * |  |
|  | 5/9 | * |  | * |  |
|  | 8/9 | NS |  | * |  |
| By Weight status | Normal/Overweight | * ** |  | * | * |
|  | Normal/Obese | * * |  | * | * |
|  | Overweight/Obese | * | * | * |  |
| HFZ by Weight status | Normal/Overweight | * |  | NS |  |
|  | Normal/Obese | * |  | * |  |
|  | Overweight/Obese | * |  | * |  |
| By race | Black/Hispanic | NS | NS | NS | NS |
|  | Black/ Other | * | * | $\underset{*}{\text { NS }}$ | NS |
|  | Black / White |  | * |  |  |
|  | Hispanic / Other | * | * | NS | NS |
|  | Hispanic/White | * | * |  | NS |
|  | Other/White | NS | NS | NS | NS |
| HFZ by race | Black/Hispanic | NS |  | NS |  |
|  | Black/ Other | * |  | NS |  |
|  | Black / White | * |  | * |  |
|  | Hispanic / Other | * |  | NS |  |
|  | Hispanic/White | * |  | NS |  |
|  | Other/White | NS |  |  |  |  |
| By poverty | No | * | * | * | * |
|  | Yes |  |  |  |  |
| HFZ by poverty | No | * |  | * |  |
|  | Yes |  |  |  |  |  |  |

HFZ=Healthy Fitness Zone; R=Right; L=Left

Table 6. Abdominal Strength (Curl-ups)-Statistical Significance of Inter-Group Differences

| Figure | Comparison | Girls | Boys |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{P}<.05=* / \\ & \text { NOT DIFFERENT=NS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{P}<.05=* / \\ & \text { NOT DIFFERENT=NS } \end{aligned}$ |
| By grade | 5/8 | * | * |
|  | 5/9 | * | * |
|  | 8/9 | * | * |
| HFZ by grade | 5/8 | * | * |
|  | 5/9 | * | * |
|  | 8/9 | NS | * |
| By Weight status | Normal/Overweight | * | * |
|  | Normal/Obese | * | * |
|  | Overweight/Obese | * | * |
| HFZ byWeight status | Normal/Overweight | * | * |
|  | Normal/Obese | * | * |
|  | Overweight/Obese | * | * |
| By Race | Black/Hispanic | * | NS |
|  | Black/ Other | * | * |
|  | Black / White | * | * |
|  | Hispanic / Other | * | * |
|  | Hispanic/White | * | * |
|  | Other/White | * | NS |
| HFZ by Race | Black/Hispanic | NS | * |
|  | Black/ Other | * | NS |
|  | Black / White | * | * |
|  | Hispanic / Other | * | * |
|  | Hispanic/White | * | * |
|  | Other/White | * | NS |
| By Poverty | No | * | * |
|  | Yes |  |  |
| HFZ by poverty | No | * | * |
|  | Yes |  |  |

HFZ=Healthy Fitness Zone


[^0]:    *The Healthy Fitness Zone categories do not equal the total for the FitnessGram Estimated $\mathrm{VO}_{2} \max$ component due to missing values

[^1]:    *upper body strength and endurance was not assessed for 2nd grade students

[^2]:    HFZ=Healthy Fitness Zone

[^3]:    HFZ=Healthy Fitness Zone

[^4]:    HFZ=Healthy Fitness Zone

