Scaling Evidence-Based Physical Education and Health Curriculum Models to Improve Youth Wellness Outcomes in Underserved U.S. School Districts

Emely Pasco Escueta, M.A.Ed.

Certified Physical Education and Health Teacher (Arizona Department of Education)

Curriculum Developer and Instructional Leader

Executive Summary

Underserved school districts across the United States face a persistent youth wellness challenge characterized by low physical activity levels, rising preventable health risks, and compounding mental and emotional stressors that interfere with learning and long-term life outcomes.[12] These challenges are not evenly distributed. Communities with fewer resources, limited access to safe recreational spaces, and constrained school budgets frequently provide students with fewer structured opportunities to build lifelong health habits.[1]

Schools remain one of the few institutions that reliably reach nearly every child daily. For that reason, Physical Education and Health (PEH) curricula are among the most practical, scalable, and equitable tools for improving youth wellness outcomes.[13] This white paper provides a practical implementation guide for school leaders, teachers, district administrators, and education policy stakeholders seeking to strengthen and scale evidence-based PEH curriculum models in underserved U.S. school systems.

The paper outlines:
(1) the scope of the youth wellness challenge;
(2) the role of PEH as a systemic intervention;
(3) the essential components of effective PEH curriculum models;
(4) implementation strategies for training, resourcing, and evaluation;
(5) scalable replication frameworks; and
(6) a future outlook emphasizing sustainability, equity, and continuous improvement.

1. The Youth Wellness Challenge in Underserved U.S. School Districts

1.1 The problem is systemic, not individual

Youth wellness is frequently framed as a matter of personal responsibility whether students "choose" to be active, eat nutritious food, or manage stress effectively. In practice, youth wellness outcomes are strongly shaped by opportunity structures that students do not control. Students cannot meaningfully choose daily physical activity if their communities lack safe

parks or recreation spaces, if families face transportation and work-hour barriers, or if schools do not provide consistent instructional minutes for Physical Education and Health.[1] When wellness is treated as an individual choice rather than a structural condition, school systems risk adopting fragmented interventions that do not address the root cause: unequal access to health-promoting environments.

Public health policy statements emphasize that a significant proportion of U.S. youth are overweight or obese and do not meet daily physical activity recommendations.[1] These trends are not isolated lifestyle issues; they are predictors of long-term chronic disease risks that accumulate over the life course. Youth inactivity is associated with increased risk factors for cardiovascular disease, diabetes, and musculoskeletal health problems, including reduced functional strength, lower endurance, and injury vulnerability.[1] In underserved communities—where access to preventive health care may be limited, schools become even more important as a primary setting for health-protective learning and routines.

In this context, the youth wellness challenge should be understood as a systemic issue requiring systemic solutions. The most sustainable solutions are those embedded in school structures, schedules, instructional expectations, and curriculum design rather than those dependent on short-term grants or extracurricular participation.

1.2 The impact on learning and school functioning

Youth wellness is inseparable from academic functioning. Students who are physically inactive, sleep deprived, nutritionally insecure, or struggling with stress are less likely to attend school consistently, remain engaged in learning, and persist through academic challenges.[12] These wellness factors influence attention, memory, emotional regulation, and classroom behavior. When students arrive at school dysregulated or fatigued, they are less likely to benefit from instruction—even when the instruction itself is high quality.

Evidence indicates that physical activity supports improved mood and reduces risk factors associated with depression.[12] in addition, physical activity is associated with improved attention and learning readiness.[1] These relationships matter because underserved districts often experience higher rates of chronic absenteeism and academic underperformance. When schools treat wellness as part of educational infrastructure, they are not "diverting" from academics; they are strengthening the conditions that make academic learning possible.

Importantly, PEH should not be framed as a cure-all for every learning challenge. However, it is a high-leverage lever that supports broader educational outcomes by improving engagement, self-regulation, and school connectedness—especially when delivered consistently and with high instructional quality.

1.3 Why underserved districts are disproportionately affected

Underserved districts are disproportionately affected because they often face structural constraints that reduce both the quantity and quality of PEH instruction. These districts frequently experience:

- **Reduced PE instructional minutes**, particularly in middle and high school grades, where academic pressures increase and PE becomes more likely to be treated as optional.[1]
- **Low PE budgets**, limiting equipment, facility improvements, teacher professional development, and curriculum modernization.[1]
- **Inconsistent health education delivery** due to staffing shortages, schedule constraints, and the absence of curriculum coherence across grade bands.[1]
- **Lower rates of student participation in organized sports outside school**, increasing reliance on school-based programming for equitable access to activity opportunities.[2]
- **High staff turnover**, which undermines curriculum continuity, weakens implementation fidelity, and increases variability across classrooms and campuses.

The combined result is predictable: the districts that most need school-based wellness supports often have the least capacity to provide them consistently. Without deliberate system design, PEH becomes unevenly delivered—strong in isolated classrooms but fragile at the district level.

2. Physical Education and Health (PEH) as a Scalable Solution

2.1 Why schools are the most equitable delivery system

Schools are uniquely positioned to provide structured health supports because they reach nearly all youth across socioeconomic categories, operate on consistent schedules, deliver standardized curricula, and measure progress through assessments and program data.[136] Schools also have the capacity to institutionalize wellness supports in a way that does not depend on family income, transportation, or access to private sports and enrichment programs.

For underserved districts, school-based PEH may be the primary reliable wellness intervention students receive. The school day may be the only time when a student has access to structured physical activity, adult coaching, health instruction, and consistent reinforcement of wellness norms. For this reason, strengthening PEH is not merely a "program improvement." It is an equity strategy that expands access to protective factors that more advantaged communities often receive through private systems.

2.2 PE and health education function best as an integrated system

Physical Education and Health should not operate as disconnected subjects. When integrated, PEH curricula can teach students both the "why" and the "how" of wellness: health literacy, applied decision-making, and the behavioral routines that support lifelong health.[3] At the same time, physical education provides structured opportunities for students to practice movement skills, fitness habits, teamwork, and self-management in real time.[4]

When PE and health education are integrated, PEH curricula can:

- teach the "why" and "how" of wellness through health literacy,[3]
- provide structured opportunities to practice physical activity, skill development, and movement confidence,[4]
- build self-efficacy and goal-setting skills through repeated practice and reflection,[3]
- create supportive school norms around health and activity participation.

A comprehensive PEH model strengthens both behavior and opportunity. It ensures students are not only told what healthy choices look like, but are provided consistent opportunities to build competence, confidence, and routine.

2.3 PEH is not "extra"—it is foundational

SHAPE America defines quality physical education as planned, sequential instruction that develops motor skills, knowledge, and behaviors for healthy active living.[4] This framing positions PE as an instructional core—not as recreation. In a strong school system, PE is not simply a break from academics; it is a structured learning environment with defined outcomes, instructional strategies, and assessment.

Similarly, CDC guidance emphasizes that health education should focus on behavioral outcomes and skills practice, not only factual knowledge.[3] Health education that relies only on lecture or memorization does not reliably translate into real-world behavior change. Skills-based health instruction, by contrast, strengthens decision-making, communication, and self-management competencies that support wellness across a student's lifespan.

In underserved systems, treating PEH as foundational is essential for long-term sustainability. Programs that depend on "extra time," volunteer staff, or short-term initiatives are the first to disappear when staffing or budgets tighten. A scalable PEH model must therefore be embedded into schedules, curriculum expectations, and district accountability structures.

3. What Makes a PEH Curriculum Model Evidence-Based?

3.1 Evidence-based does not mean rigid

An evidence-based PEH model is one that aligns to standards and validated frameworks,[45] incorporates research-supported instructional design principles,[67] uses assessment for accountability and improvement,[5] includes strategies for inclusive participation,[34] and is implemented with fidelity through training and coaching.[78] Evidence-based models must be adaptable to local needs without losing their core structure.

This distinction is critical for underserved districts. An overly rigid model may fail to accommodate differences in facilities, class sizes, staffing, or student needs. Conversely, a model that is too flexible may become inconsistent, losing the core elements that make it effective. The goal is "structured adaptability": preserving the essential features while allowing implementation pathways that fit local realities.

3.2 Essential curriculum architecture

A scalable PEH curriculum model should include:

(1) A scope and sequence

A structured scope and sequence ensures that learning is developmental and coherent across grade levels.[4] Students should not receive repetitive, disconnected PE experiences year after year. Instead, they should progress from foundational movement skills to higher-level competencies, and from basic health concepts to applied wellness decision-making.

(2) Standards alignment

Alignment to state standards and national guidance ensures consistency and accountability.[4][5] Standards alignment also allows districts to defend PEH as a legitimate academic program and to justify protected instructional time.

(3) Unit maps

Unit maps define objectives, key tasks, differentiation strategies, safety considerations, and assessments.[5] Unit mapping is especially important in underserved districts where staff turnover may be high; a unit map helps ensure continuity even when new teachers enter the system.

(4) Lesson templates

Standard lesson templates reduce teacher workload and improve fidelity. Templates allow teachers to focus on delivery quality rather than rebuilding lessons from scratch. They also support consistency across classrooms and campuses.

(5) Assessment system

Assessment is required for program quality control and evaluation.[5] A scalable PEH model must be measurable. Without assessment, districts cannot reliably demonstrate student growth, program impact, or equity outcomes.

3.3 Instructional design that maximizes movement and learning

A central problem in many PE programs is low activity density. Students spend too much time waiting in lines, listening to extended directions, or transitioning between activities. These inefficiencies reduce the actual physical activity students receive during class time and weaken program outcomes.

Evidence-based PE programs emphasize:

- small-sided games that increase engagement and repetition,
- stations and circuits that reduce idle time,
- reduced lines and eliminated activities that exclude lower-skilled students,
- active engagement routines that keep students moving while learning,
- efficient transitions and equipment management strategies.

Policy and public health guidance support the goal of having students spend a substantial portion of PE class time engaged in moderate-to-vigorous physical activity.[1][6][7] This target should be operationalized in the curriculum model through lesson design, teacher training, and observation tools that track active time.

3.4 Health education that is skills-based

CDC guidance emphasizes that effective health education:

- focuses on behavioral outcomes,
- provides skills practice (not only lectures),
- is age-appropriate and sequential,
- includes culturally inclusive strategies.[3]

A scalable health curriculum should be incorporated:

- decision-making models applied to realistic scenarios,
- goal setting and self-monitoring routines,
- communication skills (including refusal and help-seeking),
- stress coping strategies and self-regulation skills,
- media literacy and peer influence analysis.

Skills-based health education is particularly important in underserved settings because students may face higher exposure to stress, trauma, and risky health environments. A curriculum that equips students with applied coping and decision-making skills provides protective factors that extend beyond school.

4. Core Components of Effective PEH Curriculum Models

4.1 Component 1: Planned, sequential instruction

A strong PEH curriculum is not a list of activities. It is a progression. In effective systems, PE and health education operate with a clear developmental arc.

In PE, students should build:

- fundamental movement skills,
- sport and game literacy,
- personal fitness skills,
- lifetime physical activity habits.[4]

In health education, students should build:

- basic health knowledge,
- personal responsibility skills,
- social and emotional competence,
- applied decision-making skills.[3]

Planned instruction also ensures that PEH is not dependent on teacher preference. It standardizes the expectation that every student, regardless of school site or classroom assignment, receives a coherent program.

4.2 Component 2: Assessment and accountability

Assessment enables:

- student growth tracking,
- instructional improvement,
- program evaluation,
- equity monitoring.

Assessment should not stigmatize students. Fitness indicators should be used for personal growth, not humiliation or punitive grading. In underserved settings, punitive assessment practices can discourage participation and deepen inequities.

CDC's PECAT tool supports curriculum evaluation by analyzing outcomes, content, and assessment across grade bands.[5] This is particularly useful at the district level, where leaders must ensure consistency across multiple schools and teachers.

4.3 Component 3: Inclusivity and equity by design

Inclusivity must be designed into the curriculum, not appended later. A scalable PEH model must account for variability in students' skills, confidence, ability, language, and cultural backgrounds.

An inclusive PEH model includes:

- universal design strategies,
- adaptive modifications,
- culturally relevant activities,
- trauma-informed instructional routines,
- gender-inclusive participation strategies.

CDC guidance emphasizes culturally inclusive strategies as a characteristic of effective curricula.[3] When students see themselves reflected in the curriculum, they are more likely to participate, persist, and internalize the value of wellness practices.

4.4 Component 4: Professional learning infrastructure

Evidence-based curricula require:

- initial training,
- ongoing coaching,
- collaborative planning time,
- continuous improvement cycles.

Research-based models like SPARK show that curriculum plus teacher training and follow-up support improves physical activity outcomes.[78] in other words, implementation quality matters as much as curriculum content. Even the strongest curriculum will fail if teachers are unsupported, untrained, or operating in isolation.

5. Implementation Strategy: A Practical District Playbook

5.1 Phase 1: Readiness assessment (30–60 days)

Goal: Establish baseline conditions and priorities.

This phase ensures the district understands what currently exists before scaling improvements. A readiness assessment should identify not only weaknesses but also strengths—schools where PEH is already functioning well and can serve as pilot sites or demonstration models.

Key steps:

- Audit PE minutes by grade band.[1]
- Identify who teaches PE and health (specialists vs. non-specialists).[4]
- Inventory facilities and equipment.[1]
- Review current curriculum materials.[5]
- Select a pilot cohort of schools.

Deliverables:

- District PEH vision statement
- Baseline conditions report
- Curriculum gap analysis
- Pilot implementation plan

5.2 Phase 2: Curriculum design and alignment

Goal: Build a curriculum model that can be replicated.

This phase should produce the district's standardized curriculum system. The district should resist the temptation to "collect activities" and instead focus on creating a coherent architecture that can be taught consistently across sites.

Key deliverables:

- Scope and sequence
- Unit maps
- Lesson templates
- Assessment rubrics
- Inclusion guide
- Teacher training modules

Use PECAT as a structured tool to analyze curriculum coherence and alignment.[5] PECAT provides a framework for ensuring that outcomes, instructional content, and assessments are aligned and developmentally sequenced.

5.3 Phase 3: Training and coaching system

Goal: Ensure high-fidelity delivery.

A scalable curriculum requires a delivery system. Training should not be treated as a one-time event. Teachers need repeated practice, coaching, and structured collaboration time.

Recommended structure:

- Initial training (2–3 days)
- Monthly coaching cycles
- Quarterly cross-school PLC meetings
- Train-the-trainer model for sustainability

Evidence-based program research supports the value of trained specialists and structured teacher development.[7] This is particularly important in underserved districts, where staff turnover may otherwise weaken implementation quality.

5.4 Phase 4: Resource alignment in low-budget environments

Many underserved districts cannot afford expensive equipment or commercial programs. However, scalable PEH can be built through practical alignment of existing resources.

A low-budget district strategy includes:

- scheduling protection of minutes,[1]
- basic equipment class sets (cones, ropes, foam balls),
- station-based teaching requiring minimal resources,
- shared resource libraries across schools,
- partnerships with community organizations.

Resource alignment is not only about purchasing equipment. It is also about ensuring that PEH has protected time, safe spaces, and predictable scheduling.

5.5 Phase 5: Evaluation and continuous improvement

A scalable model requires measurable outcomes. Evaluation should be designed for feasibility and sustainability. Districts should not overcomplicate measurement systems at the start; instead, they should implement a minimum viable set of metrics and refine over time.

Minimum metrics:

- PE and health minutes delivered
- student participation rates
- MVPA proxy measurement (sampled)
- fitness growth indicators
- health literacy outcomes (performance tasks)
- equity indicators (gender, disability status, absenteeism patterns)

Improvement rhythm:

- baseline → 12-week review → mid-year adjustment → end-year outcomes report

484

CSPAP guidance emphasizes systematic planning, implementation, and evaluation.[6] Continuous improvement is what turns a curriculum into a districtwide system.

6. Scaling Strategy: Replication Across Schools and Districts

Scaling a Physical Education and Health (PEH) curriculum model is one of the most challenging and most important tasks for districts serving underserved communities. Many districts successfully launch pilot programs but struggle to replicate results across multiple schools due to inconsistent training, uneven resources, or weak accountability structures. To scale effectively, districts must treat PEH as an instructional system that requires standardization, support, and quality control like how literacy or mathematics frameworks are implemented.

A scalable PEH strategy must accomplish two goals simultaneously: (1) **expand access** so more students benefit from high-quality PEH programming, and (2) **maintain quality** so expansion does not dilute fidelity and outcomes.

6.1 Scaling is not rollout; it is replication with quality control

Scaling is often mistakenly treated as a "rollout" process: a district selects a curriculum, distributes materials to schools, and assumes implementation will naturally follow. In practice, this approach almost always fails. Scaling fails when districts:

- **purchase curriculum materials but do not train teachers**, leaving staff to interpret the model independently and inconsistently.
- **fail to protect instructional time**, allowing PEH minutes to erode due to testing schedules, staffing gaps, or competing academic demands;[1]
- **lack accountability metrics**, making it impossible to determine whether the program is being delivered with fidelity.
- **do not establish coaching support**, resulting in uneven instructional quality and reduced teacher confidence.

In contrast, scaling succeeds when districts treat PEH as a system. A system is defined by:

- a clear instructional model and curriculum architecture,[45]
- defined implementation expectations,
- structured professional learning,
- measurement and continuous improvement cycles,[5]
- and leadership accountability.

Quality control is not punitive; it is protective. It ensures that underserved students receive consistent wellness opportunities regardless of which school they attend, which teacher they are assigned, or which year they are enrolled. Without quality control, underserved districts risk reinforcing inequity inside their own systems, where only a few campuses deliver strong PEH instruction while others provide minimal or inconsistent programming.

6.2 A three-stage replication model

Districts can scale PEH effectively using a three-stage replication model: **Pilot → Codify → Expand.** This model is practical because it allows districts to build proof, strengthen tools, and expand only when implementation conditions are stable.

Stage 1: Pilot

Goal: Prove feasibility and identify implementation barriers before districtwide expansion.

Pilot implementation should occur in **2–4 schools**, ideally representing varied conditions (different grade bands, facility constraints, staffing models, and student demographics). The pilot should be treated as a structured learning phase, not as a final product.

Key actions during the pilot phase include:

- implementing the curriculum model in pilot schools with full training and coaching support.
- tracking implementation fidelity (minutes delivered, lesson completion, assessment use);
- collecting early outcome indicators (student engagement, MVPA proxies, skill growth);
- identifying barriers (facility limitations, scheduling problems, staffing gaps);

486

- refining curriculum materials, lesson templates, and assessment tools based on feedback.

The pilot phase is also where districts should establish a "proof narrative" for leadership: What changed? What worked? What measurable improvements occurred? What conditions were required for success?

Most importantly, the pilot phase should produce the district's first set of **replicable practices**, the core routines that will be expanded later.

Stage 2: Codify

Goal: Convert the pilot model into a standardized district system.

Codification is the most overlooked phase in district scaling. Many districts attempt to expand immediately after a pilot, but expansion without codification results in uneven implementation and quality erosion.

During Stage 2, districts should:

- create a formal **district PEH playbook** that defines curriculum architecture, expectations, and implementation routines.
- standardize unit plans, lesson templates, and assessment rubrics across grade bands;[45]
- formalize coaching tools such as observation checklists, feedback templates, and teacher reflection protocols.
- develop professional learning modules that can be delivered consistently across schools;
- define districtwide reporting expectations (minutes delivered, curriculum coverage, assessment outcomes).[5]

Codification ensures that the program is not dependent on the original pilot teachers or a single coordinator. It transforms the model into a district asset that can survive staff turnover and leadership transitions.

A well-codified PEH model should be "transferable": a new teacher entering the district should be able to understand the instructional expectations, access the curriculum system, and receive training and coaching support without reinventing the program.

Stage 3: Expand

Goal: Scale implementation districtwide while preserving fidelity and outcomes.

Expansion should be staged, not immediately. A common best practice is to expand in cohorts (for example, 25% of schools per semester or per year). This allows coaching and training capacity to remain strong during growth.

During expansion, districts should:

- train additional schools using the standardized professional learning system.
- maintain a coaching backbone that supports teachers with ongoing feedback and implementation troubleshooting.
- conduct quarterly data reviews with school leaders to track progress and identify schools needing additional support.
- ensure that curriculum fidelity remains stable (unit completion, lesson structure, assessment implementation);
- identify and replicate "bright spots" from schools with high engagement and strong outcomes.

Expansion is successful when the district can demonstrate that student wellness opportunities and PEH instructional quality are consistent across campuses—not just in pilot sites.

6.3 Use CSPAP as a scaling scaffold

CSPAP is a widely used framework for increasing students' physical activity throughout the school day.[6] It allows districts to scale wellness without relying exclusively on PE class minutes.

This is particularly important in underserved districts, where:

- PE minutes may be limited by schedule constraints,
- staffing shortages may reduce instructional capacity,
- and students may have limited opportunities for physical activity outside school.

CSPAP serves as a scaffold by expanding wellness beyond the PE classroom. Under CSPAP, PE remains the instructional core, but activity is reinforced through multiple pathways.

A scalable PEH strategy should integrate:

- **quality PE**, where curriculum outcomes, assessment, and inclusive instruction are delivered consistently;[45]
- **active recess**, where structured play and safe access increase daily activity minutes;
- **classroom activity breaks**, where teachers use short movement routines to support attention and self-regulation.
- **before/after-school activity opportunities**, including clubs, intramurals, and low-cost wellness programs.
- **family and community engagement**, which reinforces health norms and expands access to activity beyond school walls.

The practical advantage of CSPAP is that it distributes responsibility across the school system rather than placing all expectations on the PE teacher alone. It also makes wellness scalable in districts where PE minutes cannot be increased immediately.

6.4 Policy alignment that makes scaling sustainable

Scaling is fragile without policy alignment. Even the best-designed PEH model can collapse when budgets tighten, leadership changes, or academic pressures intensify. Policy alignment creates institutional protection.

District and state policies should:

- **codify minimum PE minutes**, ensuring that PEH is protected as a core instructional expectation rather than a discretionary program;[1]
- **ensure qualified PEH staffing expectations**, including requirements that PE is delivered by appropriately prepared educators or supported by trained specialists;[4]
- **require annual curriculum review and reporting**, using tools like PECAT to evaluate alignment, coherence, and assessment consistency;[5]
- **include wellness indicators in district strategic plans**, such as fitness growth measures, participation equity metrics, and health literacy outcomes.

Policy alignment ensures PEH does not disappear during budget cuts or leadership changes. It also supports long-term scaling by giving district leaders a clear mandate to maintain PEH as a district priority.

Additionally, policy alignment strengthens equity by ensuring that underserved students receive consistent wellness supports regardless of campus location, staff turnover, or local leadership preferences.

7. Implementation Toolkit: Standardized Deliverables for District Adoption

A district seeking scalable improvements in Physical Education and Health (PEH) must build more than a curriculum. It must build a delivery system. The most reliable way to reduce variability across schools, especially in underserved districts with staffing instability, is to standardize districtwide artifacts that define curriculum expectations, instructional routines, and accountability measures.

Without standardized deliverables, PEH quality depends on individual teachers' skills and local campus leadership. In high-turnover environments, this leads to predictable erosion: new teachers may revert to activity-based PE without learning outcomes, health instruction may become inconsistent, and assessment may disappear entirely. Standardization protects program integrity and enables replication.

A scalable PEH model should standardize the following deliverables:

7.1 Scope and sequence (grade-band)[4]

The scope and sequence is the backbone of a scalable PEH model. It defines what students should learn at each grade band and ensures that instruction is developmental rather than repetitive.[4]

A strong scope and sequence should include:

- grade-band outcomes (elementary, middle, high school),
- progression of movement competencies,
- progression of health literacy skills,
- alignment to state standards and district expectations,
- guidance for pacing across the school year.

This document is critical for district coherence. It prevents "randomized PE," where instruction varies significantly from classroom to classroom, and ensures every student receives a comparable PEH experience.

7.2 Unit plans (4–6 weeks each)

Unit plans operationalize the scope and sequence into teachable segments. In a scalable model, units should be standardized so teachers across schools can deliver instruction with consistency.

Each unit plan should include:

- clear learning objectives,
- lesson progression,
- differentiation strategies for varied skill levels,
- safety considerations and equipment needs,
- formative and summative assessment tools,
- inclusion strategies.

Unit plans are particularly important in underserved districts where new teachers may not have the time or support to design curriculum independently. Standardized units allow teachers to focus on instructional quality rather than reinventing content.

7.3 Lesson template emphasizing activity density

A lesson template is one of the most practical tools for improving PE quality quickly. It establishes a consistent instructional structure that supports both learning and movement.

A high-fidelity PE lesson template should emphasize:

- brief introduction and objective framing,
- immediate transition into active warm-up,
- skill-building through stations or small-sided tasks,
- structured games that reinforce skills,
- closure reflection (student self-assessment or goal setting),
- efficient transitions and equipment routines.

The purpose of the template is to increase "activity density," meaning students spend less time waiting and more time engaged in movement while learning. This is a measurable implementation improvement and a key quality indicator.

7.4 Assessment pack (rubrics + scoring guides)[5]

Assessment is essential for scaling because it creates accountability and enables continuous improvement.[5] A districtwide assessment pack ensures that learning outcomes can be measured consistently across schools.

A strong assessment pack should include:

- skill rubrics (e.g., locomotor skills, throwing, dribbling, rhythmic movement),
- fitness growth indicators (used for improvement rather than punishment),
- health literacy performance tasks (e.g., stress management plan, nutrition decision task),
- scoring guides to ensure consistency,
- student reflection tools to support self-monitoring.

Districts should avoid assessment systems that shame students or grade based solely on athletic ability. Instead, assessment should measure growth, effort, and skill acquisition. A curriculum analysis tool, such as PECAT, supports alignment among curriculum outcomes, instructional content, and assessments.[5]

7.5 Inclusion guide (adaptations + cultural responsiveness)[3]

A scalable PEH model must be inclusive by design. CDC guidance emphasizes culturally inclusive strategies as a characteristic of effective curriculum models.[3] In underserved districts, inclusion is not optional; it is a core requirement for equitable impact.

An inclusion guide should be provided:

- universal design strategies for PE participation,
- modifications for students with disabilities,
- adaptations for varied fitness levels and confidence,
- culturally responsive activity examples,
- trauma-informed instructional practices,
- gender-inclusive participation strategies.

This guide should be practical and classroom ready, offering examples teachers can implement immediately. Inclusion should be embedded into unit plans and lesson templates, not treated as a separate topic.

7.6 Teacher training modules (micro-credential format)[6]

Teacher training must be structured and repeatable. A micro-credential format is especially effective in underserved districts because it enables training through short, competency-based modules rather than requiring extended professional development days.[6]

Training modules should include:

- lesson structure and activity density strategies,
- classroom management in movement settings,
- assessment implementation and grading practices,
- inclusion and differentiation routines,
- health education instructional methods (skills-based teaching),
- safety and injury prevention procedures,
- alignment with CSPAP and whole-school activity frameworks.[6]

Training should be paired with practice opportunities, such as lesson demonstrations, peer feedback, and video reflection.

7.7 Coaching observation tool

Scaling requires instructional coaching. Coaching is what prevents implementation drift. Without coaching, teachers interpret the curriculum independently and fidelity declines.

A coaching observation tool should include:

- fidelity indicators (unit completion, lesson structure),
- activity density indicators (time in movement vs. idle time),
- inclusion indicators (participation equity, differentiation),
- assessment indicators (rubric use, feedback quality),
- safety indicators (space, transitions, supervision).

The tool should be used for supportive coaching—not punitive evaluation. The goal is continuous improvement and consistency.

7.8 Evaluation dashboard and reporting format

District leaders cannot scale what they cannot measure. A standardized evaluation dashboard should provide a clear picture of implementation and outcomes across schools.

A practical dashboard should include:

- PE and health minutes delivered,
- unit completion rates,
- assessment implementation rates,

492

- student participation trends,
- MVPA proxy data (sampled),
- fitness growth indicators,
- health literacy outcomes,
- equity indicators (gender, disability status, absenteeism patterns).

A standardized reporting format enables quarterly reviews and supports district accountability. It also helps district leadership identify bright spots and replicate successful practices.

Why the toolkit matters

These tools reduce variability and increase fidelity, especially in high-turnover environments. They transform PEH from a teacher-dependent program into a districtwide instructional system.

8. Future Outlook: What the Next Decade Requires

The next decade will demand PEH systems that are not only evidence-based but also resilient, adaptive, and aligned with emerging student needs. Youth wellness challenges are evolving, and districts must anticipate shifts in mental health, technology, and community partnerships.

8.1 Integrating mental health and physical health

Physical activity is increasingly recognized as a protective factor for youth mental health.[2] This is particularly relevant in underserved districts where students may experience higher exposure to stressors, trauma, and instability.

Schools are likely to expand PEH curricula to include:

- stress regulation strategies,
- mindfulness and movement integration,
- social-emotional learning alignment.

This integration should not replace PE or health instruction. Instead, it should strengthen the curriculum by connecting physical activity to emotional regulation, coping skills, and self-management. A future-ready PEH model will include explicit learning outcomes related to mental wellness, stress management, and resilience.

8.2 Technology-enabled personalization

Low-cost tools such as apps, wearable trackers, and digital curriculum platforms may support:

- student goal setting,

493

- engagement tracking,
- individualized fitness progress.

Technology can increase motivation and allow students to track their own growth. However, underserved districts must implement technology with equity safeguards to avoid widening gaps.

Key safeguards include:

- ensuring devices are available to all students (not only those who can afford them),
- protecting student privacy and data security,
- avoiding grading systems based on device access,
- providing low-tech alternatives for students without reliable connectivity.

Technology should be used as a supportive tool—not as a substitute for quality instruction, teacher coaching, or protected PEH minutes.

8.3 Sustainability through community partnership

Districts can strengthen PEH sustainability by partnering with:

- local health departments,
- parks and recreation departments,
- nonprofits focused on youth wellness,
- universities and public health programs.

Partnerships can support training, evaluation, and resource supplementation. They can also expand opportunities for student activity beyond the school day, reinforcing wellness habits through community infrastructure.

Community partnerships are especially valuable for underserved districts because they can:

- provide additional program funding,
- supply expertise in evaluation and public health measurement,
- expand access to safe recreational spaces,
- support family engagement and wellness education.

In the next decade, districts that build strong community ecosystems around youth wellness will be better positioned to sustain PEH improvements even during budget constraints.

Conclusion

Scaling evidence-based Physical Education and Health curriculum models is one of the most practical and equitable strategies available to improve youth wellness outcomes in underserved U.S. school districts.[13] It works because schools reach nearly every child, and

because PEH can be structured as planned, sequential instruction that develops both physical literacy and health decision-making skills.[34]

To succeed, districts must treat PEH as a system: protect instructional time, train and coach teachers, implement inclusive curriculum design, measure outcomes, and replicate through structured frameworks like CSPAP and curriculum analysis tools like PECAT.[56]

When implemented and scaled effectively, PEH curriculum models do more than improve fitness. They strengthen student engagement, support mental well-being, and build lifelong habits that contribute to healthier, more resilient communities.

About the Author

Emely Pasco Escueta, M.A.Ed., is a certified Physical Education and Health teacher with over 21 years of professional experience in K–12 instruction spanning physical education, health, music, and arts-integrated programming. She holds a Master of Arts in Education and a Bachelor of Secondary Education with academic preparation in Physical Education, Health, and Music, and is certified by the Arizona Department of Education as a Physical Education teacher. Her work includes co-authoring a Physical Education and Health curriculum for a U.S. junior high school, designing and delivering training programs for sports and performing arts, and implementing inclusive student development initiatives that expand equitable opportunities for youth participation and talent growth. She has served in leadership and mentorship roles within a U.S. school district, including participation on a school leadership team and mentoring new teachers, and has contributed to community-based cultural programming that promotes student engagement and cultural awareness.

Endnotes

1. American Public Health Association (APHA). "Supporting Physical Education in Schools for All Youth." Policy database entry and associated policy brief content (includes obesity/inactivity context, PE minutes recommendations, equity rationale, and implementation considerations).
2. Murthy, V. H. "Physical Activity: An Untapped Resource to Address Our Nation's Mental Health Crisis Among Children and Adolescents." *Public Health Reports* (2023).
3. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). "Characteristics of an Effective Health Education Curriculum."
4. SHAPE America. *The Essential Components of Physical Education* (2015).
5. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). "Physical Education Curriculum Analysis Tool (PECAT)."

6. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). *Comprehensive School Physical Activity Programs: A Guide for Schools* (CSPAP Guide).
7. Sallis, J. F., McKenzie, T. L., et al. "The effects of a 2-year physical education program (SPARK) on physical activity and fitness in elementary school students." *American Journal of Public Health* 87(8) (1997).
8. McKenzie, T. L., Sallis, J. F., et al. "The SPARK Programs: A Public Health Model of Physical Education."